

(CLICK HERE FOR INDEX)

DEBATE

BETWEEN

J. N. COWAN
ROBSTOWN, TEXAS

AND

DANIEL SOMMER
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

SULLIVAN, INDIANA

November 9 to 14, 1926

PROPOSITION FOR DEBATE:

The Church that I, Daniel Sommer, represent is in Name, Organization, Discipline, Doctrine, Practice, Worship, and Work authorized by Jesus Christ.

DANIEL SOMMER,
I Affirm.

J. N. COWAN,
I Deny.

The Church that I, J. N. Cowan, represent is in Name, Organization, Discipline, Doctrine, Practice, Worship, and Work authorized by Jesus Christ.

J. N. COWAN,
I Affirm.

DANIEL SOMMER,
I Deny.

THE SOMMER - COWAN DEBATE

[\(CLICK ON SPEECH FOR TEXT\)](#)

PROPOSITION NUMBER ONE

The church that I, Daniel Sommer, represent is in name, organization, discipline, doctrine, practice, worship and work authorized by Jesus Christ.

Affirmative, Daniel Sommer.

Negative, J. N. Cowan.

SOMMER'S FIRST ADDRESS.	3
COWAN'S FIRST REPLY.	13
SOMMER'S SECOND ADDRESS.	22
COWAN'S SECOND REPLY.	31
SOMMER'S THIRD ADDRESS — (1ST ON BAPTISM).	40
COWAN'S THIRD — (1ST ON BAPTISM)	50
SOMMER'S FOURTH ADDRESS.	58
COWAN'S FOURTH REPLY.	68
SOMMER'S FIFTH ADDRESS. — (CLASSIFYING)	77
COWAN'S FIFTH REPLY. — (CLASSIFYING)	87
SOMMER'S SIXTH ADDRESS.	95
COWAN'S SIXTH REPLY.	105
SOMMER'S SEVENTH ADDRESS.	114
COWAN'S SEVENTH REPLY.	124
SOMMER'S EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE.	133
COWAN'S EIGHTH NEGATIV.	142
SOMMER'S NINTH AFFIRMATIVE.	150
COWAN'S NINTH NEGATIVE	159
SOMMER'S LAST AFFIRMATIVE ON 1ST PROP.	168
COWAN'S LAST NEGATIVE ON 1ST PROP	178

(CONT. NEXT PAGE)

SECOND PROPOSITION

DIFFERENCE IN THE SPIRIT OF WAR AND THE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT.

COWAN'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE 186
SOMMER'S FIRST NEGATIVE 195

COWAN'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE 204
SOMMER'S SECOND NEGATIVE 214

COWAN'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE 224
SOMMER'S THIRD NEGATIVE 233

COWAN'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE 243
SOMMER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE 252

COWAN'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE 261
SOMMER'S FIFTH NEGATIVE 270

COWAN'S SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE 280
SOMMER'S SIXTH NEGATIVE 289

THIRD PROPOSITION
THE BIBLE CLASS QUESTION

COWAN'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE 298
SOMMER'S FIRST NEGATIVE 308

COWAN'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE 318
SOMMER'S SECOND NEGATIVE 328

COWAN'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE 337
SOMMER'S THIRD NEGATIVE 347

COWAN'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE 357
SOMMER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE 368

Sommer-Cowan Debate

PROPOSITION NUMBER ONE

The church that I, Daniel Sommer, represent is in name, organization, discipline, doctrine, practice, worship and work authorized by Jesus Christ.

Affirmative, Daniel Sommer.

Negative, J. N. Cowan.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: (I believe that is the way that the debaters generally begin to address the audience.) I haven't had a debate for so long that this seems a little strange to me. Nevertheless, I am here to begin in God's good providence, and that which I wish first to mention is this: This is a saddening occasion to me. Debates may be appropriate between politicians, secular educators, so-called scientists, would-be philosophers and sectarian religionists and between Christians as such on the one hand, and errorists on the other hand of every description, but the idea of members of the Church of Christ being in dispute with each other does not impress me favorably. That is the reason this is a saddening occasion to me, and one of the saddening features is that the church that I helped to establish probably thirty years ago in the old court house, that has since been torn down, has been divided and as a result there are two bodies here professing to be Churches of Christ.

People may have wondered what this means, and to say the least of it, the cause of Christ has been disgraced

in this town. Many of you perhaps have not had a clear view in regard to the cause of the division. I don't mean to say that my respondent and I are going to discuss exactly what took place here, but before we get through, the leading differences between these two congregations, I think, will be clearly set forth, and as a result you will be enabled to see why this division has occurred and I trust will be able to see who is in the right and who is in the wrong.

With that much understood, I now state that I have some cheerful feelings, however, with reference to this occasion because I have the idea that possibly my respondent and I may come closer together than these two congregations have been and show them how to get closer together, and between the brotherhood that he represents and the brotherhood that I represent, I had a hope in that direction, and I shall speak and struggle to that end in the course of the remarks that I may make on the different subjects that we are to discuss.

Now, having said that much, I will state that I believe that we will be able to come together closer than we are at the beginning if we will take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth on every question that we discuss. And then if we will both remember that the doctrine that whatever is not allowed in the Bible in so many words is forbidden, is a false doctrine, and that the doctrine likewise which may be spoken of as a legal aphorism, that any interpretation of law that *is so* restrictive that it prevents the execution of law that is already in existence and acknowledged to be right, is undoubtedly vicious and subversive of all law, but I shall talk more about these ideas after a while.

Just now I wish especially to mention about the advantage of taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth on every question in order to arrive at the right conclusion or to be impelled to the right conclusion.

I sometimes make mention when I am preaching on the subject of unity that I once heard a man on the witness stand say that he had heard a certain preacher say that it was a part of his business to divide churches. That, of

course, made a bad impression on the court. On the cross examination that witness was inquired of whether that preacher said nothing more than that on that occasion.

"Oh, yes," he said, "a great deal more.."

"What else did he say?"

"I couldn't tell all he said."

"Did he say it was a part of his business to divide churches and then stop there?"

"No."

"What else did he say?"

"He said it was a part of his business to divide churches from the world. That was his speech."

"Why didn't you say that when under examination?"

"Well, I wasn't asked for it." He had withheld part of the truth.

Now, every church ought to be separated from the world. Indeed the truth of the matter is that the word "church" in the original text, as certain of you are aware, no doubt, really means "called out" or "separated". I mean the original word for "church"—called out or separated, and of course, separated from the world. Hence when the preacher said it was a part of his business to divide churches from the world, he saw saying exactly what every preacher ought to be engaged in.

Then, friends, I make mention that another preacher that I happened to know, once had the charge made against him that he had caused trouble between a certain man and his wife.

"What," I said, "That preacher? You astonish me!"

"Yes, when he was over at the home of a certain brother I could name, that old brother says that this preacher persisted in going outdoors to brush his clothing, and he said, 'Since he has gone away my wife insists that I shall do the same, and he is making trouble between us'."

See the difference between the truth and the whole truth. The charge that a man is guilty of causing trouble between a man and his wife is certainly a very serious charge, but when the explanation was made, it simply indicated that this particular preacher had been under strict

discipline when he was at home, his wife wouldn't allow him to brush his clothes in the house. When he went away from home, he continued the good habit she imposed. Possibly I am laying the foundation for trouble in some people's homes here. If some of the people here will do what that woman did, it might cause trouble because certain of you are pretty well advanced and some of you may not wish to learn new tricks.

Down in the State of Virginia a number of years ago a man stood in a certain company and said a certain woman in that state had advertised for a husband, and she received many responses, but was so well pleased with one of them that she decided she would accept his proposal for marriage and the arrangement was made that when they would meet she was to meet him at the train and have a preacher ready and *marry* him at once. When he stepped off the train, the man said, "Lo, and behold, he was a negro."

"Well," said one of the company, "what did she do?" "What do you think she ought to have done?" "I think she should have married him." "Why, the laws of the State of Virginia say that a white woman shall not marry a negro."

"I didn't say she was a white woman; she was a negress, a negro woman."

See the difference between the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

And then I don't think anything is more commonly understood among Disciples of Christ than that we shouldn't add to the Word of God. Haven't we all heard preachers say, when justified by grace, not by grace only; justified by the blood of Christ, not by blood only? The word "only" in each of those instances, and many more I might mention if I felt like taking the time, is an addition, is more than the truth. So I think my respondent will unite with me in the declaration that we should take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth on every question. So much for the preliminary.

Now, we come to the special proposition under the general proposition. You have heard the general proposi-

tion that the Church which I represent is in his name, organization, discipline, doctrine, practice, worship and work, authorized by the Lord Jesus Christ. My respondent doesn't deny all of that though his name is to the general proposition as a general denial. We are united on the proposition that we should all be called Christians, and as Church should be called Church of Christ, and we are united that the Church when fully set in order has its bishops, elders or deacons and that these are the local servants of the church, and that the evangelists are the general servants of the Church. Why, he advocates that even as I do, and in the next place, we admit everything that is taught in the New Testament concerning the question of the worship on the first day of the week, meeting and singing and reading and praying and attending to the teaching and the Lord's Supper and the contribution, or the contribution first and the Lord's Supper, as we may prefer, and then sing a song and go to our homes. We will all admit that. No trouble between us in regard to that question and that each church should be regarded as God's missionary society to do missionary work.

Well, friends, wherein then do we differ? Why, we differ on certain questions which I regard as merely incidental while he regards them as essential, and consequently he and his brethren are going from place to place disturbing churches, dividing them with reference to these questions.

My first is in regard to the war question. I believe I wrote it down in order that I might bring it before you in the clearest possible manner.

"Christians have a scriptural right to serve their country in any carnal warfare that they regard as just, and therefore we should not agitate this question and divide churches over it."

Now, that is the special proposition, questions of whether Christians may engage in the carnal warfare even to the killing of their country's enemies. I firmly affirm it, as I understand he denies. What does the Word of God say? The question is on the scriptural right.

I turn first to Genesis 9:6: "Whoso sheddeth man's

blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man".

Man bears the image of God and God ordained after the flood was over that whosoever kills one of his fellow mortals, he thereby made an attack upon the image of his maker and should be put to death. By whom? He says by man. You will hear what my respondent has to say on the question of "Thou shalt not kill."

I show first of all that God authorized the killing to be done, and that any murderer deserved capital punishment.

From that I turn over. I wish you all to notice while I read Exodus 15:3: "The Lord is a man of war: The Lord in his name."

The most high, who said to man. "Thou shalt not kill", did not hesitate to declare himself to be a man of war.

We pass from that on to Numbers. 35th chapter, and I begin to read with the 13th verse. There we find that Moses was giving directions to the Children of Israel that when they would enter the Land of Canaan they should set apart six cities, three on one side of Jordan and three on the other side as cities of refuge for the man who had killed one of his fellow mortals accidentally. I read a few verses beginning with the 13th verse: "And of these cities which ye shall give, six cities shall ye have for refuge. Ye shall give three cities on this side of Jordan, and three cities shall ye give in the land of Canaan, which shall be cities of refuge. These six cities shall be a refuge, both for the children of Israel, and for the stranger, and for the sojourner among them; that every one that killeth any person unawares may flee thither. And if he smite him with an instrument of iron so that he die. he is a murderer; the murderer shall surely be put to death. And if he smite him with throwing a stone, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a murderer; the murderer shall surely be put to death. Or if he smite him with an hand weapon of wood, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a murderer; the murderer shall surely be put to death."

This shall be done by the revenger of blood. The

connection clearly shows this and I will not take the time to read it all because those of you who wish to know the truth with reference to the matter will turn and read it when the proper time comes.

Next I call your attention to the 15th chapter of the First Book of Samuel: "Samuel also said unto Saul. The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the Lord.

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts. I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt.

"Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." All of their domestic animals, and we find that King Saul went and slew generally what the Lord told him to slay, but he brought back the king as a kind of a trophy of the war, and he was rebuked for that very severely, and then in the 32nd verse of this same chapter, we read: "Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites: and Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past.

"And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal."

I have read these scriptures to show that the God in heaven who said, "Thou shalt not kill," also said, "Kill."

I turn from this over to First Kings, second chapter. David, the inspired David, just before his death, said to his son Solomon, (beginning to read in First Kings 2:5): "Moreover, thou knowest also what Joab the son of Zeruijah did to me. and what he did to the two captains of the hosts of Israel, unto Abner the son of Ner, and unto Amasa the son of Jether, whom he slew, and shed the blood of war in peace, and put the blood of war upon his girdle that was about his joins, and in his shoes that were on his feet,"

So the Psalmist David, friends, the one who was the sweet singer of Israel, discriminated between the blood of war and the blood of peace, a discrimination which if my opponent will consider aright, will cause him to view this question in a very different light.

Having said that much, I now turn to First Kings, 18th chapter. There we read about the man Elijah, that grand old prophet, and we find that after he had defeated the prophets of Baal, 450 men, the 40th verse said, "And Elijah said unto them, Take the prophets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them: and Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon, and slew them there." Four hundred and fifty men—a prophet of God slew, for the time had come when nothing else would do, for those men could not be converted by the power of the truth.

So much for the Old Testament. I now come into the New.

In the Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, and in Matthew 7:12, we read: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even *so* to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

You recognize that as the Golden Rule. What has that to do with this question? Just this. We as American citizens would have the American government to protect us, and take care of us and protect our rights even if it cost the shedding of blood, and yet at the same time, friends, if we are not disposed or if we are disposed to do to our government as we would have our government do unto us, when our government will summon us to its help, we will do that. The Golden Rule, in other words, requires that we shall treat our government as we would wish our government to treat us, and consequently when the time will come for us to be called upon by our government to defend it against an enemy, we undoubtedly have a Scriptural right to do so.

Just here I will make mention parenthetically that many years ago down in the old state of Virginia, I was talking to a brother there, and I said to him, "Don't believe in war; don't believe in resistance, no. Suppose ruf-

fians would come to your gate to enter your house to outrage your wife and daughters, would you simply use moral suasion?"

He said, "I wouldn't like to be tried."

I said, "What is the difference in meeting an enemy at your own gate or your country's gate?"

He never answered. He lived his life and died without answering.

Here in the 18th chapter of John, 36th verse: "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

It shows very clearly that the Saviour authorized fighting in a kingdom of this world. You can't get out of it, friends, until we die, and consequently, the kingdoms of this world are authorized by the Lord Jesus Christ to fight, but when it comes to religious questions, we shouldn't.

Next, turn to the tenth chapter of Acts, there read concerning Cornelius who was a soldier, and a soldier in the Roman army, pagan Rome, and was liable to be called upon to kill a man or several men every day in quelling a riot because he was there for the purpose of preserving order, and that man was so highly esteemed in the divine right that God sent an angel to tell him where he could go for a preacher. He was a devout man who feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always, and God thought so much of him that he authorized an angel to tell him where to go for a preacher and wrought four miracles, or we may say, made use of four supernatural operations, in order that man's conversion might be brought about, and after he was converted, why, the Apostle Peter tarried with him certain days and left him in the army.

I submit that my respondent must get Cornelius out of the pagan army before he can make a denial of this proposition stand.

That isn't all. because we turn to Acts 25th chapter, and there we read that Saul of Tarsus, or rather, Paul, the Apostle, said in the tenth and eleventh verses of this chap-

ter: "I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged, to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.

"For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar." And his appeal unto Caesar was liable to cause bloodshed, but Paul had the right as a Roman citizen to appeal to Caesar for his safety and protection against the Jews.

Revelations 5:5-6: "And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

"And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth."

In the next chapter, we read that he opened the first seal and there went forth a white horse and his rider with a bow. crowned, sent forth conquering and to conquer, indicating the mission of truth, and then we read: "And when he had opened the second seal. *I* heard the second beast say, Come and see.

"And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another; and there was given unto him a great sword."

And when the war was going on over there in Europe, I said, "The red horse and his rider have been turned loose as perhaps never before since time began."

There is one other scripture that I wish to bring before you. I see that my time has nearly expired, yet I believe I will have time enough for it. So I will call your attention to it. It is in Revelations 19:11: "And I saw Heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.

"His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head

were many crowns, and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself.

"And he was clothed with a vesture clipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.

"And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords."

Now, friends, I see that my time has expired. I will just state that I earnestly entreat my respondent to consider these scriptures for my proposition is that Christians have the Scriptural right to serve their country in any war that they regard as just, that they regard as right. If they don't regard it as right, then they should defy the government and take the consequences, because as Christians we should stand in opposition to whatever we regard as wrong, whether it is imposed by our government or imposed simply by certain individuals.

I thank you for your splendid attention, and bespeak for my opponent that you will listen to him as you have to me.

J. N. COWAN'S FIRST REPLY.

Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: It affords me the greatest of pleasure to be before you this evening as the respondent to the proposition that you have heard read and discussed. I regret very much to see a man of Brother Sommer's ability, his experience and learning, endeavor to prove that it is right for people of God, for Christians to shoulder their guns and shoot down their fellow men. Nevertheless he has undertaken to prove that is right, that murder may be legalized, and thus Christians justifiable in the perpetration of it. This I most emphatically deny.

When Brother Sommer referred in his closing re-

marks to the fact that Christians had a right when they believe their country to be in the right, to take up arms and fight for their country, I wonder if it had occurred to Brother Sommer that the Christians in the country that they are fighting against, would also be summoned to fight the Christians in this country, and thus we would have Christians in one nation shedding the blood of Christians in another nation. Here is a difficulty for Brother Sommer to overcome.

We shall now review his speech in the order in which it was delivered. He says "debates of various kinds are justifiable, but that debates among brethren gives him a sad feeling". Well, it does me. Nevertheless when trouble arises among brethren, it is perfectly scriptural and right to debate that question.

For example, I cite Acts 15:1-9, where a question of circumcision had come up in the church at Antioch, and they disputed about it at Antioch, then appealed to the Apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem, and they had a discussion of the matter there, and finally got it settled, and sent their decision down to the brethren at Antioch.

Now, we have a question tonight, Is it right for Christians to take their firearms and shoot down their fellowmen in war? It has caused trouble in the church today even as circumcision caused trouble in the church then. Then why not discuss this matter among ourselves, and get it settled, as they did that question? So I argue that debates between brethren are justifiable, if some of these brethren have advocated a false position that is giving the church trouble.

He refers to several little illustrations concerning the man that caused trouble between another man and his wife, and about the negress marrying the negro, and some few others that I do not now call to mind, which we will pass by as not argument, and does not refer to the question under discussion.

He says we are differing on mere incidentals and that I, and my brethren are dividing congregations over these incidental things. This I deny. When it comes to the

question of shooting down your fellow man who may be in his sins, who may be separated from his God and doomed to a devil's hell if he dies in that condition, and that God's people have a right to kill that man, and thus rob him of ever having another opportunity of obeying the gospel, I say that is not a mere incidental affair, but it is of very grave concern, and should be considered so by every one of us who claims to be the children of God.

He says in quoting from Genesis 9:6: "He that sheds blood by man shall his blood be shed", is a proof text proving that it is right to kill our fellow man. He could not have quoted a text more opposed to his position. The very fact that you kill a man shows that you should be punished for the killing, but as to who is to do this punishing is a different question. Then I supply his logic. If you go to war, or kill, or shed blood, then you must have your blood shed because you did that. I kind of like that, Brother Sommer. Give us another passage.

Then he quotes from Exodus 15:3, where it is said of the Lord, that "the Lord is a man of war." We do not deny any statement of God's word, my friends, but when he takes the Old Testament passages in which God was governing, ruling and controlling the nation of Israel, in their temporal welfares and in their wars, and tries to bring that as proof that we should be engaged in war today, I emphatically repudiate the argument because we can not take the examples of the Old Testament war and make them apply to us today.

If Brother Sommer had been debating with a Methodist, and the Methodist had gone to the Old Testament for proof of infant baptism, or infant church membership, you would have heard him say that we are not under that dispensation, and that which was authorized to be done in that dispensation is not authorized in this. So I hand you the same kind of an argument back, Brother Sommer, and ask you to find authority for Christians engaging in war, from Jesus Christ who was the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords,, ' in this dispensation.

Thus I set aside at one lick all the so-called argument that he has used from the Old Testament scriptures. I

am free to admit that the Lord God of Heaven did direct his people in warfare under that dispensation, so there is no difference here, but where has our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom God has conferred all authority and all power in heaven and on earth, where has he acted or legislated war on his followers, in the Christian dispensation.

So, *briefly referring to* Numbers 35:13; First Samuel 15; First *Kings* 2:5 and First Kings, the 18th chapter, which are the passages cited from the Old Testament, we will just answer them all with this one word: They do not belong to this dispensation, and if they authorized war in that age, they do not authorize it in this.

We now come to his New Testament argument. Matthew 7:12 is the first passage cited in which he quotes what is usually termed as the Golden Rule: "As you would have others do unto you, do you also unto them", and makes the argument that if we ask the government to protect us, it should be because we are going to protect the government, if they ask us to. It is unfortunate for Brother Sommer that he quoted from the Sermon on the Mount, because this is *a* masterpiece against Christians going to war.

By taking the one passage as Brother Sommer did, isolating it from the rest of the sermon, we might arrive at his conclusion, but I will begin reading with the third verse of the fifth chapter of Matthew:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth..

"Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

"Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God, "

Here I pause to state, could that be said of a man who is armored and engaged in the battles of carnal warfare, that he is a peacemaker, and. that as such be ought to *be*

called a son of God for making peace like that?

But again we read in the next verse: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness" sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

"Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

We learn from these passages that the Spirit of Christianity is the Spirit of peace, that the spirit of war is not the spirit of peace, that we can not maintain the spirit of war and the spirit of peace at the same time in the same heart. The two spirits are diametrically opposed, the one to the other.

But again in the 21st verse of the Sermon on the Mount: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment". This passage is quoted from the law of Moses and may be found in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy. I will read the 22nd verse: "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his, brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire."

Not only does our law condemn killing, but he here condemns the spirit that will prompt a man to kill.

And this, too, coming from the very Sermon which Brother Sommer quoted: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you".

Let's take the passage itself that he quoted. It would mean, according to his logic, if you want somebody else to kill you, why, you kill them. Are you willing to take your own logic, Brother Sommer?

The next passage cited is found in John 18:36, where Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my Kingdom was of this world, then would my servants fight, but my Kingdom is not from hence."

This, beloved audience, is my passage, does not belong to Brother Sommer's contention at all, because just previous to this the Lord had been arrested. One of his Disciples, Peter by name, drew his sword and cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. Jesus rebuked him for the act and healed the servant's ear. Brother Sommer might say, Wasn't Peter a man of the world? Didn't he belong to a government of the world, and didn't he have the right to cut that man's ear off? That is his argument, but Jesus Christ offered Peter, and offers Brother Sommer a stinging rebuke by commanding him to put up the sword, and healing the man's ear.

He refers to some brother (I have forgotten his name) that he asked, "Suppose some ruffian would undertake to outrage your mother or your daughter? Would you resort to persuasive means?" and the brother died without answering his question.

My friends, if I did not mistake him, that is what he said. Anyway, the point is not lost. Suppose I were to admit tonight that the man would be justifiable in slaving that fellow who made an outrage upon his mother, or upon his daughter. Is that a parallel to a man going out, volunteering as a soldier in the army, going forth to meet the enemy with a determination in his heart that he is going to kill the husband, the father or the brother of some one who has never done him a violent act in all of their lives? *I* say the cases are not parallel. If he had the right to kill the ruffian, it would not prove you had the right to go to war and kill men who are not ruffians. So there isn't any argument to that.

He refers to Acts, the tenth chapter; Cornelius, the centurion who had charge of soldiers. Peter goes up there and preaches the gospel to him, and he is converted and my opponent says that Peter left him in the army, and he continued his soldiership. That is news to all of us, isn't it?

Brother Sommer, it would be an accommodation to us all if you would tell where you learned that Peter left him in the army, and that he continued to act in that capacity.

Now, we must not misunderstand the rules and regulations of debate. I am not calling question on the point that Brother Sommer raised. That is not the idea. But I am bringing out the necessity of proof upon these propositions, and we want to know how you found out that Cornelius was left performing the duties of a soldier after his conversion. I say that is speculation. It may be argued that the Bible doesn't say anything about his quitting it. Just so I might say that when Rahab, the harlot, was converted, it was not necessary to say that she quit being a harlot, but all suppose she did. If a man is a drunkard and he wants to obey the gospel and be a Christian, and it had been reported that he had become a Christian, wouldn't you think he had quit getting drunk, or would I have to tell you before you believe? There is the kind of arguments that Brother Sommer is relying upon for proof of his proposition.

He refers again to Saul of Tarsus, Acts 25th chapter, where Paul said, "I appeal to Caesar," but as usual, there isn't any argument here for Brother Sommer. Why? Because this is a special case in the providence of God, where God had desired that Saul should preach Christ at Rome (read Acts 23:11 for the proof), and that by appealing to Caesar, he had the opportunity of preaching Christ and establishing a congregation of Christians in the metropolis of the Roman Empire, but we are not living in the days of special providences. We might as well argue that we had to see a vision like Paul saw before going to Philippi. So this does not do Brother Sommer's position any good, and the concluding passages that he offered are from Revelations, fifth and sixth chapters, concerning the white horse and the red horse. I suppose he means to apply these passages literally, that the man on the white horse had a literal bow and arrow in his hand, and the man on the red horse was a literal man sitting on the literal horse of that color and actually had a literal sword in his hand.

Brother Sommer, I believe that you have made a mistake here. If that be true, who does the red horse represent? Not Christians, not children of God, but it repre-

sents that spirit of persecution that persecuted the children of God, and now he has gone to a passage where some of God's people's enemies have undertaken to persecute the people of the Lord, for justification for war. You got the wrong bunch that time, Brother Sommer. The white horse and his rider represent the spirit of peace, the gospel of peace, that was sent forth to all nations, and when that spirit went forth, the spirit of persecution arose, illustrated by the man on the red horse, to persecute the people who are preaching that gospel.

So this completes the speech. We desire now to offer some other matter in rebuttal to what Brother Sommer has given us. First, I desire to call your attention to the fact, that, during the first three centuries of the Christian era, those who were the followers of Jesus Christ never did engage in carnal warfare. Christ never authorized it, his apostles never engaged in it, no member of the Church of Jesus Christ during the first three centuries ever took up arms and went forth to carnal war, although they were surrounded with numerous wars. The country in which they lived was engaged in warfare continually. They had had the reputation of being a peace-loving people. They were flying the banner of the principles of peace; they were following after the footsteps of him that said, "Pray for your enemies; love them that persecute you; do good to them that evilly entreat you".

This spirit of Christ, imbibed by his followers for the first three centuries, kept them out of the carnal warfare of the people and nations with which they were surrounded.

I might read you from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Gibbon, Lardner, Mosheim, Orchard, Armitage, and a host of these early church writers that bear me out in the conclusions and statements that I am now making.

We wish to call attention to this proposition: Have the people of Christ in one nation the right to wage war against the people of Christ in another nation? If Brother Sommer's position be true, they have; that people who belong to the Church of Christ in the United States

have a right, if their government demands of them to go to England, to France or to Germany, and kill Christians who live in that country, whose government demands that they kill us.

I ask you the question, my friends, can you believe for a minute that God Almighty has authorized his people in one nation to shed the blood of his people in another nation, much less to shed the blood of those who are not his people, and who are not fit to die? Another question I am going to bring out. It may be argued that we must be subject to the powers that be. and if the powers that be command us to go to war and kill, we should be subject to them. I answer, the same apostle who said be subject to the powers that be, also told wives to obey their husbands. If, my friends, there is no exception to obedience to the powers that be, then there is not an exception to the wife obeying a husband; if that husband asks her to violate the law of God, she must do it. But if it be said she must not obey him only in the things that are right, then we only have to submit to the powers that be in the things that are right, but it is not right to kill, and if our country asks us to kill a man, we should refuse to do it, and the Bible abounds with just such examples.

Suppose we say there are two landlords. Each of them has a number of servants. They fall out about the property line or some other trouble that may arise between them and they have words about it. and the falling out finally ends in their summoning their servants and directing their servants to burn the property, to destroy the stock and even to shed the blood of the other fellow's servants, don't forget the Bible says, "Servants. obey your masters in all things". Here are some masters that have disagreed and they have summoned their servants on either side to kill one another.

Well, of course, they are arraigned before the courts in our country and a lawyer for these servants plead that the Bible says, "Servants, obey your masters in all things."

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SECOND ADDRESS

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Lest I forget, I wish to read several paragraphs from a tract that was issued or set forth in the time of the World War, title, "Should Christians Go to War; or The Relation of Civil Government to the Kingdom of God."

It is too lengthy for me to read it all, so I will read just the concluding paragraphs which I include in brackets, beginning "Should Christians go to war."

"Should Christians go to war? That depends upon the war! It should be a war for liberty, justice, right. There are men and nations that would drag us down, that would put the world back a thousand years in ideas of government, that would threaten the future peace and liberty of the peoples. When the call comes, we must fight against such men and nations. The God of heaven rules in the kingdoms *of men*, but he does not rule except through human instrumentality.

"Christians do not need to provoke war. But when the wicked bring it. or right and justice and liberty demand it. let the right-thinking. Christian people of the land or lands join hands in administering that discipline which will insure future right and peace.

"I believe in peace; but, like Mr. Ford. I believe in it so much that I'd fight for it, (a great English philosopher once said: The first duty of mankind is peace, the second duty is to fight to get it), when fighting becomes necessary for me. And it is only the peace that is fought for that will be the lasting peace. Before this war a lot of foolish men. some of them in high places, thought that a mere agreement among nations, an international law, could secure international peace. But from the fate of the Hague rules, and the London and Paris declarations, in this present struggle, it has come to be seen that there can be no such thing as international law without international sanctions and penalties, and that there can be no international sanctions without an international force to back them up. And only an international war can create such an international force.

"Until all men can be brought always to listen to rea-

son and revelation, or until we all become a different kind of folk from what we are, neither man nor God can show any other way; the schemes of peace-loving, but shortsighted, men to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The great things of time and life are not bought at low price. That which began and closes the drama of this world, establishes beyond dispute the throne of God, and introduces the reign of absolute, universal peace, is war. 'And there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred and his angels; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven (Rev. 12:7. 8) And when the thousand years are finished. Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall come forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to the war; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them (Rev. 20:7-9)... And I heard *a* great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his peoples, and God himself shall be with them, and be their, God; and he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more: the first things are passed away. ' (Rev. 21:3-4). If God could not make sure his own throne and the final peace and safety of his people without a war by the side of which all our wars pale into insignificance, we can not expect that any great right or blessing can come to us that is not bought at some such price or secured in some such way."

I didn't write that, but it was written by a man that I could name, and I thought I would adopt that much of his tract for this occasion.

Now, having said that much, friends, I will come to the speech of my respondent.

While he was talking I was thinking as well as writing, and I thought of a young brother down in Licking County, Ohio, many years ago, who had a controversy

with an old physician about John 3:5, "born of water and of the spirit," and the old physician made mention of what Dr. Adam Clark said, and Dr. Jamison and Dr. somebody eke, as commentators on that passage, and the young man kept his finger on it. And when the old physician *got* through with his comments, the young man said, "Doctor, look at that verse, John 3:5. Look at it. See it?"

"Well, what of it?"

"Doesn't it read the same way as it did before you commenced your talk?"

"Yes, what of it?"

"I thought so. Your comments and your commentaries haven't taken away one single passage."

I regret to say, exceedingly, that my respondent overlooked the vital question that was made by an inspired man and that is especially found in the second chapter of First Kings where David drew the lines between the blood of war and the blood of peace and all of his talk about Christians going to war and going to war against each other just simply is made upon the basis of ignoring that Scripture. You recollect what I told you about taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in order to be impelled to the right conclusion. Now, I submit that my respondent instead of taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth as found in the word of God, why, he has endeavored to ignore every declaration, besmirch it, set it aside in some way or other, and instead of taking, he has repudiated all. All that he has his ideas on is that God said, "Thou shalt not kill," and he has enlarged on that.

The great God of the universe knew what He was doing, and consequently He knew that wars had arisen *among* His people and would arise and there were the two houses of Israel that had warred with each other. Both houses were recognized and the Psalmist David drew the line between the blood, of war and the blood of *peace*. Joab was not under condemnation for all the hundreds or thousands that he had slain with his own hands in the time of war, but when he thrust Abner and another man named Amasa under the fifth rib and killed them when there wasn't any war on hand, that was murder, and David

said that his hoary head should not come down to the grave in peace.

Now, my respondent has ignored that and what the God of heaven set forth then in regard to the difference between the blood of war and the blood of peace, why, of course, still remains. Why, the Apostle Paul declares in Romans 15th chapter, last part, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, "and the Lord Jesus Christ never interfered in any measure nor degree with this question of the civil government, but he said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

Now, my respondent makes an effort to set aside what I said about the Old Testament with reference to this question, and use as an illustration if I was having a debate with a Methodist and he was trying to prove sprinkling, I would say that belonged to the Old Testament. I would go back and show there wasn't any sprinkling of water by itself anywhere in the Old Testament as a religious performance. That is what I would do and that would be the very first something to be done and not endeavor to set it aside, especially if the proposition was about what the Scripture states, if I had the New Testament teaching thus and so, that would be another question.

Now, having said this much, friends, I turn to look at these notes that I have, and I will spend a few minutes with them.

He says, "I regret to see a man of Brother Sommer's experience say that murder can be legalized."

I never said any such thing. He knows it and you know it. Never said anything of the sort. God said, "He that shed's men's blood, by men shall his blood be shed." He has never recalled or modified that. He left the civil government where he found it. He taught Christians how to act under civil government.

My respondent has misrepresented me at that juncture, but isn't it lawful for a man to bear testimony concerning a murder when his law requires him to come and testify? Would my respondent be justified if he had seen a murder committed, would he be justified in refusing to come before the court and testify to what he had seen? If so,

he would be an outlaw, suppressing testimony which the law should have. Well, suppose that he comes and he testifies and it is upon his testimony, corroborating somebody else, that the man *is* condemned to die. What *is* the difference between his testimony and the act of the sheriff when he puts the rope around the man's neck or turns on the electric current? Without this man's testimony—and he can't be a good citizen or good Christian without giving the testimony, submit to the powers that be, without his testimony justice couldn't be executed, and he gives the connecting link and somebody has justly said, "Whatever link of nature's chain you strike, tenth or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike," and whatever link of testimony you strike, tenth or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike. His testimony put the rope around the man's neck or turned on the electric current, and if he doesn't give the testimony, I deny that he can be a Christian. He isn't a good citizen even. He is called upon to be a good citizen and submit to the powers that be.

Now, you see, friends, all his sentimental talk on that question of legalizing murder is simply talk, and I will use his expression, saying, no argument.

He said he wondered if it had occurred that Christians in one nation would be called upon to fight Christians in another. Yes, they have been, but the inquiry arises, Are they not to use their just judgment in regard to the justness of the warfare? They may make a mistake and the question arises, what are we engaged in here? Why, we are engaged in a religious battle, and if my respondent could possibly summon up sufficient ingenuity or argument or something else to crucify me or to put me to death, theologically, he would be glad to do it, and he and I have had this warfare which we are engaged in now, we have had these discussions, in contemplation a year and a half, and we haven't been able to get together until this occasion.

Now, the solemn inquiry arises, friends, a man who has had eighteen discussions on one question with certain of his brethren, as he told me, I believe it was this morning, shows that he is a warrior only in another department, and he would kill off his brethren if he possibly could

from a theological viewpoint. What is the trouble? It is a question of blood with him. "Thou shalt not kill," in that particular instance, but the very one who said, "Don't kill," also said, "Kill, not only men, but women and children", and not only so, but one part of his people were to be arrayed against another part of his people when the occasion demanded.

With that much comment on what he said with reference to that matter, I will leave the question.

His remarks about debates, Acts 15th chapter—came together, had a debate over circumcision, and he will justify our debate on that question. Well, as far as that is concerned, friends, they didn't really have a debate; they disputed somewhat privately and had a public rehearsal of it. according to Acts 15th chapter, and there was a decision, as certain of you may recollect, and what was it? Well, it was unfortunate, and that is all I said, about the debates being unfortunate. It was unfortunate for him, as a professed member of the Church of Christ to be disputing with me as a member of the Church of Christ, and both claiming to be representative men of the different domains of the Church of Christ. I said it was unfortunate; that was unfortunate, as we read in Acts 15.

And in the Book of Galatians, Paul's letter to the Galatians was written largely for the purpose of preventing a congregation acquiring that sort of doctrine. It was unfortunate, and this is unfortunate. That is what I meant by starting out after that manner, and such being the case, if they settled that up there by the divine word, I would like for this to be settled by the divine word here, but you see. I am disposed to take the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible, on this question, and you are called upon to judge whether he wants any of the Bible on this question. You are called upon to judge that.

We look a little further. He spoke of my illustrations as not being argument. I intended them to indicate the difference between taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I think the audience saw that. If we don't take the whole truth, we are liable to come to wrong conclusions and if we take more than the truth, we

are liable to come to more than wrong conclusions, so bind myself by the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

He said, when I said we differ on certain questions which I regard as merely incidental, killing a man is not incidental. No. my friends, when we say that, but going around and disturbing churches about this question, that is something that is not divinely authorized. He can't find that the Lord ever authorized an apostle to go from place to place and preach any such doctrine as he is preaching, and disturb the churches, nothing to set that forth.

Take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I believe that my opponent will have to agree with me on this question.

He said I could not have quoted the text that would have been worse against myself—that is the idea. Yes, who is to do the punishing? In the Old Testament, friends, there was an individual spoken of as the avenger of blood. He was generally the nearest kin to the one that was killed, and the God of heaven took special care of the individual who had killed a man incidentally. He was to escape and go to the city of refuge and *remain* there until the death of the high priest under whose administration the murder had been committed.. If he killed a man incidentally, but if he was brought out from the city of refuge and tried before the judges and the truth was given that he had done this deliberately "with malice aforethought", as the language of the law says, he was a murderer, the Book said, and he should be put to death by the avenger of* blood. That was God's law and the Lord Jesus Christ honored the Old Testament without a criticism and left the question of civil government just where He found it.

And he says, But where has he incited war in the Christian dispensation? Friends, he has to take that man Cornelius out of the Roman army. He says I presumed something. Well, he presumed that he was taken out. I presumed that he was left in the Roman army because not one vestige of Scripture was to the effect that Peter advised him to get him out. and my opponent can't get him out without adding and the Scripture says, Add not to his word lest (Proverbs 30:6) he reprove thee and thou

be found a liar. Not by a single syllable found in the direction of Peter advising that man to get out, so I leave him where Peter left him. He would take him out, and uses as an illustration that if a man is a drunkard and becomes a Christian, why we don't have to tell the man that he has quit drinking. No, we don't, because it is well understood that drunkenness is directly forbidden in the 'Word of God. And says those who are drunkards shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. So you see his illustration does not touch the case. But where is the Scripture that says, He that remains in an army as a soldier can not inherit the kingdom of God? He doesn't take the truth. the whole truth and nothing but the truth. He is the one that adds to the Word of God in this instance, and as a consequence, friends, I believe he is under divine condemnation. The Old Testament and the New unite in saying, Add thou not unto His word lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar. I said it was Proverbs, and here I find it, Proverbs 30:6: "Add thou not unto His word lest He reprove thee and thou be found a liar." He is implying an addition to the Word of God. God reproves him and finds him a liar. Don't say that I called him a liar, but that is the word of God.

Here we turn back to Deuteronomy and we find in the fourth chapter the following on this subject, second verse: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you. neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." Must not add nor take from it.

We turn to Revelations and we find in the last chapter of the last book in the Bible, 18th verse, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

He may say that he hasn't added to. We add by explicit statements, and we add by implication, and the man who doesn't know the difference between what is called explicit statements and implication, of course, would better study it. He has implied an addition to the Word of God in this case by saying that this man Cornelius was put out

of the army or was told to get out. It is not in the Book. He can't get it in without making an addition. When he adds, why the Word of God comes in and says, Add thou not unto His word lest He reprove thee and thou be found a liar.

A few other notes here. John 18 says Jesus rebuked Peter. He said, "Put up thy sword." They that take life by the sword, shall perish by the sword. Those that incite by carnal warfare, they will have to submit to carnal warfare. He says *that* Jesus healed the man, put his ear on again. Yes. of course, He did, and that was an indication of the Saviour why we should not fight with carnal weapons for the Lord's cause. That is the reason the Saviour needed no sword on that occasion. He says, "Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" You must not fight for my cause by carnal warfare, and not only that, but with your fists. If a man comes against me as a dog comes, to do me harm, my duty is to get out of his way, if I can, or use physical force, but if he comes against me as a Christian and because I am a Christian, I must keep my hands down. We are not to fight to advocate the Lord's cause nor are we to fight in order to defend this cause, with physical force, and every now and then I hear of certain individuals that jump up and are ready to take off their overcoats on the question of religion. I don't believe any true Christian will do that. If he does under impulse, he will apologize as soon as it is called to his attention. That is the way the matter stands.

He says I told about that brother that died without answering my question. I said to that brother, Suppose a ruffian or several ruffians would come to your place to outrage your wife and your children, your daughters. Would you simply use moral suasion? He said, "I would not like to be tried."

I said, "What is the difference between meeting an enemy at your own gate or at your country's gate?"

My opponent said something about volunteering. I never said that a man should volunteer, but while the late war was raging and it was dangerous to state your views. I published in the Apostolic Review, if I was of military

age. I wouldn't volunteer, and wouldn't advise anybody else to, but I would wait until I was drafted and if the government drafted me, I wouldn't be responsible. If I would volunteer, I would select myself for the war. I have no right. If I am drafted and the government should ask me what department I wished to fight in, I would say, I haven't any choice. My responsibility is at an end. I am simply to obey orders. I published that. There wasn't anything said about it in government circles, as far as I ever heard.

He says, Need not tell you that was no argument. Well, you can see whose argument is. We needn't tell you on that.

Concerning Revelations, literally—white horse and red horse. Before he got through he said the white horse indicated peace. Why couldn't the red horse indicate war?

Of course, it was an indication, a representation, a sign, and God sent and signified this revelation to his servant John.

It is not right to kill. Is it right to bear testimony? That is what I have made mention of.

Well, friends, that is illustration. You see the end of it, but don't forget my respondent can't make out his case until he gets Cornelius out of the army.

I thank you for your attention.

J. N. COWAN'S SECOND REPLY.

Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We now reply to this speech to which you have listened so patiently, and we shall talk this thirty minutes as quickly as any man can talk thirty minutes.

He asked a question, "if the white horse represent., peace, why can not the red horse represent war?" It can. But the red horse that represented the war, represented the enemies of God's people in war, and not the people of God in that war.

Again he says when he enters the army, if drafted, that he would not have a selection or preference of posi-

tions in that army because his responsibility would be at an end. Then whatever he did in the perpetuation of that war would be charged to the government that authorized him and drafted him to do that, and that God would not hold him responsible for the men he killed in that war.

Now, that is his argument, if I understand it. Then it is possible, my friends, according to that argument, for a man to lose his individual responsibility if drafted into the army of our country, which makes killing legal according to the laws of our country, and hence he has admitted the very thing I charge upon him in my first speech, of endeavoring to prove that murder can be legalized. Therefore, I claim to have successfully proven that according to his arguments, it is wrong to kill when not in war, but you can kill, and that killing can be legal and right and the man who does the killing irresponsible during war. The conclusion of the whole matter is that if you want to lose your responsibility to Almighty God, be drafted into the army of the United States, and God will no longer hold you responsible for your actions.

Are you ready for such a conclusion as that? I think not.

In John 18:36, Brother Sommer says that Jesus was teaching his disciples that they should not fight for His cause. I am glad he has made that admission. Then for whose cause *is the* soldier fighting when he goes to war and kills his fellow man? It is not for the cause of Christ. If it is not for the cause of Christ, it can not be for the cause of God. It must be for the cause of the devil who is the author of all war between the nations. And please excuse me from fighting to perpetuate the cause of the enemy of men's souls. He has quite a deal to say about adding to the word of God, referring to Deuteronomy 4:4. Revelations 22:19. and a passage from Proverbs, 30th chapter, and charges me with having added to the word of God concerning Cornelius' case. What does adding to the word of God mean? Hear Brother Sommer's definition: "We may add by explicit statement or by implication." In Cornelius' case, there is no explicit statement that he remained in the *army*. Brother Sommer

adds by implication that he did remain in the army; that being one way to add to the word of God by implication, then Brother Sommer is the man guilty of adding, according to his own definition.

When I showed that the Bible did not say Cornelius remained in the army, and gave you the illustration about the man who was a drunkard, but who was converted, but we did not have to say that he did not get drunk any more. Brother Sommer replies, "the cases are not parallel, because we all understand that it is wrong to get drunk, and that a Christian should not get drunk."

I wonder why, *my* friends, that we could not all understand that it is wrong to kill: that it is wrong to take the life of our fellow man. and when I hear of a man being converted. I am just as sure that that man has quit killing as I am that the other man has quit getting drunk. Can't you people see that? I know you can. so the cases are parallel. I will give you one more illustration.

In the book of James, the second chapter. I believe. and about the 11th verse: "For he that said, do not commit adultery, said also. Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."

Here, my friends, are two crimes or sins that come from the same law. If there be a way that you can legalize killing, why may there not be a way that you can legalize committing adultery? And if a man is converted, and I am to infer by that fact that he has quit committing adultery, then when I hear of his being converted, then I also infer that he has quit killing. From this conclusion there isn't any way for Brother Sommer to escape.

He says his main point was incidental killing versus wilful murder, referring back to the cities of refuge, that if a man kill another man incidentally, he could flee to the city of refuge and stay until the high priest had died and then be free, but if he killed a man wilfully and not incidentally, that he should surely be put to death. Here we have Brother Sommer's discrimination. I think plainly made out between incidental killing and wilful killing. I appreciate the difference and I do not believe if I was to

accidentally or incidentally kill a man, that the crime would be anything like the crime of wilfully murdering that man, but I want to know who could stretch their imagination to that extent, to class a man forsaking his father and mother, and leaving his home, and going into an army and taking a gatling gun and shooting the life out of his fellow man, and call that incidental killing or accidental killing? I tell you your imagination would have to be made out of rubber to get you to stretch it to the extent that that was an incidental killing.

Another point: We are discussing tonight the question, Have Christians a right to take human life in carnal warfare? Should I admit that you have the right to kill the ruffian who outrages your home, should I admit that you have the right to kill a man in a personal difficulty at your front gate, in your field or elsewhere, yet I would not have admitted the right to engage in carnal warfare. The cases are not parallel. Should I admit, my friends, that a man should be hung for murder, which I do not admit, yet that would not justify Christians engaging in carnal warfare. Why? Because when the murderer is hung, only the guilty suffer, but in carnal warfare the innocent have to suffer with the guilty, and oftentimes the innocent without the guilty. The guilty people are the ones who make the war and the innocent ones who suffer from it.

Therefore, you can not class a personal difficulty or murder, or hanging for murder, according to the laws of our country, with carnal warfare.

He said his illustrations were for the purpose of making the audience appreciate the importance of taking all the truth. Well, I think I got his point on that.

Now, let's apply that principle. He referred to Matthew 7:12, that he called the Golden Rule, which was a part of the Sermon on the Mount. He placed an interpretation upon that passage that made it contradict the entire spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, and ignored one part of that sermon that says, "thou shall not kill or even have, the spirit of murder in your heart". So

if anybody is guilty of not taking the whole truth, it is Brother Sommer, with reference to Matthew 7:12.

He says, "What are we engaged in here in this debate? A warfare, a religious warfare." Now, I wonder if Brother Sommer thinks that the warfare that we are engaged in, and in which we are not using carnal weapons; as Paul says, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds;" that if we have the right to use these spiritual weapons in destroying what we consider spiritual strongholds and wickedness in high places, that would be an argument in favor of taking carnal weapons and destroying political powers of the world.

Now, I think that Brother Sommer's brethren have a right to expect more of him than to put the two upon an equality. That is the very thing we are having this religious warfare about, is to teach the folks the harm and evil of a carnal warfare.

"Would I refuse to testify if called in a murder case when I knew that my testimony would be the cause of that man's death?" Well, suppose that I did not refuse to testify, and that my testimony did hang that man, shall we conclude then, that authorizes Christians engaging in carnal warfare? Why, certainly not. Should my testimony cause that man's neck to be broken, it would not justify me to take my gun when I knew I didn't have to, when I knew that the laws of our country would not force me to do it, when I knew that the laws of our country made a provision for me if I objected to doing it. I say when I know these things, then if I take my gun and kill folks without provocation, without having to do it, it is avoidable, the law in our country permits me to avoid it, and to place that as a parallel for hanging a man for murder, there is no parallel between the two. You don't have to go to war, You don't have to kill your fellow men. The constitution of our country makes a provision that if we object to it as against religion, we can be exempt from military service.

He refers again to the Old Testament and says if he was debating with a Methodist, that he would turn back

to the Old Testament and prove there never was water by itself sprinkled on anybody. Well, maybe you would, but you could also tell him that they circumcised their babies back there, and that made those babies in the covenant relationship of God, (and that is what your Methodist friend is contending for) that your circumcision brought the infants into the covenant, and therefore believe in the church membership. You are tied to it, Brother Sommer.

If you were debating with a sectarian, you would emphasize that the word of God should be rightly divided, but when you come against me on the war question, and *realize* you have no authority in the New Testament from the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, then go back to the Old Testament and the prophets. And just like the ones that believe in instrumental music. In the word of God they can not find it in the New Testament, and they will go to the Psalms of David and try to conduct the proof like Brother Sommer has on the war question.

Now, you can see why he goes to the Old Testament, the same reason that the organites go there for their instrumental music, can't find it in the New Testament. have to go back there for it.

He made quite a lengthy reading from a tract concerning Christians going to war without giving the name of the tract, and also without telling its author. I do not think that is the proper way to introduce testimony in a public debate, and let me mention another fact right here. I don't know how many paragraphs he had brackets drawn around, and I don't know if he read all that he had marked or not, so if the stenographer is to copy all inside the brackets, she may copy twice as much as he read. So let's not let that occur any more because it might not be fair to either party. I don't mean to infer that the stenographer would do that intentionally, but she was to copy all marked in brackets, and do we know all in the brackets was read? There is the proposition I wanted to get before you.

Now, one other thought: That is in regard to the position in John 3:5. after the physician had commented and offered commentaries upon the passage, the poor fellow

he was arguing with still said it reads like it did. your commentaries haven't taken it out of the book.

Just so I will say that all the commentators and all the preachers and logicians of the world can never reason the command, "Thou shall not kill", out of the Bible. It still reads that way and will continue to read that way until this debate closes and will face us in the day of judgment, still saying, "Thou shalt not kill."

This more than compliments Brother Sommer's second speech.

We shall now proceed with some other matters that we desire to get into this speech. At this time, we shall call your attention more definitely to the teachings of the New Testament relative to carnal warfare. Luke 22:36, Christ said, "Tie that hath not a sword, let him sell his garment and buy one".

This was just before Jesus went into the place where He was approached by the mob that arrested him. Peter used the sword and cut off the ear of the servant. Here Jesus rebuked him and healed the servant and tells Peter that all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Right here Brother Sommer would put in a proviso. He would say. all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword, except that it be by the authority of the civil government, but there isn't any such proviso in the word of God. Jesus tells them that He has power to call twelve legions of angels. He tells Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence."

If Brother Sommer had been present, he could have instructed the Lord, "that it is perfectly right for you to have that twelve legions of angels and associate them with your disciples here on earth, and you fight that wicked government that is crucifying you." If there ever was a just cause for the provocation of war. here would have been the time when the innocent Son of God who never spoke an evil word, upon whose lips there was no guile, being assailed by wicked and violent mob, and with the

power to call legions of angels to His aid, with the power to command His immediate Disciples to light, I say if then ever was a time when carnal warfare would have been legalized, this certainly would have been the most auspicious time for it, but instead of that, Jesus teaches the lesson, "My kingdom is not of this world, therefore, my servants won't fight." Brother Sommer says, "Yes, they will, Lord, if the government asks them to."

Again, Luke 9:53 to 55: Jesus enters a village of the Samaritans. They would not receive Him. James and John wanted to command fire to come down and devour them. Christ said, "Ye know not what spirit you are of. The Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

Here is the passage, my friends, that puts an eternal veto to war, because Jesus nor His Disciples had the mission of destroying anybody's life, but saving the lives of men, was their mission. I would like to know how that you expect to save the life of men and at the same time be shooting them down? Every time that you pull the trigger that fires the gun that kills a man who is not a Christian, you place him beyond redemption, you send a soul to eternity, to an endless world where there is no reprieve, there is no way to escape that condition, and I am going to tell you there is no earthly fellow man in this world who has the divine authority to send a man to hell and keep him there. If the government authorizes me to take a man's life and that man is not a Christian, then the government authorizes me to send that man to hell and never let him have a chance at salvation. From this conclusion there is no escape.

Suppose a Christian preacher should become chaplain of the army and while the soldiers are being gathered together to hear the sermon by the chaplain, he turns to the fifth chapter of Matthew and he begins to read to those soldiers just a few minutes before they are to engage in a severe battle, and he reads, "Love your enemies, do good to them that despitefully use you, pray for them that say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake," and the captain of that army should hear that preacher reading those passages to those soldiers, what would he think?

All, Brother Sommer, you know that the captain of that army would put a padlock upon the chaplain's mouth and say, "Here, we don't want none of your peace stuff before our boys. You are here teaching them to love their enemies and what we want them taught is to hate their enemies and do everything in their power to kill them."

I want to say if Brother Sommer were a chaplain of an army he would be prohibited from teaching the whole truth and nothing but the truth. How could you occupy a position in the army of the United States if you had to have your mouth padlocked and refrain from telling those soldiers to love their enemies and to pray for them and to overcome their evil with good and so heap coals of fire upon their heads? I want to tell you, friends, the spirit of Christianity is averse to the spirit of war. The spirit that guides the soldiers on in a mad rush to take human life is not the spirit of Jesus Christ. Therefore, I am here to raise my voice against that position and to teach my brethren that the way we should exert our influence over civil government is by preaching the Gospel to them, teach kings and rulers, teach governors and presidents, how that it is wrong to take human life and then when my testimony is brought before court, it will not break a man's neck because capital punishment is wrong, and when we teach that out of the world (and it is fastly going) then our testimony will not be the cause of murder, certainly not.

It has been said, if our government demands of us to fight, we must fight. In Acts 5:28-29, we have a case where the rulers of the government asked Peter and John not to speak any more in the name of Christ, and they answered, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Here they rebelled against the rulers and powers of the world.

Again in Daniel, the sixth chapter, we find that Daniel refused to submit to the decrees of Darius, the king, and was thrown into the lions' den because he would not submit. Again, the three Hebrew children, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, refused to bow to the image that the king had made and were placed in a fiery furnace.

With these cases before us, my friends, if our govern-

ment should exact of us. that *we* should take our guns and shed human blood, we should do like these ancient ones, refuse to do it. and take the consequences. I am going to tell you the God that brought Daniel through safely the God that delivered the three Hebrew children from the fiery furnace, the same God will deliver us in the end if we will only be true and *loyal* to his Word. I believe in obeying the government when the decrees of that government are in harmony with the Bible, but if they violate His Word. I must obey His Word rather than the government.

I thank you. ladies and gentlemen.

BAPTISM

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators. Ladies and Gentlemen: I felt very well satisfied that our afternoon's session could not be as well attended as the night session, but I am gratified to see as many present as are here.

That reminds me of a man who preached in a penitentiary to the convicts. He said, "I am glad to see so many present", and when he saw a smile pass over the faces of his audience, he said, "But there are not as many as ought to be". And they were all agreed with him. I suppose, on that question.

The subject before us this afternoon is re-baptism. I don't need to announce any special proposition because most of you understand what that means. Now, a general proposition has already been brought before you that the church which I represent is in name, organization, discipline, doctrine, practice, worship and work authorized by the Lord Jesus Christ. My respondent denies that, not entirely, but of course, just in certain particulars.

Last night we eliminated certain particulars and made mention of others, and one of those others that we are to discuss is the question of re-baptism or valid baptism

Now, of course. I refer to single immersion. I don't mean trine immersion because I regard that as a mangling of the divine institution. I suppose my respondent regards that so. and it is not a question of single immersion or trine immersion, but simply immersion into the name of the Godhead by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I represent those Disciples of Christ, or those Churches of Christ that believe we may be baptized or persons may submit to the institution of baptism for am one or two or three or greater number of reasons out of a considerable number that are found in the Book.

My respondent may differ from me on that subject. but we will hear from him hereafter.

Now, I believe that I bring before you again the idea that was presented last evening that we should take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in order for us to come together, and I am exceedingly anxious that we shall be brought together, or at least modified, so that Churches of Christ will not be annoyed and divided and subdivided perhaps on this question of valid immersion as has been the case in times past, and for that reason we are joined together in this discussion, and I will bring before you a few of the Scriptures on which the churches that I represent depend for the position that they occupy.

First I read in Matthew 3:15: "And Jesus answering, said unto him. suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him."

According to this the Lord Jesus Christ, who didn't have any sins to be pardoned, submitted to the institution of baptism for the purpose of fulfilling righteousness. as he had come to fulfill all righteousness, and this is an act of righteousness. He submitted to the institution of baptism. We commonly say that this ought to be sufficient for people generally in regard to the question of baptism being necessary or essential for us for even if we could find men and women as spotless as the Saviour was. still they would be required to be baptized, we say to them, for the purpose of fulfilling righteousness.

The next Scripture to which I call your attention is in Matthew 28th chapter. I read the 19th and 20th verses:

The Saviour said, "Go ye therefore, and teach nil nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son. and of tile Holy Ghost;

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded yon: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Now, this Scripture makes mention of the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, and we have need for that when we come to attend to what we call valid baptism.

The next Scripture is in Mark, 16th chapter, beginning with the 16th verse, or this is all that I will read: The Saviour said, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

We have need of that and we believe that *is* the reason why we should be baptized.

Next I come to John 3:5: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

In view of this declaration we insist that we need to be baptized in order to be born of water and this is a Scriptural reason for baptism.

I turn next to Acts 22nd chapter, and I read the sixteenth verse. Here we find words addressed to Saul of Tarsus, when he was there as a believing penitent in the city of Damascus. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Here is a reason for being baptized. It is connected with the washing away of sins when the individual in rendering obedience, calls upon the name of the Lord. And I next read in Romans sixth chapter, third and fourth verses: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

Now, I represent the churches who believe that when individuals are buried with Christ for baptism into death

for the purpose of obeying the Saviour, that they are Scripturally baptized. When that is done, of course, upon or by the authority of Christ and into the name of the Godhead.

The next scripture to which I call your attention is Galatians, third chapter, 20th and 27th verses: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

The churches that I represent believe that when we are baptized for the purpose of putting on Christ, we are Scripturally baptized.

The next Scripture to which I call your attention is in Colossians, second chapter: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

We believe that when we are buried with Christ In baptism into death and are raised with him through the faith, that raised Christ from the dead, why, of course, we believe that we are Scripturally baptized.

Next, I turn to the Apostle Peter's first letter, third chapter, and there I read, 21st verse: "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: "

And then, friends, we also believe that when a man is baptized according to Acts 2:38, why, he is Scripturally baptized. I read it: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

I say with reference to this last Scripture, we believe he is Scripturally baptized if he does not put too much stress on that expression "for remission of sins". If he does, and he is just thinking about "for remission of sins, remission of sins, remission of sins," rather than obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, I have my doubts about his baptism; thinking too much about himself instead of obedi-

ence to the Lord Jesus Christ, and that is where clanger comes in. I don't care whether it is that scripture or any other, if we unduly emphasize it. You may take any scripture taken in the Bible and emphasize until you make an error of it. You may take any truth found in the Bible and emphasize it after a manner until you lead a certain class of people to think that is the only something in the universe worth consideration, and as a result they make an error of it.

Take the subject of prayer, of thanksgiving or contribution or Lord's Supper, or anything else that you see fit. and you can strain it until you make an error of it That is the reason I say if you don't think too much about the question of the "remission of sins". You may think enough about the question of the remission of sins when you are baptized, if you have been taught unduly to emphasize this, to make an error of it, and as a result forget the importance of the being obedient to the Saviour.

Now. friends, I am numbered with those disciples and represent those churches that believe that we may be baptized acceptably in divine sight by any one of these scriptures unless we would emphasize it unduly, and if we are to have two or three of them before our minds that wouldn't be amiss, but I don't believe anybody here or anybody anywhere else that I have ever seen was ever baptized with all of those scriptures before his mind at the time of the baptism. So, as we can't be baptized with all of them before our minds, what shall we do? Why, take any one of them that may be impressed upon our minds and yield obedience. We may indeed be baptized with the general idea of obeying God or obeying Christ, I give you an illustration.

A brother told me some years ago that on a certain occasion a boy came forward that seemed under size and the preacher said to him, "Son, why have you come forward?"

He said, "I wish to make the good confession, sir".

"Why do you wish to make the good confession?"

"I wish to be baptized."

"Why do you wish to be baptized?"

"Because God requires it."

The preacher didn't ask anything more, that was the general idea. Divine requirement. Faith is a divine requirement; repentance is a divine requirement; confession is a divine requirement; baptism is a divine requirement. I represent those churches who talk after this manner on the subject of baptism, and we are afraid to emphasize unduly any one of these requirements. My respondent will indicate to you, I suppose, what he thinks, on this subject, and we may have quite a discussion before we get through with reference thereto, but if he will take the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth even as far as I have brought it before this audience this afternoon, I think very likely he will be modified somewhat at least on this question because I am confident that by taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, why, we will be impelled, just as certain as that we have dear minds and honest hearts, and even ordinary reverence, to come to the divine Book, and that will bring us closer together than we otherwise would be.

Now, having said that much on the subject, I next call your attention to this: That I represent those churches that are satisfied with Scriptures that I am going to read in your hearing on another phase of the subject. First, in Romans 6:17-18, we have the following: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.

"Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."

Now, you notice, if you please, that Paul said, "that form of doctrine"; he didn't say "purpose of doctrine". Don't let anybody impose upon you the "purpose of doctrine". The purpose or condition of the heart is in the words "obeyed from the heart". "That form of doctrine"; not a word said about purpose, but "form of doctrine"; nothing said about the purpose. For that reason I am numbered with those brethren who say that when an individual is immersed into the name of the Godhead, that has the name of Christ called over him as the one by

whose authority this is done, and this is by a single immersion and he is raised again, that individual, *as* certainly as that he is sincere, has obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered, and he says, "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness".

Now, keep this before your minds, my hearers: It says "form of doctrine", and nothing is said about the "purpose of doctrine", because we may have to consider this question of purpose before we get through this.

Now, I call your attention to First Corinthians 11:28. Writing to the Corinthian brethren with reference to the Lord's Supper which is an ordinance, an ordinance, an ordinance, to be attended to by Christians as a test of their faith even as baptism is an ordinance, an ordinance, an ordinance, to be attended to by the alien sinner in order to become a Christian, Paul says with reference to this in the 28th verse, here before me: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup". Now notice, he is to examine himself, and if anything is well understood among the Churches of Christ, it is that we are not to examine somebody else on the question of fitness for the Lord's Supper. We have set ourselves against those who sit in judgment upon their brothers and sisters in regard to their fitness after they have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered in the gospel and that has been denounced by us from one end of the brotherhood to the other, and I don't know any Scripture that has been more generally emphasized than that a man should examine himself, examine himself, examine himself, and if this be the divine appointment with reference to fitness for one ordinance, is not this the divine appointment for fitness of the other ordinance, especially when Paul asks "who art thou that judged another man's servant? Before his own master he stands or falls," he says, and as we are not to examine the other man's servants in regard to fitness for the Lord's Supper, one ordinance, why should *anybody* presume to examine another man's servant in regard to fitness for the other ordinance called baptism?

Now, with that much before us, I turn to Paul's second letter to the brethren at Corinth and the last chapter, and there we read in the fifth verse: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith: prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?"

Here is not only the divine doctrine of self-examination in regard to one of the ordinances, but in regard to the question of being "in the faith." and as Paul says over here in Romans, 14th chapter, "Who art thou that Judgest another man's servant? to his own master he stands or falls." Yes, that is the fourth verse of Romans 14. "To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yes, he shall hold up: for God is able to make him stand."

Now, the question arises, friends, who am I to sit in judgment upon an individual who informs me that he has obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered in the Gospel; in other words, that he has been immersed and what is the difference between me. if I take that position, and the sectarian who sits in judgment upon this individual before his baptism and hears his experience and decides that he is fit, between him and me if I sit in judgment upon him after he has been immersed, and I hear his experience and I say he is not fit? The sectarian says. "You are fit," upon his experience, and I hear that and because it doesn't conform to what I have read in the Book, why, I say he is not fit. We are both sitting in judgment upon another man's servant, and we are both disregarding the Scripture which says, "Let a man examine himself," and "examine yourselves and prove your own selves whether you be in the faith or not." We are both engaged in just about the same business only the difference is before and after. You have seen that kind of a picture, haven't you, before taking and after taking?

Here is an individual before taking to the water, or being taken to the water. Why, there is a man who sits in judgment on him; he is going to obey from the heart the form of doctrine delivered in the Scriptures, and he hears a certain experience, not exactly in harmony with the Book, perhaps, but in connection with it, and makes his confession of faith in Christ, and after he has been

taken to the waters, suppose I sit in judgment on him and I say. "No, that won't do. You did not have the right purpose."

Now, with that much before our minds, friends, I could leave the subject with you here without any fear whatever concerning the results, but I have a few minutes left yet. and I believe that I will occupy those few minutes in talking to you a little farther on the subject, to see if I have brought before you everything that I wish.

Well, it is in Acts. 19th chapter, that I find something to which I wish to call your attention. There we learn that the Apostle Paul came across and found certain brethren at Ephesus who had been baptized, were certain of John's disciples. I begin to read with the second verse: "*Me* said unto them. Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." (The later versions differ a little from this. We will pass on; we are not engaged in an examination of the versions just now.)

"And he said unto them. Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said. Unto John's baptism.

Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him. that is, on Christ Jesus.

"When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

If we are going to bind ourselves up and down and in and under the exact language of the divine text, here are two questions that we might ask somebody that has been immersed and comes to us as an immersed believer: "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you were baptized? The individual might hesitate now because the Holy Spirit is not given in a miraculous manner, and then the apostle said, when the } said they hadn't heard if there was a Holy Ghost. "Unto what, then, were you baptized, and they said, Unto John's baptism," and then he said he told them about John's baptism, and said they were to believe on him who was to come, and when they heard about Christ, with reference to whom seemingly they had

not been previously informed, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

The one question to which I especially call your attention is this: "Unto what then were you baptized?" Literally, into what? Now, had I come to an individual who has been immersed by some sectarian, and I don't know about this, I say. "What about your baptism?"

"Well," an individual said to me once, "I have been immersed. I am satisfied with it if you are, but if you think I ought to go into the water again, I am ready."

I said, "You can't go into the water on my say-so. Here is the Book of Acts. Read it. I call your attention to it; special Scriptures. You read this and then if you are satisfied with your baptism, I haven't anything more to say. If you are not. let the Scripture take you into the water."

I never say a word to them about design in baptism. Do you know why? I don't find that expression in the Book—design of baptism, no more than I find "getting religion." One is as strange to the New Testament as the other. So I don't preach upon the design of baptism. I don't ask people if they understood the design of baptism when they were baptized. I number with those disciples who hold that we may be baptized for any one of these Scriptural reasons or several of them and be acceptable in the divine sight without understanding, as I now mention it. what is sometimes called "the design of baptism."

The Lord's purpose in having us to be baptized, that is another question, but don't forget when we obey from the heart the form of doctrine delivered to us in the Scriptures, we have been Scripturally baptized even if we didn't understand anything about purpose which isn't mentioned in the text that I have brought before you. and I don't think that it can be found in any other text with any degree of certainty.

Now. with that much before our minds, friends, I am about ready to leave this question with you, although I haven't said all on the affirmative side that I may wish to say, and a subject like the subject we had last night is only partly discussed by one affirmative, and when my respondent comes to take the affirmative on all these ques-

tions, and I have the negative, then we will hope to have brought out before the audience that may be assembled here on the different occasions as nearly as possible every vestige of truth hearing on the subject. And I believe that you will all agree with me that we ought to take the truth, the whole, truth and nothing but the truth in order to be impelled to the right conclusion with reference to God's Word.

I thank you for your attention, friends, and trust you will treat my respondent as you have treated me.

BAPTISM

J. N. COWAN'S FIRST ADDRESS (Negative)

Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are indeed glad to be here again this afternoon to follow my opponent in whatever way that he leads. I must confess my surprise at his abandonment of the war question so soon. However, debaters all have their tactics, and so I presume Brother Sommer thinks he can best debate the war question in the negative than to offer the arguments he has to offer in the affirmative, although it is strictly an affirmative proposition for him. He is affirming that Christians may take human life in carnal warfare. I deny, and it seems like the logical manner to have debated that question would have been for my opponent to have stayed in the affirmative. But now he has decided to take up the next proposition, namely, re-baptism, sometimes called sect baptism, and has spent his third affirmative speech of this debate on that question.

We shall be glad to follow him upon this question and shall now pay our respects unto that speech.

He introduces Matthew 3:15-16, in which we have the account of our Lord's baptism, and the design stated in that baptism which was to fulfil all righteousness. Never was there a more specific expression of the design

of baptism, although Brother Sommer says the design is not mentioned in the Book. Let me quote that passage again. "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." Here the "fulfillment of all righteousness," is positively named as the design of our Lord's baptism. True enough, he didn't have any sins to be remitted, but when we are baptized, Brother Sommer will admit that we have sins to be remitted, and inasmuch as God's righteousness are God's commandments, Psalms 119:172. then we are baptized in order to fulfil all the commandments of God.

Then when Brother Sommer says baptism has no design or, that we have no design in being baptized, he contradicts the very first proof text that he offers in this discussion.

Next he refers to Matthew 28:19-20. That is a statement of the great commission, and we couple with that Mark 16:16 and John 3:5, and reply to what he has said upon those passages all at once.

First, I believe the passages, that they teach the truth and can as truthfully say that the churches which I represent believe the teaching of these passages, as well as the churches that he represents. I fail to see any argument in this upon the question at issue. However, if there be an argument, it is in my favor, because when one reads the great commission as stated in Mark 16:16, that I will now quote, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned," how can an intelligent, sensible man that can understand the reading of the English language, read that commission and not see the object in believing and being baptized? One must be indeed densely ignorant to read that or hear it read, and fail to see that salvation is the object of the words "believe and be baptized," and no grammarian in the world can diagram it grammatically otherwise.

He refers to Acts 22:16 where Saul of Tarsus was told to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here **is** another posi-

tive statement of the design of his baptism. The educated man that Saul was. hearing this language from Ananias, the Lord's preacher, telling him to be baptized and wash away his sins, he could not have misunderstood the purpose or the design in that matter. What Brother Sommer wants to find in the New Testament, is where some person of character submitted to the command to be baptized and did not understand what it was for.

Now, when he finds that case, where under the Apostolic ministry they baptized people, or had them baptized who did not understand why, or the purpose for which they were being baptized, if such a case can be presented by my opponent, it will settle this debate, and I will give up the proposition and say that I am wrong.

Then what kind of a baptism are we discussing? From Brother Sommer's viewpoint, one not found in the New Testament. Then why will he call me an heretic for denouncing that baptism that can not be read in all the teachings of the New Testament, where one person or one individual was baptized who did not understand the purpose or the design of that baptism.

He cites Romans 6:3-4, where Paul says, we are buried with Him in baptism, and Brother Sommer says he will accept as Scripturally baptized all those who are buried with Christ in baptism in order to obey God. But it might be interesting to this audience for Brother Sommer to tell them how can one who believes a false doctrine and one who makes a false confession that contains a flat denial of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, that such a character as that can be buried with Christ in baptism, when he is doctrinally wrong and verbally wrong in what he believes. In Galatians 3:26-27, his next reference. He says he will accept any as Scripturally baptized who were baptized for the purpose of putting on Christ.

I will accept those as Scripturally baptized for the same purpose. What you need to find is a Scripture authorizing you to accept one on their baptism when they confess to you they put on the Lord Jesus Christ before they were baptized. Colossians 2:2, the next reference. He says that "I will accept those baptized who are bap-

tized in order that they might rise with him to walk in Ins life." So will 1. That is a clear statement showing that the new life begins after baptism and not before, and if a man has that understanding that he is being baptized in order that he might walk a new life, he certainly has the right design in being baptized. These passages are my passages. They belong to my side of this question. Brother Sommer will accept those who have been baptized or immersed at the same time believing that they had already risen with Christ and were not being baptized to rise with him at all.

His next reference is I. Peter 3:21. He will accept those who are baptized in order to obtain a good conscience toward God. Will you please note, friends, that in all of these passages there is a design stated? And if you had not known that Brother Sommer was differing from me while he was talking about these passages, you would have thought he was arguing my side of the question. The ones that Brother Sommer accepts upon their baptism claim to have had the answer of that good conscience before their baptism and are not baptized for that purpose at all. You will have to fix on that again. Brother Sommer.

Now, he comes down to Acts 2:38, and he says he will accept that kind of a baptism or the baptism described in that verse provided we do not put too much stress upon the phrase, "for the remission of sins." I wonder if it is possible that you could emphasize that truth until it would not be the truth. That is a new argument to me. You might say there is one God and emphasize that statement by saying there is one God and one God until finally he would not be God, I guess. I want to tell you people you can not place too much emphasis upon the truth of God. It is the lack of this emphasis that has caused so much sectarianism to creep into the church of Jesus Christ, a part of the church has been neglecting that passage and preachers, desiring numbers rather than quality, have allowed people to run into the church over a part of the truth as found in Acts 2:38. We will have more upon Acts 2:38 later.

I will now proceed with his affirmative speech.

Then he relates an incident of a boy, young in years that demanded baptism of a preacher and the preacher asked him why he wanted to be baptized, and he said, "Because the Lord required it." Brother Sommer says that is God's requirement that folks shall be baptized and that is all the evidence that he would want that the boy was a fit subject for baptism, but before my opponent finished his argument upon that, he says that faith is a requirement, and so is repentance a requirement and confession is a requirement, and here this poor boy confessed that God for Christ's sake had pardoned his sins, and Brother Sommer will baptize him on that confession; if he will not, he will accept him if some other man will do the baptizing, and he will accept him on that baptism, and yet that man has omitted one of God's divine requirements. That is the predicament a man gets into when he is fighting God's eternal truth.

First Corinthians, 11:28: From this passage he makes an argument that when one undertakes to eat the Lord's Supper, they should examine themselves, which is true, and also the man who is to be baptized should examine himself, and that if we have no right to examine our brother before the communion, neither have we a right to examine the brother or the man who demands baptism. That being true, then Philip, the evangelist, made a terrible mistake because you know he demanded baptism and Philip examined him to see if he had the right faith, which he had no right to do according to this argument. He thinks it is all right to examine them whether they believe. Then, who has given you the authority to let them off from any other divine appointment of God and not examine them upon that? We have as much authority for examining a man to see if he believes as we have to see if he believes the right thing, and the good confession is the evidence we have that he does believe right, and when he confesses that he believes that God for Christ's sake has pardoned his sins, we know then that he has not been taught right and we would refuse to baptize a man upon that confession.

Suppose one presents himself for baptism to Brother

Sommer during this debate, and the party presenting himself will tell Brother Sommer: "I have a desire to be baptized to obey God; I was converted last night during the meeting, gave my heart to God and felt gloriously saved, and now I demand baptism at your hands." Brother Sommer, will you baptize him? Please tell these folks if you will, or will not. If you say that you would not, then the same party will say, "I will go to the Baptist Church and tell them what I base experienced and they will baptize me and then I will come back to Brother Sommer and Brother Sommer will say, 'Were you baptized to obey God?' 'Yes. ' 'All right, brother, I will run halfway across the house to shake you in. '"

If you can not see the inconsistency of a position like that you must be dull indeed of comprehension.

But, again, with reference to the Lord's Supper, there certainly must be a design in eating the Lord's Supper. That design is expressed to show the Lord's death till He comes. If that is to show the Lord's death till he comes, can we partake of it without having that design in our minds, and do it Scripturally? Certainly not. Therefore, when the Bible says baptism is for the remission of sins, can we submit to it with any other view in our minds and do it Scripturally? If we can we may change the design of the Lord's Supper. So Brother Sommer's proof text proves fatal to his position.

He refers to Romans, the 14th chapter, where Paul is speaking with reference to judging another man's servant, "to his own master he standeth or falleth," which had to do with local conditions as well as private life, and is not talking about a man's standing before God at that time, but we should remember that Jesus says that "Ye shall know the tree by its fruits." How are you to know a tree by its fruits? Isn't that judging? We have a perfect right to judge providing we get the beam out of our own mind. Then we can see clearly to get the mote out of our brother's eyes, and believing I have the beam entirely cast out of my own eye, I am going after the beam of sectarian baptism that is in Brother Sommer's eye.

John's baptism, Acts 19:2-4: Paul asked the disciples

if they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed and they said, "We have not so much as heard of the Holy Ghost." Then Paul said, "Unto what then were you baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism."

If I did not misunderstand Brother Sommer, he said that they had not heard about Christ at the time of their baptism, and that is why their baptism was not valid, but he remembered Apollos, a mighty man in the Scripture, and one who believed on Christ and could preach Christ with power, who had been to Ephesus and had preached and proved to those people that Jesus was the Christ, and they had been baptized in that belief, and yet their baptism was not valid. A more fatal passage to Brother Sommer's position could not have been introduced. People have heard Christ preached, they believed on Christ, they heard him preached by an intelligent and eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures, but the man was wrong on baptism, just like Brother Sommer is. and Paul convinced them they needed a re baptizing and did re-baptize them. I thank you for that passage, Brother Sommer. That completes his speech.

I have in my hand a little tract written by Brother Daniel Sommer, the title of which is "Sectarianism—Analyzed, Defined and Exposed."

On page 10 of this tract I will read you what Brother Sommer has to say:

"What shall we say of those preachers who denounce all persons, who happen to hold a membership in a sectarian denomination with a sentence of sweeping impeachment, as though they were all equally under the influence of sectism? We should say that they are probably more sectarian than some whom they denounce. Their manner shows that they are unscripturally exclusive, and this is one of the elements of sectarianism.

"Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are identified with sectarian churches and wear sectarian names? No, not in the full and Scripture sense of the word Christians. In mind and heart some of them are doubtless converted to Christ, but they can not keep the ordinances fully, nor be altogether in harmony with

the gospel while they hold membership among sectarians and wear sectarian names."

From that quotation we deduct the following, that a man can not be a genuine Christian in a sectarian denomination. Then if that be true, but if Brother Sommer takes those in from sectarianism who are not Christians, he is receiving into the fellowship of the church that which is not Christian material and hence stands self-condemned, but to be more sure that I am right in my deductions from that quotation, I read again from page 11. Brother Sommer asked:

"Can the world be converted to Christ by means of sects or branch churches?" Answer—"No." Then the denominations or sect churches such as Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and others are not converting the world to Christ according to Brother Sommer's own answer. Then if the ones they preach to and the ones they claim as converts are not converted to Jesus Christ, then they are not Christians and when Brother Sommer receives them, he is receiving those who are children of the Devil into his fellowship, and he is my witness upon this occasion.

I wish to call your attention to another thought or two while we are still upon the subject of baptism. We learn in First Corinthians 12:13 that "by one spirit ye are all baptized into one body." I would suggest that the sense of the passage is brought out more clearly if I should render it, "in one mind," are you all baptized into one body. In one mind, that is, we all have the same mind, the same intention, the same desire, the same design, in being baptized, if you please. But we do know that those who are baptized by the sects and those that we baptize are not baptized in the same mind or with the same design in their minds. The same process that saves adds to the church. The one body is the church. Ephesians 1:23; therefore, all baptized into one church, yet Brother Sommer has it, you are baptized and then join a church, and he says of those who belong to sectarian churches that they have been baptized right, but after their baptism have joined the wrong church. But if they have been

Scripturally baptized, they were baptized into one body, How could they have gotten into the wrong church if their baptism put them into the one body? It would be impossible. Therefore, we conclude that those who have been baptized for the purpose of getting into a different body than the body of Christ are not in the body of Christ and I am going to ask you people to think right along this line for a minute. Is it possible for a man or a woman of intelligence to submit to baptism by the authority of the Baptist Church, or the command of a Baptist preacher, and do that with no motive at all in view? Doesn't everyone know that they have in mind to get into the Baptist Church, and they know that is why they are being baptized by that Baptist preacher, in order to get into that church? Most assuredly they do. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

**DANIEL SOMMER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE
ADDRESS**

Brethren and Friends. Ladies and Gentlemen—Gentlemen Moderators: I was feeling so much amused from one viewpoint and saddened from another that I was a little informal about addressing you. For my thought went back to the remark about my leaving that war question. I didn't wish to take everything away from this man. He is to affirm his proposition all the way through. Why should I continue on the war question and exhaust it and leave him nothing to do? He would have liked to have been on the negative side and to have had the last speech, but I propose to treat him fairly; let him have a little affirmative; put the laboring oar into his hands. He is thirty years younger than I am. Why shouldn't he have the laboring oar in his hands as well as for it to be in my hands?

He is surprised that I left the war question so soon, and I said Christians had a Scriptural right to go into the war and kill people, and he denied it, and he thought I ought to be in the affirmative all the way through. He

talked a good deal about the Christian spirit forbidding warfare. I want him to affirm the Christian spirit that he talks about and show fully what it is. He couldn't have had it on the negative.

I will state to the audience this: Those present last evening well remember that my opponent, even on the negative, was driven, in order to have something to say, to the position that God and Christ are both murderers for no taking of life, according to his doctrine, could take place without its being murder, and according to his contention last night it was that God who ordered more people killed than anybody else in the universe, why he is the greatest murderer of the universe. He was driven to that on the negative. He will be driven to something worse— if it could be.

Didn't Christ kill Ananias and Sapphira dead just for lying? Wasn't that murder according to what he said last night? Of course, the killing of a human being couldn't have been right. I had the privilege of replying to what was said. Those of you present last evening will recollect he couldn't get anything in his head but murder. When a man killed another man and God said he should be killed, that was murder, to kill the other man.

Now, in regard to this going over these Scriptures to which I refer. About the time I came to the fourth or fifth Scripture I began to see something; "He finds design in all these Scriptures." Now, he holds that we must be baptized understanding the design of baptism, which I said is an added idea for the word "design" is not there, nor the word "purpose."

We are to obey God by reason of divine authority and as far as the purpose in giving the command is concerned, that is on the divine side. Our business is obedience. A man tells his servant to do thus and so, and he turns around and says, "What for?" A father tells his son to do something, and he says, "Dad, what for?" and the father has to explain everything. That is not a recognition of authority, but we are to obey and in recognition of the divine authority, but this is a point that amused me, and I put two heavy brackets around this little paragraph, "He finds design in all these Scriptures." This proves that we

may be baptized in submission to any one of them and submit to the design of baptism. He holds it must be Acts 2:38. He varies from that because he has lately been driven from it. and it is the un-Scriptural contentions of Acts 2:38 for the remission of sins, for the remission of sins, for the remission of sins, that has caused a great deal of this controversy. because take up an individual who has been baptized, and asked, "Were you baptized for the remission of sins?" "No, I didn't think of the remission of sins."

"Were you baptized with the design of baptism?" "No, I didn't think about the design of baptism, I was baptized to obey Christ; I was baptized to be buried with Christ, I was baptized because I couldn't see that I had fulfilled the Scripture in any other way than to be immersed and for that reason I went down into the water."

It was obedience, but my opponent has relieved the case in finding the design of baptism in nearly every one of his points. I wrote, "He has over-proved his case, by determination to break me down. In proving what I said that an individual may be baptized to fulfil all righteousness, and he may be baptized just to be buried with Christ, for baptism into death, and to put on Christ, and for the answer of a good conscience, and he has the design of baptism according to his reasoning, the design of baptism in all of these, and so in order to give me what might be called a slap in this case, he slapped himself because I contend we may be baptized with any one or several of these Scriptures before our minds and be Scripturally baptized. And in his determination to break me down in this case, why, it has been a boomerang that flies back. Somebody has said that.

"Many a shaft at random sent
Hits mark the sender never meant;
As gun when aimed at duck or plover.
Flies hack and knocks the owner over."

I think that applies in this case.

So he has found so much design that we will let him have it. and his contention, however, when he came a little

farther on, was that it was Acts 2:38 only. That is here somewhere in my notes: How can one that believes a false doctrine be baptized acceptably? Thinks that he has put on Christ before baptism.

I don't believe that one single one of the sectarians thinks that he has put on Christ. They don't use that expression before baptism. I have never heard one of them say, "I have put on Christ." Here is where the sectarians make their mistake and they misname it. When the prodigal son broke down in his rebellion against his father and decided that he would return to his father's house, if somebody had found him after he started backward and said, "Jonathan, where are you going?"

"Going back home; I am going back to my father," would likely have been his response.

"Jonathan, how do you feel?"

"Why. I feel better than I have at any time since I left home," no doubt would have been Jonathan's response.

"Do you think your father will receive you?"

"I believe he will."

Now, suppose this one asking the question had said, "Jonathan, if you feel better, that is evidence that your father has already received you," and he had imposed upon Jonathan that false idea. Now, friends, that is what the sectarian preacher does.

Here is an alien sinner. The preacher declares to him that he needs to give his heart to God, surrender his will, give himself up and he struggles, whether at the mourner's bench or privately, and he makes a full and complete surrender, and just when he makes the surrender, he feels better. "The preacher tells him as soon as he finds out he feels better that is evidence that the Lord has already accepted you and pardoned your sin, and he imposes upon him that falsehood and having been thus misled, he thinks he is a Christian because the preacher has told him so, but still when he comes to hear the Gospel more fully presented, he says, "I wish to obey Christ more fully than I have obeyed him. I have surrendered my mind and my heart to Him, but I wish to be buried with Him in baptism into death." and yields with that condition.

I sometimes try to illustrate that by the marriage con-

tract. Here are two people; they become acquainted and learn to know each other. After a while the fatal question is asked, and when that fatal question is asked and favorably answered, those of you who have passed through than experience, know very well there is a very decided change of feeling—I am yours and you are mine—and if they behave well, they will forsake other company for each other's company. Now, don't they feel different? Yes, we will say; yes, they feel better.

Suppose somebody would come in and say, "You are already married." That would be a falsehood. They are ready to take each other, prepared for the marriage, but there is something else necessary in order to be married to each other in the manner that the law will allow, to say nothing more than that, and the rules of good society require, it is not simply a change of feeling.

Here are the individuals who have surrendered themselves in mind and heart and thought to the Saviour, converted in mind and heart and life to Jesus Christ, not yet converted in doctrine, and as a result they have not yet been baptized, but now when the time comes that they are baptized, say by a Baptist preacher, or say they demand baptism at the hands of a Methodist preacher, that sort of an individual has made the necessary changes preparatory to baptism and then wishes to be baptized. I never saw but one Baptist preacher baptize an individual in my life, and that one just said this, "Upon a profession of your faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the authority of Jesus Christ, I baptize you into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

I have inquired of a Baptist preacher in regard to the confession that is demanded before baptism, and he says they all ask, "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" That confession is necessary.

He may talk about confusion in regard to whether they have already become Christians or not, but I ask the question whether an individual's faith must be purified from all errors in order to be acceptable to Christ. He dares not affirm it. If he does, he will impeach those who were baptized on the Day of Pentecost because they were still under the error that Christ was their Saviour only,

and that Gentiles were not Gospel subjects, and they were under that very serious error and miracles needed to be wrought afterwards in order to purge the Jewish mind from it.

But take Acts 2:38, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." I demand of my opponent whether he understood that promise when he was baptized. I demand he tells whether he knew what that referred to. I feel like demanding whether he knows for a certainty what it refers to even now after his twenty-five or thirty years' experience as a preacher and study of the Scriptures.

I would like him to tell this audience. Here are the two commands and promise, "Repent and be baptized (the promise) for the forgiveness of sins;" in Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" two commands and two promises. The commands are to be obeyed by us and the promises pertain to the divine side.

Now, that is the way that matter stands, I believe, before all those who will examine it carefully and will not undertake to strain any Scripture. I wish to look at a few more of these notes that I have.

New life begins before baptism, they think, and he says it begins after baptism. Now, when we come to a critical discussion of being' born of water and the Spirit, we will have that brought out before the mind, and James says, "You have been begotten again," or the Apostle Peter says, "You have been begotten again by the incorruptible word." I will get the exact language as found in Peter's first letter, and 1st chapter and 23rd verse: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

Here the Apostle James says in his letter, 1st chapter and 18th verse: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures."

Now, with that much before us. we see very clearly that (the Word of God has something to do with us before baptism or else we wouldn't be baptized.

He says, "I wonder if a man could emphasize remission of sins until it could not be a truth."

Yes. he could emphasize it until he would impress the individual that this is the only Scripture; he has confessed this isn't the only one on the subject. and just as soon as he gets the idea that this is the only Scripture on the subject undoubtedly he has unduly magnified it.

He made mention of the case of the boy and said "the poor boy confessed that God for Christ's sake had pardoned his sins." Our reporter's notes will show that said the boy said, "I wish to obey God." He was one that hadn't been baptized before. He wished to obey God. The reporter's notes will show that, and that isn't the first misrepresentation that he has made.

"He surely felt he made a mistake about the eunuch for he examined him." I was speaking about the examining after. Philip didn't examine him after the baptism. Philip didn't see him any more. He was talking about the design, and he says. Did you understand the design of the baptism when baptized? Did you understand Acts 2:38? Did you understand the baptism?" and he takes Philip and he says he made a mistake about the eunuch for he examined him. I wrote down, "Philip examined him before his baptism just as the preacher did the boy before his baptism by asking questions by reference to faith."

My opponent must fill up his time with something; he seems to grab at anything in order to fill up his time, and I hope to follow him more closely at a later date.

Here is the old question, Suppose someone presents himself and says, "Brother Sommer. I believe that God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins." Will you baptize him? And then the same party comes back to Brother Sommer after he has been baptized and Brother Sommer receives him because he has obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine.

That is an old question that has been handed down. I suppose for the last fifty years with all of these re-baptism extremists. I heard of it some years ago. The truth of the matter is when an individual comes to me and asks me. says he wishes to be baptized and talks to me

about his experience, I tell that one just like one who comes to me and asks me. Will you baptize me, and leave me a member of some other church. (A man asked me that many years ago when I was twenty-five years of age.) I said, "for me to baptize you with the understanding that you are going to join some church not mentioned in the Bible would be to baptize you with the idea that you are still going to do wrong." The man turned away and never came to me for baptism. Do you understand that?

A lady approached a man named Campbell Jobes and said, "Would you baptize me and let me be a member of another church?"

He said, "Madam, if I baptize you I trust you will be sincere, and if so, I will baptize you into Christ, and then if you turn away from Christ and join something Christ never mentioned in His book I can't help it." But she came to meeting and continued to come and a few evenings after that came forward and made the confession and he baptized her without saying a word about church membership, and when the time came for her to be recognized and receive the right hand of fellowship into the congregation and thus be numbered with the brethren in that place, she came forward among them. Not a word said about church membership. And a man wished to make an agreement with me once at an earlier date about being baptized to church membership. I said, "Church membership isn't in this proposition. You haven't obeyed Christ. You wait and obey the Saviour; that is the question for you." Then he wished to obey Christ in the institution of baptism.

An old preacher of the Church of Christ baptized me over in the state of Maryland and I united with the congregation at a place called Jerusalem. But why I mention this before you is simply this: I have found some years ago that I was represented as contending for the position I occupied because some sectarian baptized me, and when I incidentally revealed that it wasn't true, but I was baptized by a preacher of the Church of Christ, quite a number of brethren wrote to me and said they were so glad to hear this; "that I was told that you were baptized by a sectarian."

What wretched inferences are drawn by people who occupy the wrong position! Now, with that much before us, friends. I come hack to this question. A man comes to me and presents himself and says, "I believe that God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins."

I would say, "I don't believe you believe anything of the sort. You think so; it has been imposed upon you by some preacher. That isn't your side of the question. You wish to obey the Saviour. You believe with your whole heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. That is the question. Never mind about your experience, whether you have been religious or irreligious. The question is not what you have been, but what are you going to be." would say, "never mind your experience."

As far as my opponent is concerned, if he would be convinced of his error and wish to be baptized before this meeting is over, in order that he might be baptized into obedience into the Lord Jesus Christ. I wouldn't ask him about his long rambling experience in denouncing sect baptism, but I would ask him of his faith in Jesus Christ, whether he believes with his whole heart.

I understood that that kind of a question was presented to Bro. W. G. Roberts. Incautiously he made a response that some people made capital out of. There is nothing in that; it is a mere catch question anyway. He says there is a design in the Lord's Supper. He wants design everywhere else; why not have it in the Lord's Supper. Baptism for the remission of sins. He says, Can we submit to baptism with any other design than for the remission of sins? That is where he and I differ. That is where the contention is. After telling us that there is a design in nearly all of these other passages, the design is there, he found it more than I ever found. He thinks for all of those other purposes, for breaking me down on the subject. When I discarded the subject as belonging to the divine side, he said, Can we submit to baptism with any other design than for the remission of sins? And I underscored that heavily, in order that I might catch it. That is the heresy in this case, disturbing the minds of men and women who have been baptized into obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have had to baptize a considerable num-

ber of persons who had been baptized by a preacher of the Church of Christ, and one about fifty years after he had been baptized the first time on account of that question of design; fifty years later he insisted upon being immersed again. ' He was old Brother J. W. Morris, the father of the celebrated A. M. Morris. I baptized him at Hale, Missouri, and a stepdaughter of his at the same time, who had been immersed because some one had said, Now is your time. She said, "I was baptized without understanding I was obeying Christ, but thought it was according to their say-so, so I should be baptized."

He says he has a right to examine after he gets the mote out of his own eye. I am satisfied when he gets the mote out of his own eye he will make a different sort of a speech from what he has. Let him get the mote out. I am afraid there is a beam there.

Apollos was mentioned. They had been baptized. He ridiculed the idea that they hadn't heard of the Holy Ghost. What do we find with reference to Apollos? He preached Christ, and how much of it? He knew only John's baptism. Well, John's baptism had in it, I indeed baptize you with water. He that comes after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and Fire. Here were these people who according to the common version had not heard there was a Holy Ghost, if they had been baptized into John's baptism, understanding it well, undoubtedly they would have heard of the Holy Spirit. The later version says. We have not heard whether the Holy Spirit had been given, but when they were told to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, then they were baptized. It wasn't that John told them to be baptized, but then they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Sectarianism—yes, that trap—page ten. I will examine that, friends, and then when we come to his affirmative on this question I will have a fine time with that chapter A man can not be a genuine Christian, he says, according to that tract, while in sectarian churches. I still say that. I didn't recollect saying that but, friends, that has been my conviction, I might say, for half a century. Why I can't keep the ordinances—may have obeyed Christ

to start with and then turned aside. Don't we have individuals that believe and confess and believe, as we think all right, and then they become backsliders, accept some false doctrine?

Sometime ago there were two persons, a man and a wife, over there in Missouri at the place where I was preaching last winter a year. They had been betrayed and gone to join the Seven Day Adventists. and afterward were convinced that they had made a mistake and came back. Can't people obey the right doctrine and then join the wrong church? My opponent speaks as if that couldn't be done. Alexander Campbell obeyed the right doctrine and then joined the Baptist Church. History shows that without any question whatever.

And then he went so far as to say receiving those that are the children of the devil. You may believe in Christ with your whole heart and repent of your sins and confess your faith in Christ and be baptized to obey that form of doctrine, but if you have been betrayed to join a church not mentioned in the. Scripture you are yet a child of the devil and have to come back and become a child of God by receiving baptism at the hands of that kind of preacher That comes as near popery as anything I can imagine That may be spoken of as popery, the idea of official grace

First Corinthians 12:13: the official spirit; in one mind. The common version says in one mind. You are all baptized into one body. We will submit into one doctrine, and the form of doctrine—did you notice he didn't bring up that form of doctrine without purpose. I pointed out in Romans 6:17-18, "You have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you," and no time was given to the question of the purpose of the doctrine.

I thank you for your attention.

J. W. COWAN: Brother Moderators. Ladies and Gentlemen: In just as nice, quiet manner as I can. I will review the speech to which you have listened. I am going to take up the last point first. You remember he has accused me of misrepresentation, and I think he is perfectly sincere in that; he thinks I have misrepresented him. It is

easy for a man to think that and hard for him to see where he "misrepresents the other man. All debaters have to contend with that, so he accused me of saying that a man who had believed on the Lord Jesus Christ had the right faith and had confessed his faith in Christ, and was baptized to obey God was a child of the Devil.

Now, I never said that. My argument is, a man who has believed a false doctrine and made a false confession and has been baptized for a false purpose, is still a child of the Devil, and that is what sect baptism is, and that is the kind that Brother Sommer is defending. They believe that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, a false faith about Christ; they confess they have already been saved, a false confession, and baptized for an unscriptural purpose, and how in the name of heaven can it be a Scriptural baptism?

We shall now begin with the first of his speech. He said he was so amused that when he arose to address the audience he was quite informal in his manner of address. I think he missed that just one word. He should have said, "I was so 'confused'" instead of "amused." That would come nearer to being the truth.

He refers to the fact that I am thirty years younger than he and it is nothing but right that I should take the labor more in my hands and affirm some. Now, Brother Sommer. don't beg for sympathy on your age; if you are too old to do this job, you ought not to have gotten into it. And in the next place, the statement was uncalled for, because we have agreed to debate six days, which would have given us two sessions affirmative on each proposition, and he quit his war question with just one session, and that is what surprised me. At the rate he is going now, he can not affirm on his general church proposition for three days. He will run out of material, or else he will save material back that should be brought into his affirmative, and use it as negative matter while I am in the affirmative. I predict that is his tactic. "I will withhold what proofs I have to offer until I am in the negative and can better use them while Cowan has not the right to follow me up."

What he said about going to prove that I had God and Christ both murderers, and that they murdered Ananias,

was all out of place, does not pertain to the subject, and will be considered while we are upon the war question the next time. He says the purpose or design of baptism is on the divine side and not on the human side. If a father tells his son to do a thing, the son should not say, "What for?" but go ahead and do that without questioning the design the father had in giving the command.

Now, I know, my friends, that is not a good plan for any father to adopt in raising a boy; just to give imperative commands without ever teaching that boy why these things should be done, is a very unwise idea, and will create a dislike in the mind of that boy for the father. So our loving Heavenly Father has told us to be baptized, and has been so merciful and kind to us to state the very reason for that baptism, and I can not see any harm in me preaching and advocating that reason to other folks. The imperative command is, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

There is the imperative commandment of Jehovah as announced by Peter upon the Day of Pentecost. We have just as much authority to say that, "in the name of Jesus Christ" is no part of the command as to say that "for the remission of sins" is no part of the command. Then could you baptize a man without using "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," without that prepositional phrase? He would say no. Then if "in the name of Jesus Christ," which phrase modifies both verbs, "repent and be baptized," if that is a part of the command, then "for the remission of sins," another prepositional phrase that modifies both verbs, is also a part of the command, and if we are baptized for any other purpose, we disobey the command. But it may be said that, if Cowan argues if we are baptized for any other purpose, than to obey, that it would exclude those statements of design in the passages that Brother Sommer introduced. Not at all. To be baptized with the desire to arise to walk in newness of life is equivalent to being baptized for the remission of sins, for any man who knows enough of the truth to obey God, knows that remission of sins is essential to walking in

new life; and so I may deal with the other passages under consideration. So when I say if we are baptized for any other purpose than for the remission of sins, we are also baptized for another purpose than to arise to walk in newness of life, because the design as stated in these two passages, are equivalent. Brother Sommer says that I contend that we may be baptized for any of these designs; that is, to be buried with Christ that you may be raised to walk in new life, or that you may obey from the heart that form of doctrine that you may be freed from sin, that he thinks all of these designs are all right, and he will accept them. But show me the sectarian preacher, Brother Sommer, that baptizes for the purpose of their candidates arising to walk in new life, and for the purpose of obtaining freedom from sin at the time they obey that form of doctrine.

You may accept these designs, but the sectarians do not accept them, and yet you will accept their baptism without the design, not only without the true design, but with a false design.

He says that sects do not say they have put on Christ before baptism. Brother Sommer certainly is not posted on sectarian doctrine, because they certainly do teach in all their manuals, creeds and disciplines, that one is born again, born of the spirit, a child of God and in Christ Jesus before their baptism. You may ask any Baptist preacher in this town if he doesn't believe and teach that a person is in Christ and saved before baptism, and you will get the answer, yes.

I don't know why Brother Sommer wanted to say that unless he must "fill up his time."

Concerning the prodigal son, suppose some preacher had met that prodigal son, said Brother Sommer, as he is coming home, and informs him that he has already been received by that father just because he feels good over the fact that he is coming home, that he would be doing for that boy what the sectarian preacher does for the sinner; because the sinner makes up his mind to obey God and feels good over it, the sectarian preacher will tell him, "You are saved now," and makes him believe it, and

gets him to submit to a baptism that is created by a human institution over eighteen hundred years after the baptism of Christ was instituted, and makes that man believe that he is a member of the true Church of Christ, and Brother Sommer says, "I will take that man on his baptism," a baptism created by the Baptist Church eighteen hundred years after that given in the New Testament.

Now, are you brethren willing to abide by such a baptism as that?

MARRIAGE: He refers to the idea of a woman getting married, and because she has learned to love her intended husband, and because her faith in her fiancé is growing nearer and dearer, that she feels so good about it, that somebody might make her believe that she was already married.

Brother Sommer, says that is what the sectarians do for the sinner, make him believe he is married to Christ before he really is. Then what would be the result if a young lady was made to believe that she was married before she really was, and was to go to performing the dirties and functions of married life under that proposition? Wouldn't it be terrible? And yet Brother Sommer says that "I will take this fellow who is made to believe that he was married to Christ before he was, and fellowship him, and make him believe that it was all right for him to live in that state up until the time he learned better.

Now, Brother Sommer, aren't you ashamed of that illustration? Don't you think it does vileness even to your own position to offer it *as* proof in this debate? I would rather he would not have introduced a thing like that, and I yet contemplate that he will withdraw what he said about it. *it* may be, though, he intends to go on and make argument from this marriage illustration concerning the fact that she may learn something more about a husband after she was married, which he might argue as being occasion for remarriage. He may bring that; if he does, I will be ready with my answer.

Passing on to the next thought: He refers to W. G. Roberts, about one Baptist preacher being the only one he ever saw baptize a person, and he told the man he was

baptizing him upon a profession of their faith in Christ. I am sorry Brother Sommer hasn't witnessed any more Baptist baptisms than that. Probably his brother Roberts has been a few more than he has and we will hear him speak on the question. I now read from "Forty Reasons Why I am not a Baptist," by W. C. Roberts, a witness Brother Sommer has introduced himself. Page 36.

"My thirteenth reason is that they call upon their converts to profess that God for Christ's sake has forgiven their sins."

That is what your co-laborer, W. G. Roberts, has to say about Baptist baptism. I believe I will give you a little more from his opinion on page 44.

"The Baptist Church theory of conversion tends to produce unbelief in the Word of God."

Here we have W. G. Roberts, one of the leading debators that represents the same churches that Brother Sommer does, telling us in plain and unmistakable terms that Baptist teaching, Baptist doctrine, tends to cause people to disbelieve God's Word, and yet upon a baptism produced by that infidelity, is valid baptism according to Brother Sommer. I believe I will read from page 53 of the same book:

"We have two commands in Acts 2:38, Repent and be baptized and the purpose expressed is, for the remission of sins."

Did you get that word "purpose." Brother Sommer? Brother Roberts uses that. I will read on:

"But suppose baptism is not in the 38th verse, that there is but one command, and that is, repent, and we read, 'repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. '

"Now, dear reader, what does it mean? When repentance and baptism are connected by the conjunction, 'repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, ' then we ask, What does the passage mean thus expressed? Does it mean both because of and in order to? Every school boy knows better, and so do the Baptists. Does 'repentance for the remission of sins' mean in order to, and 'be bap-

tized for the remission of sins' mean because of? Say, do they? Are these two opposing ideas expressed by the very same words in the very same sentence in the very same connection? Every school boy knows better."

That will be sufficient from Brother Roberts at this juncture, and I insist that when you place these people in debate with a Baptist on the question of baptism, they are forced to come over and take our position, but where there is no debate with a Baptist, and they desire to get greater numbers into the churches or congregations, they are ready to waive that truth of Acts 2:38, and receive those who have been baptized upon a very opposite design to that stated in the passage.

He wanted to know if I understood what the gift of the Holy Ghost was when I was baptized. I answer that there may have been a great many things that I did not understand about it. I may have had many things to learn about it, but one thing I did know, that I would not get it until I was baptized, whatever it may be. Just so I may have learned more about what the remission of sins means, but I certainly did know I was baptized for the remission of sins, whatever it did mean, and whatever enjoyment I might get out of it after having received it.

So we still have the design expressed there, and I do know when I intended to become a married man that I would have the ceremony performed before I could be married, that it was in order to obtain a wife that I did that; however, I did not know just how much a wife would be worth to me until after I got one and lived with her a while. Yet I knew I had to be married in order to get the wife. There is the initial design of being married, so repentance and baptism for the remission of sins is the initial design in which we are baptized, and we are then brought to where we can enjoy the unfoldment of all the blessings that may come as a result therefrom.

He refers to First Peter, 1:23, James 1:18: Both of these passages relative to being begotten and born by the Word of God. I heartily agree with the passages, but according to Brother Roberts, Baptist teaching tends to cause people to disbelieve the Word of God, so Baptist

preaching, not being the Word of God, but having a tenancy to having or causing people to disbelieve, it could not be a factor in the begetting of a child of God. Then one who has heard such preaching as Brother Roberts denominates a form of infidelity and has submitted to that baptism under that teaching, could such a one he said to have been born of the Word of God, or even to have been begotten by it? From this predicament, my Brother Sommer will never be extricated.

Referring to Philip's examining the candidate before baptism, he admits he had the right to do that, but we didn't have the right to examine a man after his baptism. Then I cite as authority for examining him after having received baptism the 19th chapter of Acts where Paul most assuredly examined those people that had received John's baptism, and taught them the truth sufficiently until they received baptism in the name of Jesus Christ.. So here we have Scriptural authority for examining before and after their baptism.

It always pleased me to furnish a man with information that he needs if I have it, and this is one time I happen to have it.

Now, in regard to that old question that Brother Sommer denominates a catch question, and he sought to lessen the force of my argument by saying "old question," "catch question," and he blundered around over that question and never did answer it, thinking that you people would forget it because it was old. These things on account of the fact that they are old do not become untrue. If so, the gospel of Christ would become untrue. This old question has caught every sect baptism preacher among our brotherhood, and I believe that you have it denominating right when you call it a *catch question, but it has caught every one of you.*

He did not extricate himself from the inconsistency that I placed him in.

I wish to refer now to what he said relative to the stenographer's notes showing that I had misrepresented him about the boy. Now, I did not mean to misrepresent Brother Sommer, and I meant to say suppose this same

boy that Brother Sommer had described coming and demanding baptism, had said, "I believe that God, for Christ's sake, has pardoned my sins, I was converted last night, and I want to be baptized, because of that fact." I wasn't attributing to you that language, Brother Sommer, but I was changing the illustration, showing how it would fit one coming from a sectarian organization and demanding membership in your churches; that will straighten out any mistake relatives to the stenographer's notes.

My question is, my friends, that whether it be *old* or *new*, Brother Sommer, would you baptize a man who made the confession that God for Christ's sake had pardoned his sins? Hear Brother Sommer's answer in this way: "I would tell him, You don't believe any such thing, sir; that is just your opinion." In other words, you would tell this man who demanded baptism of you that he was mistaken, that he believed a falsehood. Very well, Brother Sommer would not baptize him until he could preach him out of that falsehood. This same fellow goes over to the Baptist Church, and when they open the doors he presents himself for church membership, and he tells them, "for Christ's sake God has pardoned his sins," and he believes that. The Baptist preacher says, "You are right, my brother, I believe you. I will baptize you on that confession." The boy may say, "Brother Sommer wouldn't do that. Now, you tell me it is the truth. I believe and I am willing to let you baptize me." So the Baptist preacher baptizes him and next Sunday he comes to Brother Sommer's Church and comes forward and gives his hand. "Have you been baptized?" Brother Sommer says, "Yes," he says, "Are you satisfied with your baptism?" "Yes."

Brother Sommer says, "All right; we will give you the right hand of fellowship.

You can see that is inconsistency gone to seed. You surely must be dull students—in fact, I believe you all see it. I even believe that Brother Sommer sees that I have him tied—on the question, to use his own expression, have him *caught*,

Again we have a promise from him that he will review what he has said in his tract when he gets in the negative,

a proof on his tract written on Sectarianism that there were no Christians among the sects, and the sects' creed would not make Christians.

I believe I will turn and read that again. On page 11 of Brother Sommer's tract he asked a question: "Can the world be converted to Christ by means of sects or branch churches? Answer, No."

Then every one who has been converted to sectarian churches or branches have not been converted to Christ, Brother Sommer being" my witness. Yet he will receive them into fellowship into his church in their unconverted state.

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

CLASSIFYING

DANIEL SOMMER—AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before I begin what I have in contemplation tonight, I wish to bring before you something that pertained to our last meeting. There have been several remarks made since our discussion began which I don't wish repeated. My respondent, last night when I handed something over to the reporter which I intended to read, had read, in dealing with that, made the remark, "How can we know that he read all that he handed over?" And cast a reflection upon me or the reporter or both of us. He thought it might reflect upon the reporter, so he withdrew that, but the reflection remained upon me that I had handed over something, or was liable to hand over something that I had not read.

Now, I state that I handed over that and had it marked within parenthesis, what I read—nothing more, nothing less. That ought to be sufficient between gentlemen without any reflections. And then today there was a reflection made, when I happened, incidentally, to mention the difference in our ages; my respondent turned upon me and

he said, "If Brother Sommer is going to beg for sympathy because of his age, if he doesn't feel able for this job, he ought to hand it over to some one else."

All that was unkind, unjust, ungenerous, and there was another remark made. Well, I said I was amused, and he said I was confused, as though he would put words in my own mouth as though I didn't know what the condition of my mind was, especially when I proceeded to tell what I was amused over.

Now, I don't wish anything more of that sort. One of my brethren said to me after the discussion was over this afternoon, "Your respondent is inclined to be a little bit nasty." I don't wish to have the reputation that I have debated with a man that is nasty or anything of that sort or respect. I had a debate of that sort some years ago, and I have always regretted it, and even that isn't all that I wish to state before I begin to talk tonight on the subject that is before us.

My respondent had something to say on another question that I now refer to. He spoke of my failure to answer certain questions, that I blundered over it, didn't answer it, and got away from it without answering it. It was the question with reference to, well, what I called the "catch question," and he said it had caught every man on my side of the question thus far. I thought I was through with the question. Now, we will take it up in its worst form.

I spoke, and I will repeat it for the sake of those who were not here this afternoon. Suppose a man would come up and say, "I believe my sins have been forgiven. I want you to baptize me." And I said that I would not baptize that man upon that kind of a confession, but I would endeavor to teach him that he should confess his faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and if he wouldn't do that, then I would not baptize him. Then he said, "Suppose he goes to a Baptist preacher and makes that kind of a confession and the Baptist preacher baptizes him and he comes back to you after he has been baptized there, and you tell him he has obeyed the right doctrine but joined

the wrong church and give him the right hand of fellowship."

That was presuming what was not the right case. I would know that that man was dishonest because he had refused to obey Christ in baptism upon a confession of his faith, and if he would refuse to make a confession of his faith before his baptism, why, undoubtedly I would know that that man had not obeyed the gospel sincerely just because I had tested him beforehand, or he turned away from the plainness of the gospel; and in all that my opponent said with reference to this question this afternoon, it is all summed up in this. It is presumed that people who have believed certain errors and yet have been baptized, that they can never learn the truth, so their baptism can be acceptable in God's sight, but we will deal with that when we come to the affirmative that he is called upon to make with reference to this subject.

I thought I had the papers out that I intended to bring before you tonight. I see I haven't, so I will reach after them.

Now, I am going to read a speech that I wrote out when I thought I was going to have a written discussion on this subject. I would say to our reporter here to rest with reference to this matter, for I will hand this speech over, but I don't wish any more unjust or abominable inferences, so I will read and let the reporter take notes as usual.

I represent those Churches of Christ that believe Christians may classify pupils in order to teach them in the Bible, at some other time than the hour of worship, and may have Godly women to teach them when occasion requires. We believe this is our Scriptural right or privilege. That is the definite proposition now that I propose to argue, and here is the first argument.

First, Jesus Christ declared, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Second, Little children have ears to hear, but can not understand teaching that is most suitable for those of mature age.

Third, Therefore, we may Scripturally adapt teach-

ing to their understanding and do whatever else is necessary for them to hear, even to classifying them or placing them in classes by themselves.

SECOND ARGUMENT: First, Jesus Christ classified His Disciples when he took Peter and James and John up to the Mount of Transfiguration, that they might receive special instruction which was not then suitable for the other apostles.

Second, little children and other uninformed persons need to be separated from others in order to receive special instruction.

Third, therefore little children may be separated, Scripturally separated, from others in order to give them the special instruction that they need.

THIRD ARGUMENT: First, Jesus Christ made a separate class of his disciples when He explained to them privately the parable of the sower and the parable of the tares.

Second, What Jesus Christ did in making a separate class of certain ones in order to explain to them certain parts of his public teaching is an example for us.

Third, Therefore, we may classify children and others in order to explain to them what they could not otherwise understand.

FOURTH ARGUMENT: First, Jesus Christ regarded the three churches in Asia as seven different classes of learners that needed seven different kinds of instruction.

Second, Jesus thereby set an example of having different kinds of instruction.

Third, Therefore, Jesus' disciples may now divide learners into seven different classes, if necessary, in order to give to them the instruction that they need.

FIFTH ARGUMENT: First, The Holy Spirit recognized twenty-one different classes of disciples in causing certain apostles to write to Christians twenty-one different documents in which are that many different grades of teaching.

Second, What the Holy Spirit recognized and caused to be done in this respect we may do.

Third, Therefore, we may divide into classes for the

purpose of imparting instruction according to ability to receive it.

SIXTH ARGUMENT: First, the Apostle John recognized three different classes of disciples when he wrote the second chapter of his second letter and gave instruction accordingly.

Second, What the Apostle John did in this respect we may do.

Third, Therefore, we may recognize several classes on any occasion, and give instruction so that they may hear or understand what is offered to them.

SEVENTH ARGUMENT: First, the Apostle Peter referred to reason as a basis for what he proposed in Acts 6th chapter in behalf of the church.

Second, What the Apostle Peter did on that occasion we may do on any occasion in behalf of the church.

Third, Therefore, we may divide children and others into classes in order to instruct them in the Scriptures as that is the most reasonable method.

EIGHTH ARGUMENT: First, the Apostle Paul referred to nature as furnishing instruction concerning a question of propriety in one of his letters.

Second, The Apostle Paul declared that he was intended to be a pattern for us.

Third, Therefore, we may refer to nature as furnishing us with teaching so as to enable our pupils to understand us because Christ said, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

NINTH ARGUMENT: First, The Apostle Paul condemned speaking in an unknown tongue when no interpreter was present to make known what was said.

Second, But speaking to children that have ears to hear in words and on subjects that they can't understand is like speaking in an unknown tongue without an interpreter.

Third, Therefore, we should classify children and others so that they may understand what is said to them.

TENTH ARGUMENT: First, The Apostle Paul Wrote of milk for babes and meat for those that were of full age, referring to instruction for different classes,

Second, Paul is a pattern for us in regard to teaching as well as in long suffering.

Third, Therefore, we should avoid giving strong meat by way of instruction to babes and this suggests classifying.

Here are ten arguments offered in logical form. The wording of them may not be the best in every instance, yet they are offered with confidence, and my respondent is invited and challenged to show wherein any one of my statements is not true, if he can. I hope he will not say that I have not offered any precept or example of Scripture in favor of my proposition for these two reasons: First, my proposition is not one that calls for precept or example. The words "permit" and "may" are the strongest words I use in my proposition, and, therefore, we are now discussing a question of privilege or propriety or expediency, but not a question of authority or positive obligation or necessity. Whatever is set forth in a divine precept or divinely approved example is authorized and must be done regardless of results, but my proposition is not of that order, and I trust my respondent will remember this, and not mention precept or example in his reply for my proposition is not one that requires such evidence.

Second, I trust my respondent will not make any mention of precept and example because if he does, he will imply that precept or example is necessary for much that he practices under the head of permission or privilege or propriety or expediency because it is proper under the circumstances.

I have offered these words of precaution for my respondent's consideration so that our discussion may be as free as possible from all charges and countercharges, and therefore, may be as free as possible from all that might tend to confuse the hearer and the reader. The truth does not need any false reasoning nor bluff in its behalf.

In my next speech I propose to take care of what my respondent may offer in reply to this one and then will try to offer a few clear statements concerning woman as a teacher of a class of learners in the Bible.

The arguments and remarks I have thus far read were

written for Dr. Trott's inspection and consideration, while I thought that I would have him for my respondent in the proposed discussion, but having found that he belongs to a certain class, I shall proceed without special regard to him personally and shall present my eleventh argument. As Dr. Trott isn't present, I didn't wish to read everything that I had written concerning him.

ELEVENTH ARGUMENT: First, In Titus 2:3-4, we find the divine command for the aged women to teach the younger women.

Second, In this we find that one special class of women is required to teach another special class and give special instructions that are not applicable to any other class of learners.

Third, Therefore, classifying learners is authorized and women as special teachers are authorized by the New Testament instruction on that subject.

TWELFTH ARGUMENT: In the Greek of the New Testament from which our English translations were made, three words are found referring to womankind, and these are *guna*, which generally refers to a married woman, and *parthenos*, which means virgin, and *hera*, which means widow.

Second, According to the Greek text of the New Testament the only restriction placed on womankind in regard to teaching refers to married women.

Third, Therefore, the Greek text of the New Testament does not restrict all of womankind from being a teacher in the church, but only married women, and they are required to be in subjection to their husbands.

THIRTEENTH ARGUMENT: First, The Evangelist Philip had three daughters, virgins, that had the gift of prophecy.

Second, The Apostle Paul declares that all possessed of the gift of prophecy may prophesy that all may learn, First Corinthians 14:31.

Third, Therefore, certain daughters that were virgins were permitted to be teachers in the church under Scriptural restrictions.

FOURTEENTH ARGUMENT: A married woman named Priscilla assisted her husband to teach a certain preacher

named Apollos the way of the Lord better than he had previously known that way, Acts 18:26.

Second, That preacher was of a special class on a special occasion.

Third, Therefore, a married woman may be a teacher of a special class on any special occasion under Scriptural restrictions.

These last four arguments are offered for the consideration of those that wish to restrict all of womankind from teaching all of those that they are capable of teaching, either publicly or privately, but these are not all that might be offered. An angel of God said to a certain woman, "Go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead, and behold he goeth forth before you into Galilee, and there ye shall see him, lo I have told you."

Later we find this: "Then said Jesus unto them, be not afraid. Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee and there shall they see me." See Matthew 28:7-10. On the basis of these declarations a strong argument may be framed in favor of woman's usefulness in the church, at least privately. Jesus appeared to women first after his resurrection from the grave and made them the first to bear the news of his resurrection. Some one may now be ready to ask, Why, then, did the Apostle Paul give any instructions about women's silence? The first answer is that he was in First Corinthians 14:34-35 referring to the wives of those inspired men that were edifying the church for he said, "and if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. ""

The second answer is that the Greek word here translated speak means first to make vocal utterance, to babble, and the third answer is that those women were restricted in regard to speech in order to avoid confusion by wives asking their husbands questions, in the public assembly. But one may now be ready to ask, Why did Paul write to Timothy about the silence of women? The answer is that he again referred to the married women for he mentioned child-bearing as her part and such women should not go before the public. Modesty would forbid, if no other law was against it.

All this is submitted for the consideration of those that would un-Scripturally restrict all of womankind in regard to church privileges. But very few of them will consider it. The preachers of that class would rather content themselves with ridiculing what is offered to them on the subject. They are ignorant, wilfully ignorant, perversely ignorant, of the truth on the subject, and they wish to remain so. They wish to be in a little class by themselves, and confuse and divide disciples of Christ, wherever they can do so, and thereby celebrate themselves as divisive characters, and when they have an opportunity to discuss the question of woman's silence or woman's privileges, they show impulsiveness and act as if they belonged to the white feather brigade. That is what has been true heretofore with those I have approached. But woman, as well as man, and man, as well as woman, in any congregation of disciples, must generally, if not always, wait to be called on by the elders, if elders be present, in order to speak acceptably. A man or a woman may know more than all the others of the congregation combined, yet except in rare conditions that one must wait to be called on by an elder if an elder be present; if any elder be not present, then a deacon or some other leader needs to call on those that are to take part in a meeting unless the invitation to speak is general and a general invitation to take part in a meeting can seldom be done with safety.

Good order requires that all such as should take part in a meeting should wait to be called on to do so. Besides those that are anxious to take part or that will talk too long should not be gratified to the damage of a meeting. On this principle, when I resigned my eldership in Indianapolis in 1922, I stated in conclusion of my written resignation. If I can serve the congregation at any time as a private member. I shall try to be at your service, or used words to that effect.

Neither men nor women may always be the best judges of the service they may render to a congregation, and therefore, they need to be informed when and to what extent their service will be acceptable and even when men and women may be best capable of judging in regard to the service they should render, yet those that they would

serve must be in a favorable condition of mind in order to be served to the best advantage. We can not benefit those by our talking that hate to hear us talk. Therefore, our talking to an audience is a delicate performance and should be considered with modesty and this includes teaching a class of pupils, but some one may yet be ready to say, But I would like to know where your precept or example is for dividing into classes.

In response, I state that I can not put brains into the heads of people, or honesty into their hearts. Certain persons are so constituted that they get an idea into their heads, especially a wrong idea, they are so full of it that no one can ever persuade them to accept the right idea to dislodge the wrong one. They haven't any room for the right idea because they are full of the wrong one. Besides, that class of people are likely to feel that they will be disgraced if they humble themselves enough to acknowledge that they have made a mistake, and, as a rule, when they are urged upon with the right idea, they become angry and use unhandsome words against those that urge them. But I shall try to be patient in this discussion to the utmost so that if those that I am exposing will not learn the truth, that is now urged on them, then the fault will not be mine. When persons are naturally intense and are so limited in education that they don't know the meaning of words, then they become mischievous characters, especially in regard to religion, and this is especially true of those that are extremists against the privileges of Bible classes and woman's privilege in teaching classes, and have extreme notions concerning valid baptism. Yet I shall try to be patient with them, and if possible, leave them without excuse. If they will not be convinced of their errors, besides, I shall try to save others from accepting their errors. Therefore, I state again what was previously declared concerning precepts and examples, that the questions under consideration do not require precepts and examples for several reasons: First, we are not discussing a question of duty or obligation or necessity, such as faith and repentance and confession and baptism and the communion and contribution. But we are discussing a ques-

tion of privilege, Scriptural rights such as the exact time of the hour of worship, protracted meetings, building meeting houses, the place for baptizing, various other questions that might be named that have pertained to the incidentals of the existence and progress of a church from its beginning.

In other words, we are not discussing questions that are essentials, but only certain of those that are incidental, not those that are fixed by law, but certain of those that are varied according to conditions, especially varied in form.

In the New Testament we find mention made of what is required by law as set forth in precept or command, also by approved example or precedent which must be attended to in the divinely appointed manner.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I first desire to call your attention to Brother Sommer's last remarks. He says we are not discussing questions that are essential, not questions of precept and example, not questions of authority, but privilege only, yet the proposition says that the church that he represents is in origin, doctrine, name, practice, work and worship authorized by Jesus Christ. Does that sound like we are discussing question of authority? If Brother Sommer is right, then he has left his proposition and is discussing something that Jesus Christ has not authorized.

Beginning with the first of his speech, I note he has some complaints to make with reference to what he calls insinuations or reflections that I should have made upon him. I am sorry that he has so understood me for I did not intend to reflect upon him. But I do know it is not customary for debaters when debates are being reported, to turn over marked copy without a definite public statement as to where the copy begins and where it ends, and I do know that when men are honest they do not care for being watched, and if they **are** not, they ought to be watched.

I will state farther that after referring to his age and

to the word *amused* and *confused*, claiming that I had put a word in his mouth, which of course I did not. I said I thought the word *confused* would better represent his condition of mind than the word *amused*, and I still believe that. That isn't casting a reflection.

But now, after you think about these things that he has mentioned, that he hopes will not occur again, will you listen to these remarks, referring to preachers who stand with me, and I suppose I am included in the number. He says, "They are willingly ignorant and perversely ignorant, belong to the white feathered brigade. He can not put brains in our heads nor honesty in our hearts, that we consider it would be a disgrace if we were to humble ourselves and acknowledge that we have made a mistake, that we were limited in education and did not know the meaning of words."

Now, these are a few of the expressions I culled from my opponent's speech.

Now, I ask this people, does it come of good grace of my opponent to raise an objection to the things that I said, and then come back at me with a tirade of hard sayings like that? I suppose it is all right for Brother Sommer to call me anything he wants to, just so I don't call him anything, but don't worry, Brother Sommer. I am not going to call you any ugly names; I am going to treat you as nice and kind as I know how.

Then he proceeds to patch up a little work that he saw he was sorely in need of, his attention from the last session of the debate, concerning the catch question. He says, "I would not baptize a man who confessed to him that he believed that God for Christ's sake had pardoned his sins, and that if this man went to a Baptist preacher and made such confession and received baptism, and then came back to Brother Sommer for fellowship, that the man would not be honest," but Brother Sommer supposes (or I will use his word), presumes, that if the man did make the mistake of making the wrong confession and of being baptized for the wrong purpose, although it isn't the gospel, it would save him, so a falsehood, according to Brother Summer, will save a man just so he doesn't know it's, I

falsehood; but if he knows it is a falsehood, of course, he will be damned if he obeys it. There is the legitimate conclusion from his argument.

Now, we begin with his speech that he read on the class and woman teacher question, Argument No. 1: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. Little children have ears; therefore, they should hear." Very well, I agree to that, but there isn't anything in that that speaks about dividing a congregation into classes to teach them the Word of God.

Second Argument: The transfiguration, because Jesus carried Peter, James and John upon the mount and was transfigured before them, that is justification for dividing an audience into classes with a plurality of teachers, all teaching at the same time.

I must insist, if this be authority, that Brother Sommer is under obligations to inform us who taught the other classes, or were there any other classes assembled for teaching at that time?

Again, Argument No. 3: Christ explained parables to his disciples; therefore, formed a class of them. If Christ did that (by separating his disciples into a place apart from the multitude, that authorizes us to divide assemblies into more than one class and teach them all at the same time. That is his argument) then I wonder who taught the other folk while Christ was teaching his class. Brother Sommer, there isn't but one class and one teacher here, doing all the teaching that is spoken of in the passage.

It may be argued. that Christ spoke to the multitude first, and then privately expounded to his disciples what he spoke to the multitude. I answer, that what he spoke to the multitude was not intended for the multitude to understand, because he was speaking in parables for the very reason he did not want the multitude to understand. See Matthew 13:34, Mark 4:34, Luke 8:10-11.

Then have we got a parallel case to that? Does Brother Sommer speak to a multitude in a sense that he does not desire them to understand, and then classify to explain to them privately? No, the cases are not parallel.

When Christ was doing this teaching, the time had not come for the truth to be revealed; therefore, he kept it covered in parable language. So you can't have that case, Brother Sommer.

"Seven churches in Asia; therefore, justifies seven classes." Really. I don't think that worthy of notice. We might refer then to a thousand churches in the United States; therefore, we may have a thousand classes in one congregation. What proves too much, proves nothing, Brother Sommer; therefore, your argument is reduced to an absurdity.

The question for discussion is, Shall one of those seven churches when they assemble together for teaching, be divided into different classes for that teaching? There is the question at issue.

Argument No. 5: Says the Holy Spirit recognized twenty-one classes, and therefore, directed twenty-one epistles. If that be authority for classifying a congregation. I fail to see where the authority is. because all twenty-one of these epistles were intended for the very same class of people. Would you say that Corinthians would apply to one class today and Galatians to another class and it would not do to reverse the order? Certainly not, so you can see there isn't anything to that argument.

Argument No. 6: John, second chapter. He says recognizes different classes. I will state here it is one thing to recognize the fact that there are different classes of people, and another thing to divide those classes into groups for the purpose of teaching them.

Acts, sixth chapter, he says that Peter used reason for some work that was to be done in the church there; therefore, we are to use our reason as to the work of forming classes, or, to use a better word, organizing classes. However bad that Brother Sommer hates organization, he is going to take on another one during this debate.

Now, he has left divine authority and referred to human reason as being authority for the class question as well as the woman teacher question. The same human reason tells other folk that it is best to have musical instruments in the worship; the same human reason tells other

folk it is best to have missionary societies to do mission work, and if you are going to put your reason up as a standard to measure your work by, you should not decry the other man for putting his reason up for the same purpose.

Then he refers to nature, that nature will teach us that it should be classified teaching. The word, nature. my friends, if he will allow me to tell the meaning of a word, is from the Greek word *phusis*, and is defined to be, "That which by long habit or practice has been acquired." Thayer is my authority. Then if that is to be our guide in this work, then whatever people have practiced a long time until they have been accustomed to it. that they have been habited to that practice, that makes it right whether the Word of God teaches it or not. and that is the best authority that Brother Sommer has for the class system.

The Ninth Argument is concerning speaking in unknown tongues, that Paul forbids that unless there be an interpreter. So he reasons that it be wrong to speak to children in language that they could not understand, and I say that is true. But the question is, Has God made the Bible too hard for children? Did not the Lord know exactly how to fix up his Word so that it would be adaptable to all ages and abilities? Then when I read God's Word to this audience tonight, every man and woman and child of an understanding heart can get that part of it that ' God Almighty intended, and I challenge Brother Sommer to deny it. But he would have you think that unaccountable children were subject of gospel address, and I want to ask him *to* do me the favor of citing me the passage of Scripture that is intended or directed to an unaccountable child. Please make a note of that and give us the passage that is addressed to an unaccountable child.

Then he refers in his tenth argument to milk for babes and meat for older persons. I do not deny, my friends, that there are these two kinds of food, but I do deny that Brother Sommer has the authority or the knowledge or the power to divide the milk and the meat. Whenever he shows me what verses of Scripture are milk and what verses are meat, I will agree to have two classes, and

I will give the meat to one class and the milk to the other, but suppose we have seven classes. I will say six for the sake of a better illustration. There would be no need for six classes unless there were as many grades of pupils. We will suppose, then, that there are three of the meat class and three of the milk class. So after having divided the milk from the meat, then I would have to divide the meat into three classes and would have to divide the milk into three classes, and I would still have another problem on my hands. So after Brother Sommer has told me what the milk is, then he still must tell you what verses are skim milk and what are whole milk and what is clabber, so as to give three classes of milk to three grades of pupils. Then I would have to learn what was old tough meat, what was tender meat, and what was soup (I guess you would call it), that I might divide the meat among the three classes of pupils.

After he has accomplished that task, then take the twenty-one classes he spoke of, and divide this milk and meat into twenty-one different grades, if you please, and you can see he has a problem on his hands that he never can solve.

He refers to Titus 2:3-4 about the old women teaching the younger women. We believe in it, but that didn't say they should teach them in the public assembly. He may say, "I did not intend that." Yes, he did. He said, "Any man or woman may speak in the public meeting if they are called upon. So if you are going to stand by that statement, you are going to contend that women may teach in that public congregation. Then pray tell me where it was that Paul meant for them to keep silent. We know they shouldn't keep silent in private, in their homes, and Brother Sommer said not in the congregation. Then where did Paul mean for them to keep silent? Surely somewhere.

Then he tries his hand on giving the Greek words that are translated woman, or women, in the New Testament. The first one *gunakos*, found in First Corinthians 14:35, is defined by Thayer, the standard lexicographer of the world today, to mean "a woman of any age, married, single

or a widow." Now, when I tell you the definition of the word. I cite you to the authority for that definition.

So when Paul says it is a shame for a woman to speak in the congregation, he used a word that means universally a woman of any age, whether married, single or a widow.

Brother Sommer says the restriction for women to keep silent only applies to married women. That being true, you girls better exercise your teaching ability in public while you are single, for as soon as you get married, the padlock goes on your mouth, and you are restricted from teaching. Now, surely you don't mean that. Brother Sommer. I will give you the privilege of taking that back if you desire.

We know, however, that the majority of class teaching in the congregations that Brother Sommer represents, the married women are doing the teaching and not single women. Then how can you claim that your churches are Scriptural in work and worship when you say that Paul restricts married women, and they are allowed to speak in your congregations?

Then he refers to Philip's daughters, Acts 21:9. Philip had four daughters which prophesied, but it didn't say 'they prophesied in public or in the assembly of the saints. I believe women may prophesy, but let's respect the prohibition that inspiration has placed on them.

First Corinthians 14:31. "Ye all may prophesy," and he argues that "all" included women. In this passage Paul says, "The prophets may speak one by one, that all may hear and all may learn." The word "prophet" is in the masculine gender, and he is instructing those prophets who were all men on this occasion, to do the prophesying, and not a prophetess (the feminine gender), was allowed to speak in that assembly.

Again, he refers to the word translated *speak*, in First Corinthians, 14th chapter, which word is *laletin*. He didn't tell you the word, and said it means a vocal utterance or babble. I admit that in the classical Greek we have that given as one definition, but in New Testament Greek there is no such definition to it.

He refers again to First Timothy 2:11-12. where Paul says "But I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp au-

thority over the man for Adam was first formed and then Eve," and his exegesis of that passage is, that Paul had reference to married women only and that, too, to married women in the maternity state.

Now, isn't it a sight how people will try to get away from a plain declaration of Holy Writ? You never heard a sectarian preacher try harder to evade the force of Mark 16:16 than these preachers who advocate women speaking in public do to get around this passage. Talk about adding to the Word of God; talk about implication; talk about implying things in the passage that is not written! Here you have a noble demonstration of it from Brother Sommer.

Why did Paul say women should keep silent? Because it is a shame for "a" woman—(I am quoting from the revised version) that is indefinite—to speak in the assembly.

That, my friends, completes the speech to which you have listened, and I have taken pains to notice every argument and every Scripture that has been cited.

In my next speech I shall take up some new matter that I shall offer in my rebuttal to the things that may be said, and the positions taken by Brother Sommer. As I still have two minutes and a half, I am going to call your attention to one or two objections. Brother Sommer has written a tract on the Sunday School question. On page 1 he says: "The first objection to Sunday Schools as organizations separate from the church as an organization or society is that they are not authorized either directly or indirectly by the New Testament."

Now, he is talking about a Sunday School as maintained by sectarians, and his objection is that they are not authorized directly or indirectly, but when he comes to defend his class system of teaching which is but a Sunday School under another name, he says, "We are not claiming authority, precept or precedent for it, but just a privilege."

Again on Page 1 he says, "Therefore, we can not have them without going beyond what the New Testament Scriptures set forth for our guidance." "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God."

Note, my friends, "Neither can we have the Sunday School in connection with the church without going beyond and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ." Brother Sommer admits that Christ has not authorized it by command, precept nor example, not even a precedent, that it is wholly a matter of personal privilege and the man who contends for these things does so without divine warrant from the New Testament; therefore, is going beyond the doctrine of Jesus Christ abiding not in it, and the awful consequences, he has not God nor Christ.

Now, I ask you, my friends, to consider these things in the light of reason and honest and fair mind, which I believe you will, and when you arrive at honest and just conclusions we shall be satisfied.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your kind attention.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER: Brother Chairmen, Ladies and Gentlemen: Didn't I give my respondent something to talk about? And now, in order that you understand the character of his talk, and what it amounts to, when examined, I will read in First Corinthians 11:5: "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head, for that is even all one as if she were shaven."

The woman prayed or prophesied, and what was the prophesying for?

We read in First Corinthians 14:22: "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believeth not, but for them which believe.

"If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

"But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: "

Here in the eleventh chapter he tells about a woman prophesying, and then here he tells about prophesying being

for them that believe not, and furthermore, he tells about them prophesying here, one that believeth not, unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all, "and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."

I continue to read in order to show you what my respondent has been endeavoring to palm off upon you as I incorrect:

"How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.

"If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret.

"But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence—" ' (Man is to keep silence; man is to keep silence, man is to keep silence—this very chapter.) in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

"Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.

"If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."

It is only men; let the man hold his peace; let the man hold his peace; let him keep silence. So the restriction of silence is twice imposed upon men in the assembly. What for? That only one should speak at a time..

"For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.

"And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.

"For God is not the author of confusion but of; peace, as in all churches of the saints.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches—" My opponent has it, Let all women keep silence in the churches, let all women keep silence in the churches, let all women keep silence in the churches. That is his position, and that is what I object to. There is the controversy between us.. Who are your women?

"For it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

"And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."

He may tell us all about the dictionary and Thayer and all that with reference to the women here spoken of, that it means a woman married or unmarried. I want to say about the widows or maids that are here. How are they going to ask their husbands at home? How are they going to ask their husbands at home? How are they going to ask their husbands at home?

My opponent passes from your women who can ask their husbands to all women, all women, all women. That is what he has in mind, and he is endeavoring to palm that off upon you, thinking that you haven't looked closely at these Scriptures.

Now, I turn next to the language over here in Timothy where Paul wrote to Timothy on this subject in his first letter, second chapter: "-Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection." What does that mean?

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

"For Adam was first formed, then Eve."

Was Eve a married woman? Was she? And Adam said, "This is bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh." Was she a married woman? "For this cause, Shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife? Was she a married woman?

"And Adam was not deceived; but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." Was that woman married?

"Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

Why, what have widows and maids to do with child-bearing, except they come as a nurse to *take* care of a woman under those circumstances? That is generally regarded as propriety for a widow. What does he do? He

would keep you in ignorance of the connection with the reference here, and he would palm off on you, all women. I just object to it, especially as the Apostle Paul tells about women praying and prophesying and the prophesying being for the edification of all.

But I simply bring that before you in order to show you that much of his talk has been not taking the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, on the subject.

He made various charges with reference to me; that is the serious charge I will make concerning him.

Now, I will begin again with the second: In the New Testament, we find mention made of what is required by law as set forth in precept or command; also by approved example of precedent which must be attended to in the divinely appointed manner. This is true of baptism, and the Lord's Supper and much else.

Third, Then we find mention made of what is lawful or permitted by law, such as the eating of meats that had been offered to idols. See First Corinthians 6:12 and 8:13. Here we find the doctrine of expediency set forth. Certain practices that were lawful were not expedient, were not proper under certain conditions because they occasioned offense to certain members of an individual congregation. Therefore, they were to be avoided. That is the divine teaching on the subject.

In view of all this, we may safely say that such men and women as will not or can not understand what has been offered in the preceding paragraphs are not fit to be teachers of their brethren or anyone else, and if they should learn what has been offered and will not learn it, such men and women are not fit to be regarded as members of the church of Christ, especially if they cause trouble by their wilful ignorance. They are numbered with those that cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and in Romans 16:17-18, the Apostle Paul described such persons and informs us how to treat or regard them: they are not servants of Christ, but try to serve their own selfish purposes. They do not try to build up churches; they try to disturb and divide Churches of Christ that are already established, "and by

good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple," or deceive those that are not well-informed. And this has been the chief business of innovators and hobbyists among Disciples of Christ for many years. Instead of devoting themselves wholly to making and instructing Christians, by leading men and women to obey the gospel and live right, they have devoted themselves largely to perverting Christians by leading them to accept the erroneous notions that are common to innovators and hobbyists.

The Apostle Paul commands Christians to mark such characters and avoid them, because they are not servants of our Lord Jesus Christ, but serve their own selfish purposes.

Now, I am prepared to state that The Apostolic Way, so-called, and its advocates generally, if not always, are of the class that the Apostle Paul warns us against in Romans 16:17-18. They cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine of Christ, by denouncing certain incidentals or expedients in the Disciples' brotherhood, and calling for precept and example in favor of them. By so doing, they condemn themselves for they have adopted much for which they have neither precept nor example.

In my remarks, I shall mention (additional remarks) a few items for the reader's, consideration, and trust that by considering them, this question may be settled at least in many minds.

Now, here are the additional remarks:

First, we can not find either precept or example in the New Testament for calling a preacher to hold or assist in a protracted meeting.

Second, The same is true in regard to a preacher reading an opening lesson before prayer.

Third, The same is true of a public prayer in a promiscuous audience.

Fourth, We may say the same of the sayings, "Let us kneel," and "Let us stand," and "Let us sit," and "Let us bow while prayer is offered," and even for the saying, "Let us pray," especially in a promiscuous audience. Neither precept nor example for it.

Fifth, Nor can we find precept nor example for calling on anyone to lead in prayer.

Sixth, The same is true in regard to calling for someone to begin the singing, or for announcing a song, or for even singing among ourselves in any other meeting than that which is especially intended for worship.

Seventh: Nor can we find either precept nor example in the New Testament for offering a formal invitation for sinners to come forward to confess faith in Christ.

Eighth, The same may be truly said of singing in invitational hymn.

Ninth, And we may say the same of taking an alien sinner by the hand and asking that one concerning faith in Christ.

Tenth, The same is true in regard to taking an erring Christian by the hand.

Eleventh, Neither can we find precept nor example for an elder standing and presiding at the Lord's table.

Twelfth: And the same is true in regard to the saying, "Let us stand while we give thanks."

Thirteenth, Yes, and the same may be truly said about deacons or someone else taking the bread and wine around to the brethren.

Fourteenth, Nor have we any precept nor example for inviting all to come forward and help themselves to the communion.

Fifteenth, The same is true in regard to the use of a plate or several plates on which to pass the bread of the communion to an audience of worshippers.

Sixteenth: And the same may be said in regard to the practice of dismissing an audience by the common benediction or any other form of speech when services are ended on any occasion.

Seventeenth, Nor have we the precept or example for buying lots and building meeting houses.

Eighteenth, Neither have we any such authority for purchasing a house to meet in for worship: a hired house is mentioned in Acts 28:30, but not a purchased house.

Nineteenth, Nor have we the precept or example for our songbooks.

Twentieth, And the same may be said of all regular meetings for the church, except the meeting on the Lord's Day for worship.

Twenty-first, Finally, the same may be said concerning the manner of making the weekly contribution whether by passing a basket or coming forward and laying it on the Lord's table or by putting it in a box when walking out of the meeting house.

These twenty-one items are near or about all accepted I and admitted and adopted by all the denouncers of Bible classes, and women teachers, and so-called sect baptism among Disciples without precept or example in the New Testament in favor of it. But as soon as they come to Bible classes and women teaching them, and the something they designate sect baptism, then they cry out long and loud and frequently, Where is your precept or example? Where is your precept or example? Where is your precept or example? And by that loud and long and frequent call, they confuse as many people as possible, and work as much division as possible, contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and to this we may add, they glory in such division. The doctrine of Christ requires that we should forbear one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, (see Ephesians 4:1-3) and that doctrine then mentions seven units or objects on which we should be united; one body or church, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God, the Father of all.

Why not be satisfied with these seven units, and try to be tolerant and forbearing in regard to all that pertains merely to incidentals? Those Disciples that contend for unorganized Bible classes and do not have any officers in them or over them, except the elders and deacons and evangelists of the churches in their own divinely appointed places, such Disciples are not contending for any extra units and are not adding to the essentials to salvation. They are contending only for the liberty of adopting the best plans or arrangement for teaching children and others without extra organization.

A certain man on my opponent's side says that he is

a school teacher and has a life certificate for teaching. But he would never have secured that certificate nor would he have been tolerated even one year as a teacher if he had insisted on placing all his pupils in one class and had kept them there regardless of age or understanding. His pupils would have complained; their parents would have protested, and the school board would have told him that he should conform to the ordinary methods of classifying or be dismissed. Why, then, has he reversed himself in regard to teaching persons in the Bible and insisted that all pupils must be in one class? Does he say that the Bible so teaches? I deny it, and have shown to the contrary in my arguments as shown in the former part of this exposure.

The Saviour declared in Luke 16:8, that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light, and here is an instance of it. But the man I referred to as a servant of the school board conformed to the common custom of classifying and this showed his common sense. Yet as a supposed child of light, he reversed himself and has been showing himself as a carping critic, a disturber, and a divisive character. What is worse, if possible, is that he has become a scurrilous character with reference to those who oppose him, in Romans 14:22, "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth."

But not one of the denouncers of Bible classes can be happy in this principle, for all of them allow over twenty-one different doctrines and practices which condemn their reasoning against Bible classes under the general command, "Let all things be done unto edifying." and the additional command that "all things be done decently and in order." Under these two general commands found in First Corinthians 14th chapter, the denouncers of Bible classes have tolerated, and even adopted, over twenty different doctrines or practices that are incidental to the church, but for which they have neither precept nor example.

Why, then, will they condemn themselves when they come to the question of Bible classes by denouncing them

and throwing themselves back and asking, Where is your precept and example for such classes? Where is your precept and example for such classes? Where is your precept and example for such classes?

Those that reason thus should be ashamed to live and afraid to die. They are self-stultified and self-condemned when measured by the Bible or common sense or common consistency.

In view of what has thus far been offered, the question arises, What do the denouncers to whom reference has been made depend on in order to confuse their hearers and readers? One of them said some years ago, "Let the mammies teach their children at home as my mammy taught me, "

He was promptly inquired of for the chapter and verse which authorized anyone's mammy to teach her children in the Scriptures, and he couldn't give it, but was silent, and ought to have been ashamed.

Another of them said, in regard to the elder women teaching the younger women about their behavior, as Paul wrote in Titus second chapter, "Let them do that teaching at home." And if asked how he could say that without adding to God's Word, then he wouldn't need to be silent, and should be ashamed because Paul doesn't say at home, at home, at home, and the man who says *at home*, adds to God's Word. And as I pointed out last evening, I think it was Solomon, the wisest monarch of Israel, who said, "Add thou not unto his Word, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." And he is under condemnation if he adds "at home."

At home would be a good place if they could reach them; certainly at home would be as good a place for such teaching as any other place, even a meeting house. But an older sister in the church might not be able to visit all the younger married women, or might not be able to visit here and there. This command in Titus 2:3 would not be obeyed, but if those younger ones, wives and mothers, would be put in a class by themselves in a meeting house, then they all might learn at once.

When certain teachers add only to the question of

doctrine or faith, then they are guilty of adding to God's Word. And on the same principle, if anyone adds "at home" to any command that requires the older women to teach the younger, then that one is guilty of making an addition to the Word of God, and is inexcusable in so doing. (See Romans 2:1.)

He condemns in another way what he presents himself. And I once knew a man who opposed classifying learners in order to teach them, that made a pretense in regard to teaching them at home, but it was only a pretense. I heard him try to teach them one day and he showed that he had scarcely a clear idea in regard to teaching. He was, or had been, a reader of some paper that was used to oppose the Sunday School, but did not inform parents about their teaching of children, and this illustrates what is generally true. The opposers of classifying learners in order to teach them, are, with very few exceptions, unable to teach a class, and even unable to teach their own children at home if they have any children. They have studied their unreasonable plan of disturbing churches by their extreme notions, and with few exceptions they know but little more.

Such professed Disciples are both unscriptural and unreasonable. They are engaged in a mission of mischief among Churches of Christ and have probably done tenfold more harm than they have ever done good.

I think I know a few of that class, and, friends, I fear that when the time will come that they will be called upon to stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ and give an account for their stewardship, then I fear they will be under condemnation because of the course that they have pursued. I have known a considerable number of them that never, never, never established a congregation, but they have gone from place to place in order to disturb congregations. And wherever they have been able to preach only one sermon, instead of preaching on that which would edify the congregation and build it up, in some way or other had introduced their peculiar, extreme notions, and left the congregation in a divided condition, even if they preached there only once.

Now, that is exceedingly unfortunate. Even though have used some severe language here, I beseech you to consider that the Saviour himself said, "As many as I love, I rebuke, and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent."

I have been connected with the Disciples brotherhood about fifty-seven years, and have been endeavoring to preach the gospel for about fifty-five years, and I think I am acquainted with conditions of things in the Disciples brotherhood, and I say to you that those who occupy the position of my respondent have done, as a rule, from what I can judge by being in districts where they have been, tenfold more harm than they have ever done good. And here is something for us to consider: the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, friends, is the institution which he died to establish, and whoever interferes with the welfare of that church is in danger just as certain as that the Bible is true.

I thank you for your attention.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have heard quite a lengthy reading from Brother Sommer, which no doubt is the best he has to offer and the majority of what was read was not upon the subject, but was irrelevant and would have been ruled out of court by any judge hearing this trial, but it is all he had to offer, and he had it prepared, cut and dried before he came here, and of course it didn't fit the occasion, but he had to use it, hit or miss.

All that he has said relative to the preachers that are associated with me in the work I am doing, regarding the character of their work, may with equal force be said of Brother Sommer by brethren who favor and maintain religio-secular schools. They may charge that Brother Sommer has gone over the country disturbing the peace and harmony of congregations by opposing those schools or colleges that they are maintaining, and hence could use such as that which is not worthy to be called argument against him. I shall not indulge in that kind of argument.

He says some of our people are too ignorant to teach

their own children. Wonderful information, that, that men and women who have obeyed the Gospel, that know how to live the Christian life, that knew enough to get married and to keep house, and yet not knowledge enough to tell the little children what they need to know. That is a terrible charge, Brother Sommer, that you are bringing. Of course, it isn't true, but it is only made by Brother Sommer for an effect. It was uncalled for. We are not discussing about how much my brethren and sisters know, or his brethren and sisters know, but what does the Bible teach on this question. All of that part of the speech referring to us by vile epithets and hard names is entirely out of place and is beneath the dignity of a high-toned debate.

He wanted to know something about the chapter and verse for mammy teaching children at home, and some brother that he had conversed with or that he referred to at least, could not give the passage. Therefore, that proves that there is no such passage because this brother couldn't find it. Isn't that wonderful? There are many such passages, both in the Old and in the New Testament. I will only refer to one case and pass on for the present. That is the case of Timothy's mother teaching him, as well as his grandmother. That ought to be enough.

He refers to him who will not condemn in another what he allows himself. This we shall notice just a little later. He also refers to some preacher, and calls him a scurrilous character, that teaches school and divides into classes, but reverses the order when he teaches in assembly the Word of God, and thinks that is something terrible that a man should do that. When he is teaching school, he is doing that upon human authority. When he is teaching a congregation the Word of God, he is doing that upon divine authority. That makes the difference. Divine authority says, when you are assembled in one place, let one speak at a time, which would only be necessary to have one class in that instance.

Again, in our public schools we have as many text-books as we have classes. In our religious assemblies we have but one textbook, the Bible, and Brother Sommer by his refusing to show me how to divide the milk from the meat, and then subdividing the milk and the meat, has ad-

mitted that we have no grounds for organizing classes until you can organize the food to give those classes.

He says in their class work they have no organization and no officers. I beg to differ with him here because the word "organization" means to arrange into parts for systematic work, or action. This definition is taken from the encyclopedic dictionary. If, then, my friends, Brother Sommer arranges the different learners into classes for work or action, he is organizing classes, and when he appoints teachers over those classes, they are the officials conducting their class as an officer in that class, and whoever takes charge of this work, let it be an elder, let it be a preacher or any other member who arranges it or controls it. he is the superintendent of that institution and the preacher that goes around over the country dividing churches by advocating those things is the traveling organizer or the field secretary of the organization. He has as much organization as the sectarian Sunday School, and I am willing to give ten dollars in cash for every point of difference in organization between Brother Sommer's class work and the regular sectarian Sunday School organization.

Now, there is a fair proposition and a chance for Brother Sommer to make some money. If his life is like most preachers, he needs it. Get me clear now. Ten dollars for every point of difference in organization from that of the sectarian organization called the Sunday School. I propose to show as many part of his class system as there are parts in the Sunday School organization that Brother Sommer fights.

Now, everything that Brother Sommer has said relative to calling a preacher, reading a lesson before prayer, promiscuous prayer, stand, sit or bow to pray, call one to lead a song, formal invitation, singing invitation songs, asking sinner for a confession, stand, presiding at table, passing emblems, plate or several, dismissing audience. meeting houses, song books, contributions, etc., are things that he says we practice for which we have no authority, and if we will practice these twenty-one things without authority we should allow him to practice the class system without authority. Now that is his argument. Acknowl-

edging we have no authority, we have no command, we have no precept, we have no precedent for the class system, but you haven't got command or authority for these other things, therefore, I just admit that I have no authority for the class system, says Brother Sommer, virtually.

Yet his proposition says that the congregations that he represents in doctrine, work and worship are *authorized* by Jesus Christ. Now, where is your authority for your class system from the Lord Jesus Christ? He has forsaken his proposition and gone into nature and human reason and the wisdom of this world to justify his class system. That doesn't sound like the old slogan, "we speak where the Bible speaks and are silent where it is silent." That doesn't sound like, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." The passage that says the Bible furnishes a man of God to all God's works, would not come into your use here, Brother Sommer.

I will say this much with reference to those things, that where God has given a command and has not said how to carry it out, we are left to the selection of the plan or method of carrying it out, but where God has given a command and has said how to obey that command, we are bound to such restrictions.

In the case of teaching a congregation of people that have assembled in one place, we have a positive divine law that says, Let one speak at a time and let your women keep silent. Therefore, inasmuch as God has legislated upon this question, we are not left to use our own judgment as we would be in passing the emblems or standing up to pray or kneeling to pray or other things of that character. So your twenty-one items do not serve you in this discussion, Brother Sommer.

What he has to say about causing division, and that we should avoid those that do cause division, is true. The man that causes division should be avoided, but who is it that *is* causing the division? Brother Sommer says his class system is on a par with eating meat that is sacrificed to an idol, that it is not commanded, but you have the liberty to eat the meat and you have the liberty to have the class system. Paul says, "If eating meat will make his **brethren to offend, he will** not eat any more while the world

stands." Brother Sommer says if you object to the class system, we will have it anyway.

Do you see a difference there? Who would be the cause of division if some brother would eat meat and offend that brother and drive him from the House of God? Why, the man that ate the meat. Who would be the cause of division if a man practices the class system that is on a par with eating meat, and it drove some one away from the House of God? Why, the man that introduced the class system. In the language of one of old, Thou art the man, Brother Sommer, that is the cause of the division.

Then, the rest of his speech was put in concerning married women, and this is the only part of my speech to which he referred. I suppose I so completely routed him from the position he occupied upon the passages of Scripture introduced, that he thought about the only show he could make would be about the woman question, and hence, has offered us a few amusing things upon that question. We shall notice them

He says in Corinthians man is commanded to keep silent twice. Certainly that is true. What does it mean by him keeping silent? It means he must not play the role of teacher in that congregation. If he speaks in an unknown tongue and folks can not understand him, then don't let him undertake to teach in that congregation. If to keep silent on the man's part means not to teach in that congregation, what would keep silent on the woman's part mean? The same thing, that she should not be a teacher in that congregation. So the argument is mine.

He says that Paul said, Let your women keep silence, and Cowan says. Let *all* women keep silence, therefore, making a distinction between *your* women and *all* women, ignoring the definition given of the word woman, ignoring the standard authority upon the definition of Greek words. Professor Thayer, who defines the word to mean a woman of any age, married, single, or a widow, running rough-shod over authority, puts his own judgment and his own definition above that of the scholarship of the world. He still persists in the idea that only married women were commanded to keep **silent**. That being

true, then, any congregation that Brother Sommer represents in which there are married women teaching a class in that congregation, they are un-Scriptural, and I just wonder if the congregation that he represents in Sullivan have any married women teachers in it? If so, you had better get them out, because Paul forbade them to teach, and put your inexperienced girls who are unmarried in there to teach.

But he says, What about the maids and widows who have no husbands? How can they ask their husbands at home? Now, I am not responsible for maids and widows not having husbands. But does not Brother Sommer know that women of that class either have a father or mother to look to for instructions and a widow certainly is not without someone that should guide her, and be her guardian. How in the world could it be a shame for a married woman to teach in public and not be a shame for a woman that is a widow to teach in public? I would like to know the difference in the propriety of the thing. Would it be more immodest or more indecent for a married woman to teach a class than it would for a single woman to teach a class? Brother Sommer, that distinction you are making here is ridiculous and unreasonable. So that completes the last speech of Brother Sommer, and I shall now do some advance work as I promised you in my former speech.

I wish to state that Brother Sommer fights what he calls a Sunday School organization. We take up his tract again on the Sunday School question and we will commence reading on Page 2. Brother Sommer quotes the following Scripture, Romans 14:22: "Happy is he who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth," and Romans 2:1, which says, "For wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

In the following quotations and conclusions it will be shown that Brother Sommer is the man who allows the things which he condemns, and does the very thing for which he judges, for which he condemns others.

On Page 4, it reads: "What it proposes to do for others, is what the parents are inclined to neglect." He

means the organized Sunday School proposes to do this, and thereby encourage the parents to neglect. "That is to say, what is proposed to be done for children in the Sunday School encourages parents to neglect studying the Bible so as to be able to teach their children; thus we learn that the Sunday School is popular with many because it contributes to their ease and indulgence." Now, hear in mind this quotation is Brother Sommer's objection to the Sunday School.

Every objection in the above to the Sunday School applies with equal force to Brother Sommer's meeting for class teaching; thus he allows the very thing he condemns. Therefore, Brother Sommer's class system will be just as popular because it would be conducive to the ease and comfort of the parents.

Please explain why, Brother Sommer, sending a child to an organized Sunday School would cause parents to neglect them, and sending them to an unorganized Sunday School (if there should be such a thing), would not cause parents to neglect them? The objection that applies to the organization also applies to this "semi-organization" that Brother Sommer is representing.

On Page 6 of the same tract, he says, "The first harm that they do is in preventing parents from being impressed with the responsibility of teaching the Bible to their children. The next harm is that instead of children receiving a half dozen lessons in the Bible each week from their parents, they receive but one and that a very short one from a Sunday School teacher."

Just so it may be argued in the class system that Brother Sommer is in favor of. It will cause parents to neglect their children and wherein they should have a half-dozen lessons, they depend upon the class system to give them one and a very short one upon Sundays. So you are the man that condemns the other fellow for the very thing that you are allowing and advocating in this debate.

Again on Page 6: "Another harm resulting from the Sunday School *is* that teachers in such schools are without authority over the children, and they are generally permitted to do as they please. Finally, so little is required of the children by their Sunday School teachers, especially

where the humanly devised lesson leaves are used, that the end in view is not accomplished.

Now, note, friends, a Sunday School teacher has as much authority over the children in their class as a class teacher has over the children in their class, unless the

teacher is one of their parents or guardians. Where is the class system in operation where only parents or guardians are the teachers? If none of the congregations with which Brother Sommer is identified has such class teaching, with parents all teaching their own children, and not the children of others for the reason they have no authority over others' children, then how is his proposition true that it is a Scripturally authorized division? He condemns other folk for teaching children over which they have no authority and tolerates the same thing in his class system, unless you can find the class system in vogue where the parents are teaching their children only, and not the children of others, and Brother Sommer's objection is that it is harmful for teachers to teach a class over which they have no authority and only parents have that authority; therefore, you would have to have a class system with parents teaching their own children.

I am going to say if such a rule was enforced, it would break up every Sunday School on earth. You fathers and mothers would say, "If I have to teach my own children every Sunday, I will just teach them at home." Wouldn't you? Well, that is the thing you ought to do, but Brother Sommer condemns the Sunday School for having teachers who have no authority over the children taught, and turns right around and endorses the very same thing. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." You should not judge another for doing the very same thing that you do yourself.

But again on Page 10: "But the forming of classes is left to the decision of each congregation. In every assembly where one or more persons in good standing will object to the forming of classes, they should not be formed. The same is true in regard to women becoming teachers of classes in a meeting house, but where there is objection to any woman teaching a class, then let the objection prevail if it be urged by one of good standing."

This, my friends, is a dead give-away that it is not authorized; it is not essential, and a man or the woman who contends for the class system and women teachers to the extent that will cause one brother or one sister in good standing to object that you can eliminate the class system and not have it, shows that it is not authorized by the Word of God; but again on Page 10:

"But no one can justly claim to be a Disciple of Christ and yet object to a church gathering all of every class to a meeting house or elsewhere, putting the Bible or Testament into the hands of every one who can read, and then expounding the Word of God to them, and then let this be done everywhere with diligence to God's honor and glory."

I say "Amen" to this statement of Brother Sommer. We can all agree on that, and it is all God's will and no man that is a Christian can object to it, and the church in Sullivan can be united on that statement of Brother Sommer's. But if he is going to contend that you must have the class system at the expense of peace and harmony, of course, you will continue to maintain the class system.

But let me note again in the same tract on Page 19: "But when parents are impressed that some one else will teach their children in the Scriptures, they are liable to feel that they don't need to study the Bible for their children's sake. Many of them love their children *so* devotedly that were it not for the thought of what the Sunday School would do for them, they would search the Scriptures with care in order to teach their children aright, but in view of what is proposed in the Sunday School they suffer themselves to remain ignorant of the Bible and thus it is that the Sunday School results in a twofold damage, a damage to parents and a damage to children."

Just so you may substitute class system in the place of Sunday School in this passage and still get the same twofold damage. Therefore, Brother Sommer is still condemning a thing in Sunday School people that he allows to practice himself.

Again, Page 14: "If parents or other guardians wish

to begin in to do this private teaching, expounding in the meeting houses by calling their children into little groups or companies in different parts of the house, they are only carrying out what has been begun by the one that did the public reading and expounding."

And note here that we conclude, that parents should teach their children only and not the children of others, because they have not authority over other children. Where is the congregation which maintains such practice? If there be no such congregation, then how can the church that Brother Sommer is identified with be Scriptural in doctrine, work and worship? Keep in mind he advocates that fathers and mothers should gather their own children into groups and teach them and not the children of others. Whenever you put that rule in force, you will break up the class system, and put the fathers and mothers to teaching their children in the home where such teaching is commanded to be done.

Thank you, ladies and Gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Affirmative): Brother Chairmen, Ladies and Gentlemen: Those of you who were present last evening recollect that my respondent said he would give ten dollars for every difference that could be pointed out between the organized Sunday School on the one hand, and our Bible classes on the other. I call attention to that especially because of the manner in which he made it.

Now, friends, I call attention to four items in which the organized Sunday School differs from even what he charged upon our Bible classes. He said the elders were superintendents and the teachers were the officers. Well, that didn't touch the question of organization as such. We don't have any collection extra for the Sunday School. We don't have any treasurer, we don't have any literature extra for the Sunday School and we don't have an secretary to keep books, to tell the number of pupils.

There are four things in which the organized Sunday

School differs from our Bible classes. The clerk or secretary, the treasurer, the collection and the literature.

Now, here are four respects, and he said he would give ten dollars for each one. If my respondent is as good as his word he will hand over to me four ten dollar bills or forty dollars in whatever form he sees fit to give it.

I mention that kindly, respectfully, but he need not think that I am going to forget it because while I am not a financier, yet on this occasion I calculate to remind him of it as often as may be necessary until the close of this debate. I mention it now and if it isn't settled, I will mention it again tonight, calculate so to mention it, and if anything befalls me, Brother Harper has just stepped in here, and I calculate he should take my place if necessary, to carry this debate to consummation, and I charge him to continue mentioning those forty dollars until they are handed over or until this debate ends.

Now, with that much stated, I next come to the question of authority, with reference to which my respondent became so earnest last night as certain of you recollect, especially who could sit in the audience and see him, and as I inferred I found him at one time at my left hand and at another time over there, I thought I could hear him, although my hearing is not quite as it was. Yet at the same time I thought he was losing his dignity, that he was swinging from side to side, and indeed his manner caused me to think of old Daniel Webster in the United States Senate on one occasion. He was talking about those men who had their hands in the public crib, as he thought, and at a certain juncture, he said, "Mr. Speaker, I propose, Sir. that these gentlemen be called upon to disgorge." he said in his stentorian voice. And my respondent's method of speech caused me to think he was positively disgorging on that occasion and he was endeavoring to disgorge on me and besmirch and beslime me after a manner that would make me contemptible in the estimation of this audience.

It is beneath the dignity of a gentleman always to be saying, "Brother Sommer this" and "Brother Sommer that." I don't believe I have mentioned my respondent's name a single time since I began this debate. I have mentioned him as my respondent. I am afraid the debate will

be full of "All, Brother Sommer, you will have to do better there;" "You can't get away from that;" and all that__what shall I call it—balderdash. That is a respectable English word. Just balderdash. But I wish especially to refer to what he said about authority.

He said that my proposition required me to find authority for this, that the church with which I was connected was by divine authority in name, doctrine, practice, worship and work according to the Scriptures.

Now, I wonder if he ever thought that the Lord Jesus Christ had authorized the doctrine of expediency; whether he ever thought of it or not, it is a divine doctrine, and that means that what is permitted by the law of Christ is lawful and that lawful something becomes expedient under certain circumstances. But while I have this before me, lest I forget, I will make mention that he said Paul's expediency was such that if eating meat would cause his brother to offend he would eat no meat. He thought he had the clamps on me, but "Brother Sommer will say Have the classes even if they do cause offense." And yet, at a later moment he found some good reading in my tract on the Sunday School question and actually read that Brother Sommer said that if one person objected while he was in good standing, why, they should not have the classes, and then he said, "I say 'Amen' to that." The only thing in the tract that I have been called upon to repudiate as not being correct he said Amen to! I have repudiated that in the Review, I don't know how often. That is one declaration wherein I made a mistake for when I wrote that tract I did think that those who objected to Bible classes might be humble Disciples. Since then I have found out that they are dictatorial Disciples, dictatorial Disciples, dictatorial Disciples. As for humility, they don't know what it means, but on the contrary, if there be a congregation of a hundred or 150 or 200 Disciples, whatever it may be, and they have adopted some of these witch-begotten and hag-born ideas and extreme notions as we may safely speak of them. They will say; "I don't like that; that hurts my feelings."

They can stay away if they don't wish to come, and

they can come and listen or they don't need to go into the classes. But no, that won't answer the purpose, so they have become dictators in regard to the congregation. Now, there isn't anything in that.

As far as Paul is concerned, friends, I make mention of this: that when Paul said, "If eating meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world stands," it only affected him. But this question to which I refer may affect a hundred or two or three hundred Disciples and maybe that many children, and consequently his idea on that subject does not apply, that one individual may hamper the progress of a whole congregation. And I have seen near about that many congregations and have become quite well acquainted with them that adopted his idea, and I have never known any that have shown any signs of life and progress. If they increase, it is by immigration, people who have come in, moved in and, consequently, increased the assembly.

Now, having said that much, I come back on this question of expediency of divine doctrine, and it is divinely authorized. Then I wonder, did it ever occur to him whether the Lord ever authorized an appeal to reason. I quoted the Scripture or referred to it that the Apostle Peter said, It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables. And then he proceeded upon that basis to call upon the brethren to appoint seven men of certain report and other qualifications to take charge of the business affairs of the congregation there at Jerusalem so that is a divinely authorized doctrine and appeal to the common sense of the people, a just judgment of people.

Paul on another occasion said, Commending ourselves to every man's judgment in the sight of God. Then I wonder if he ever thought that it was a divinely authorized doctrine that Paul mentioned when he said, "Doth not Nature teach you—"thus and so? in writing to the Corinthians in the 11th chapter; and thus an appeal to Nature is a divinely authorized doctrine.

Then I brought up the statement likewise that the Saviour said, "The children of this world are wiser in

their generation than the children of light" That is a divine doctrine, and I pointed out that the children of this world have learned how to teach children in different classes according to ages.

No man can serve among the teachers of this country at least, if he will put all of the children in one class. It produces confusion and the children couldn't make progress. They haven't any books. He says, "We have one book and one class." We have one book made up of sixty-six different documents.

Now, suppose that the school books were made up of one volume with sixty-six or fifty or forty different documents for the different ages. Don't you see very clearly that they could have the one volume, or we might have the entire Bible divided up according to the different parts and suitable for the different classes of learners.

Now, having said that much on the question of authority, and thus showing you that all of this swinging from side to side (and I don't know whether he frothed at the mouth or not) but at the same time all that kind of speech that you heard last night in which he endeavored to besmirch and besmear me over on the question of authority is simply that much—I called it balderdash, and I will still say that. It is rather the style of the demagogue, not the style of a dignified debater on the question of religion.

Now, next I make mention of his talk about milk and you recollect what he said, how I divided the milk, milk, strong milk and weak milk, and bonnyclabber; and meat: tough meat and tender meat, and then there will be soup, and tried to make this all appear as ridiculous as possible.

I submit to your just judgment, friends, that is beneath the dignity of a man discussing a question that is serious and solemn as the question of religion, and all of this was in order to place me in a predicament.

Well, I wonder if I will get an idea into his head or the head of his friends on this subject, if I make an analysis of the Bible from beginning to end. It is divided into history, law and prophecy. One statement says law, prophecy and the Psalms. That is division from one viewpoint, but history first, and there are seventeen hooks of history. The

first book, Genesis, doesn't have much law in it, but Exodus has history and law; Leviticus, history and law. Numbers has history and law, and then we come to the book of Deuteronomy which has history and law. Then we have the book of Joshua, history chiefly; Judges, history chiefly; then the book of Ruth, history chiefly; then first book of Samuel, history and some law; second book

of Samuel, history and some law; first book of Kings, history and some law; second book of Kings, history and some law; first and second Chronicles, history and some law. and then Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, all of which have history, with some phases of law in them. So history comes first and history is the easiest part. That is the common school education, we will say, of a learner in the Bible, and the law may be safely designated as corresponding to the high school education of those who study the Bible. And then if there are those who wish to take a university course in the Bible, taking up the prophecy, let them be well prepared by the history and law preceding and they will have something to hold them for a period.

The same is true of the New Testament. There we have history; four books of history with the law referring backward and referring forward, and then we have the fifth book especially with the law pertaining to becoming a Christian, and then after we come to the close of the book of Acts, we have twenty-one letters which are chiefly what may be called law for the Christian, teaching him how to work according to the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the last book, while it has some law, it is chiefly prophetic; Old Testament and New are both then in harmony with each other.

Now, we take a little child before he is five years of age. and he looks up and says, "Who made that sun, the moon, the stars?" and we tell him the Good Man in the sky made these, and we never have to tell him anything else except that this Good Man is the great God of the universe who made the world; and we pass on and the little children at that age, or even earlier, can proceed, as I know and all the fathers and mothers here know who have told the Bible stories to the children, and they will reach after them and think more of them than any Mother Goose

melodies or anything else that can be imposed upon the children, and you will never have to tell the children that these stories are not correct. No Santa Clans arrangement in this. There is the milk for the babes. It is in the history.

Thus with the Old Testament. Then when we come to the New, we read there the genealogy of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Before we get through the book of Matthew we have the birth of Christ and the second chapter tells that Jesus was horn in Bethlehem of Judea, and in the days of Herod, the king, behold there came wise men from Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? We have seen the star in the heavens and come to worship. We give the milk to the babes.

When we come to the Sermon on the Mount, we have something beyond the milk, but we can pass over that in connection with the history and so on, through Matthew, then Mark, then Luke, and John, and by that time they are prepared for the book of law called the book of Acts, and that book, dear friends, then gives us what may be safely designated the law for the alien sinner to become a Christian. And from that we pass on to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus as found in the twenty-one letters and there we find the strong meat for those who are of full age, and if my respondent has any doubt about that, let him take the book of Romans and undertake to expound it from beginning to end.

Now, having said that much, I have disposed of that with reference to which my respondent, I might say, endeavored to break down and besmirch me last evening in his last speech and indeed, his course has been such from the beginning, as I intend to point out more fully hereafter, as to indicate to me that he doesn't care for God, man nor the devil, just so he breaks down the speech of his opponent.

I pointed out with reference to the question of civil government that he stated that which implied that God and Christ are both murderers, and he will never get away from that and he is going to hear more of it hereafter.

Well, with that much said on authority and on the

money question and on the milk question, why, we come to what he said about my twenty-one items, that I made mention of, and he said that they don't apply. That is easy. That is easy. I could have said that what he said last night didn't apply and then stopped right there. That would have been easy, but instead of that, I took up the case, analyzed it, showed it was wrong, first, middle and last. But when we came to the question of the women, I pointed out and showed that his doctrine is that *all women* shall remain quiet instead of *your women*, all women. Then he said, "You young sisters can teach until you get married and then the padlock is put on your mouth." He talked about the padlock, padlock, padlock, and endeavored to bring me in disrepute with as many as possible because of his use of the word padlock.

Then he said Philip's daughters prophesied, but not in the public congregation. I would like to know where he got authority for the word *not*. That much addition to the Word of God.

I pointed out in First Corinthians, 11th chapter, a woman was spoken of, not only a virgin, but a woman, a married woman was spoken of as speaking or prophesying and praying with her head covered, and then we learn further that provision was intended for the edification of the congregation. Now, would she need to prophesy in secret and have somebody else tell it out to the audience?

Is that the way the Lord has been in the habit of doing business? He said the word prophet is in the masculine gender. Is the word prophecy in his book in the masculine gender?

He said in the New Testament Greek no such definition as babble is found to the word—he said *lalelin*. That is the infinitive form. It is *laleo* in the indicative, as babble. I think he would better look again and if his lexicon doesn't give it, I think he ought to try to get another. Then I wrote down here while I had in mind, "I wonder what my Opponent thinks of Philippians 4:3: "Help those women who labored with me in the Gospel." I wonder what he thinks of that.

He says, "All that was said by Brother Sommer about me and my brethren, regarding to division may be said of

him by those that favor the colleges." That is easy; that is very easy. Why, yes, it is said of me by those who favor the instrument that we have caused division, but we turn around and ask them, Who is it that commenced this thing? as Abe Lincoln said to the bull that had chased him to the haystack and was getting the worst of it from Abe, and pawed and bellowed, and Abe said, reasoning with the bull, "I would like to know who commenced this." So with the instrumental music people, and those who are agitating these questions with the churches advocating the Bible classes; here come some who say you can't have them.

He said I was guilty of terrible charges made by Brother Sommer only for effect. In the first place, not terrible charges except as they were true, and of course, for the effect of trying to bring the truth before the people, the truth before the people. He said I was guilty of vile epithets and hard names. Not true; no vile epithets. He said some brother could not find a passage for some mother teaching her children. He said there are many such passages in the Old Testament and the New, and referred to Timothy's mother and grandmother, many such passages. Now, the question arises, Where are those passages in the Old Testament and the New?

When I referred to the Old Testament on civil government which is strictly an Old Testament question, originally, he said that didn't apply.

Human authority for the school teacher, and we are under the divine authority, and we have but the one class, and I wrote down here, "But the one book made of many books."

Says organization means arranging for work. Yes, here is where he came in on that question, where he offered the ten dollars. We will not say anything more about that.

His proposition says authorize. That dealt with the authorized question, and he says where anything is commanded and there is no special command with reference to the manner of doing this, why, he says, we are left to plan for the carrying of it out.

Well, there is a special, definite, tremendous command that the Saviour gave over and over again, "He that hath

ears to hear, let him hear," and seven times over we find in John's vision on the Isle of Patmos, the Saviour declared through him, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," so there is the divine command to hear, and the little children have ears to hear, and should be permitted to hear, and should be given the spiritual food that is necessary for them and that is found in both the Old Testament and the New.

Now, let me see if there is anything else that I have overlooked.

He charges me with saying, if you object, I will have it anyway. I have already dealt with that. Says, Thou art the man. Yes, I suppose he pointed at me at that time. We will have it anyway. What affects me only, I can forego, but what affects the whole congregation, that is another matter. A man may call me by any name he sees fit, but when he interferes with the work of the church that Christ saw fit to establish, I will throw a spiritual sword in his pathway if I can.

So he thought he had so completely routed me that I left it. That didn't occur to me, and I wonder how he thought of it. I thought, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?"

"Running rough-shod over authority." What authority? I don't care how many lexicons he would present. He hasn't read but one here yet. He quoted from one he calls by a prominent name, Thayer, I believe he says. He quotes from that, but, friends, the question arises here, What avails a definition *if it ignores the context in which a word is found?* Words are determined by their connection, and the lexicon that is against words in their connection undoubtedly is not to be relied on.

Finally, he said, Women that have no husbands, why, they take up questions, they have a father or brother or some one else they can question.

Now, I see here—I had forgotten about that tract question—Here he found some good reading in a tract he got from me on the Sunday School question, and I believe I mentioned that a while ago, that the only sentence in that tract that I now repudiate, he grabbed that and said Amen. And I regard it now as wrong, but the good

part he didn't accept, and the part that is not good, and that I have repudiated, he reaches after.

Well, friends, instead of beginning something else, I will just make mention to you, don't be disconcerted if my opponent cuts capers and plays pranks again, as he did last night. Don't be disconcerted because I will have a chance at that, remember, at a later date, and when I have a chance at it I propose to expose it first, middle and last, or at least do with it what the Yankee did who had in his field a large stone. He got tired driving around it, and so he dug a hole and let it fall in. So I will open up what the Scripture says on the subject and let his whole speech fall in, when he directs it against the truth.

I thank you for your attention.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Those of you who heard the discussion yesterday evening no doubt saw me, where I was standing and how I moved. I am sure you will state that I did not move over six inches to either side during the entire speech, but to Brother Sommer it looked like I was swaying six or eight feet. Now, that is the difference in his vision and the vision of the audience, and the way I account for that was the confused and addled state of his mind. I make this apology for him for fear he would not make it for himself.

He seems a little bit out of humor and becomes irritated at the predicament that he is in, and tries to place all the blame on me. He reminds me of the man who heard the great commission read that says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." The man saw that put him in bad because he had not obeyed that command, and he got mad at the man who read the passage, when the truth of the matter is, he was getting mad because he was in the condition he was in. He saw the passage condemned him, and that is Brother Sommer's predicament.

I am sorry he thinks that what I said in my replication to his speech was beneath the dignity of a gentleman and a debater and that I was trying to besmear him, and I

don't know how many other hard words that he did use, attributing them all to me. The report of this debate will show whether or not his charges are true and I shall ask the reader to examine the speeches on either side and see if Brother Sommer's charges upon me are true or not. I shall be satisfied with the reader's decision.

First, in reference to the ten dollar proposition. He thinks *he* finds four differences between the Sunday School as maintained by others and the class system as maintained by himself. His first difference, he says, is no collection. However, we have plenty of testimony from different congregations that are identified with Brother Sommer or he identified with them who do have a collection, and who also have the literature. I will mention one which is at Cloverdale, Indiana, not over fifty miles, I suppose, from this place.

So that he has lost two of the ten dollars. I do not owe him that ten dollars, and will not pay it until he establishes the difference. Of course, where they have a collection, they have some place to put it, they keep it somewhere, that makes a treasurer, and hence he loses the third ten dollars. And, last, he says they have no secretary or on officers of any kind in that organization, yet in publishing a paper called *The Apostolic Review*, we find on page 6 of the issue of April 29, 1924, he gives an illustration here of a man who ran a mill and allowed the customers to pour all kinds of material into the hopper and grind it all up together, that it would not make bread that was safe for man or beast to eat. Now I quote him:

"And so with a Bible class without any one to regulate it. Such a class is a bid for erratics and speculators that enjoy all opportunities to express their wild notions."

So we learn from this quotation from Brother Sommer's own pen that he recognizes the fact that some one must take charge of, run or regulate his Bible class system, which is a superintendent, if you please, it matters not whether you have named him that or not; he is a superintendent, and as superintendent he orders the classes arranged, which is organization, and appoints teachers over those classes, which is the work of a super-

intendent, and receives the report of how many were in each class and how much collection from each class and what kind of a lesson they had; and tell me that isn't organization. Dear people, get your dictionary and look to the word "organization;" read the definition of it, and then you will see that I am right, that he has as much organization as the sectarian Sunday School, and hence I do not owe any forty dollars yet.

I wish to refer to one thing that Brother Sommer read in his written speech last night, that he referred to Dr. Trott, and H. C. Harper of Florida, and others, when their names should not have been introduced in a public discussion of this kind, and especially when they are not here to care for themselves. I will state this, however, that if either of them could have been as fortunate as have been, and have secured Brother Sommer for a debate, they would have amply cared for themselves.

He said my movement from one side of the pulpit to the other was beneath the dignity of a debater. Brother Sommer, will you please tell me if I had moved as much as you thought I did, what book of parliament usage, what rule of honorable controversy, what rule of good pulpit ethics did I violate by moving from one side to the other of the pulpit? Be sure, now, and give us your authority upon that.

Ladies and Gentleman, such objections filed by Brother Sommer only serve to fill space and to try to prejudice the minds of the audience against me, and to keep the truths that I have presented covered up.

He next comes to the word "expediency," and asked if I did not know that the law of expediency was authorized. Certainly I knew that Paul said, "All things were lawful but all things not expedient," and I also showed last night it was not expedient for Paul to use meat if it caused his brother to offend and I quoted from Brother Sommer that if one brother was offended by the eating of meat—I mean by the introduction of classes—that they should not be formed. But I did show later in his tract that where they all come together with one man reading to the entire

congregation that no Christian could afford to object to that, and offered that as a basis for Christian union.

I am going to say this evening that we can all be united upon that platform that was given in the last quotation, but we never can be united upon that thing that is called the class system, even though it be brought under the law of expediency. Seeing, then, that it is causing trouble, division and strife among the congregations of the Church of Christ, I am going to say that if you love the class system better than you love unity, you will keep it. If you love unity better than you love the class system, you will discard it.

He says eating meat only affected Paul. Why, my dear brother, it would affect anybody who liked meat, but if by eating of that meat, I would offend a brother, just so the class system may offend one brother; it may offend many brothers. There is no such distinction between the two as Brother Sommer tries to draw. But now he says, "I repudiate that statement that I made in my tract. I say now the class system ought to have full sway, it matters not if brethren in good standing do object to it." Although he said it is just an expedient, not law, not a command, we have no example of it in the Bible, no precept. Brother Sommer will admit we have no authority from that standpoint, only an expedient, and now he says, "I am going to advocate that you stay with that for which you have no precept, example, authority, even, if the brethren object to it."

Now, he will say I am trying to besmear him, I suppose, but I am only showing him up in the true light.

He says the brother that doesn't want the class system can stay away, and calls them some hard names. He says they are no longer humble Disciples, but have become dictatorial Disciples. It is all right for him to call us any kind of a name, to give us any kind of a title that he wishes, just so Cowan doesn't hand anything like that back to him. I am not going to hand it back to you, don't worry, I must reduce your argument to an absurdity, but I am not going to say you are a demagog, dictatorial or scurrilous

or any other opprobrious epithets that you have called us. But he says we can stay away if we don't want the classes. Just so our digressive brothers say, "If you don't want instrumental music, if you don't want to have anything to do with our aid or missionary society, stay away and come on and worship with us. Will you do it, Brother Sommer? Certainly not. He knows he would not do it.

Then he refers to another vain imagination of his, that the churches that I represent are not growing and prospering any except some one moves into the community. I just closed a meeting week before last, with twenty-nine additions, twenty-five of whom were baptized; one before that with eleven additions, and I believe nine of them baptized, and we are growing and increasing with great rapidity all over the country and are even spreading out in the north and have come here to stay and our work is going to stay in the north, and we are going to deal the innovators misery with the Bible and Bible only, and the church and church only, as the organization with which to do it.

So you might as well prepare yourself, Brother Sommer, for the fray.

Then he goes back to Acts 6, where Peter uses reason or the word reason, and asked the Disciples, "Is it reasonable that we should quit the word of God, and serve tables."

Brother Sommer says this gives you the right to follow our reason if Peter used that word in that respect in Acts 6. He had forgotten that later in the same Bible there is a command for the ordination of deacons laid down as divine law.

Now, find, if you please, your command in the book anywhere to divide and assemble into classes in order to teach them the Word of God. Absolutely can not do it, so I have a vantage ground, there. Brother Sommer admits there is no command for the division into classes. It is only human reason that justifies it, and nature which is defined by Thayer to mean practice or that which has been acquired by long habit or practice. The fact that a man

has practiced a thing a long time does not make it right, either.

Then he refers to Luke 16, where the children of this world are wiser in their generations, than the children of light, and tries to argue from that passage that we have a right to employ worldly wisdom in serving God, and that the class system is the product of worldly wisdom, and not the product of the divine wisdom. I thank you for the admission, sir. Now listen—he will say that is besmirching him.

Paul, in the third chapter of First Corinthians, draws a wide and broad contrast between worldly wisdom and the wisdom of God, and he says the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, yet Brother Sommer would tell you that the wisdom of this world works out the class system, and if it is foolishness with God, we will have it if it drives brethren out of the worship of the Church of Jesus Christ.

He refers to the fact that the Bible has sixty-six documents in it called books, and a very long' inference is drawn that that authorizes the class system. It is just about like the inference I heard one time when the fellow read about where Christ rode into Jerusalem upon the ass's colt. Therefore, he concluded it is right to baptize babies. Just about as much connection between his inferences as there are in Brother Sommer's inferences that there are sixty-six books in the Bible; therefore it is right to divide into classes in order to teach. Think about how that would look, friends, one class studying one book, another class another book, until they have sixty-six classes with as many teachers all teaching at the same time. Why, there isn't any foundation for an argument I there for Brother Sommer.

Then he again calls me a demagog and he is afraid that what I have said will ruin the appearance or the character of the debate in book form, and that because I called him Brother Sommer. Is it possible that me calling you Brother Sommer, or using your name in that book will besmirch the book or besmear it, or undignify it? I wonder why the man talks as he does.

Brother Sommer desists from calling me "brother," yet if I were to offer myself for membership in one of his congregations, and say that I am satisfied with my baptism. I guess he would call me "brother" then. He would even call a Baptist "brother" in that respect. But enough along that line for the present.

What he has said about the division of the Bible, law, history and prophesy, I have no objection to. The Bible contains them, and what he said with reference to the genealogy of Christ, that is all true, but when he undertakes to become authority on what part of the Bible shall be taught first, I am not going to accept him as authority on that question.

That is a statement wholly manufactured and brought forward by Brother Daniel Sommer, that there is a certain order in which the Bible must be taught. Teach the child first history, then law, then prophesy. Who gave you the authority to establish such an order, Brother Sommer?

Again he reasons, because that all people have ears to hear, and as little children have ears to hear, they ought to hear also. Certainly that is a fact, but didn't Paul tell the parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and do you have to go to the public assembly in order to teach your children that God made the moon and the sun, that the great character called the Good Man made all these things? Is there a father or mother here this evening that does not know that they should teach the child these things in the home, even if there never was such a thing as a Sunday School? Yet Brother Sommer builds, or tries to build, an argument upon that proposition.

Again he says that I do not care for God, man or the Devil, that all I desire is to gain a victory at any price. Now, that would make some men mad, but it just tickles me. I never was happier in my life. You couldn't call a man anything harder than that. Brother Sommer, claiming that I didn't have any regard for God, man or the Devil. Could you think of anything worse than that you could call me, and then if I happen to say, "Brother Sommer has fallen into an inconsistent predicament," he says I am

besmearing him, but he can tell the audience that I haven't regard for God, man or the Devil, and that is all right for him to say it.

I suppose Brother Sommer thinks if a man disputes what he says, it is almost equal to sinning against the Holy Ghost, but, my friends, I am here to contradict that which is not in harmony with the Bible, it matters not if Daniel Sommer, or any of his colleagues contradict it.

Again he said concerning the twenty-one items that he mentioned last night that I answered by saying it doesn't apply. Now, that was not my answer. The notes of this debate will show it was not my answer. I showed according to what he introduced about them, that he recognized they were without authority, and so was the Sunday School or class system as he calls it, without authority, and that because we did those things that we could not read a command for, that authorized him to do something else, he had no command for, thus incriminating himself with us. Then I showed that the most of those things that he mentioned were things we had to do in order to carry out the command where no special order was given for carrying out that command, but when it came to the question of teaching, God not only said how to teach, but gave the plan of how to teach in a public assembly, and I cited First Corinthians 14:31-35 as proof. That was my answer.

What he says about all women, and Paul says, your women, he tries to make a distinction here between your women and all women. Well, I am going to say this, my friends, Paul did not only have reference to the church at Corinth, because the previous verse says, "As in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silent," a general order, and when he commanded Timothy, who was an evangelist, what to teach the people, Timothy was to visit various churches all over the country and he gave him the same command which makes it of general application, Brother Sommer, and not confined to mean at Corinth.

During the last five minutes of my speech, I am going to bring up two authorities. Before I do that, I have another point or two to mention. The word women in the

Greek is from *gunakos*, the very word used in First Corinthians 14:35. He said I hadn't produced the testimony. Now I have the testimony at hand. Now I read, "Universally, a woman of any age, whether a virgin or married or a widow." There is your authority, Brother, Definition Number One.

I wish to call attention to another mistake that Brother Sommer has made: When I said the word *Lalein* in classical Greek sometimes did mean vain talking or babbling, but in New Testament Greek it had no such meaning, and he said I was mistaken about the word being *lalein*, that it was *lalintos*. I have the authority. Here is the approved Greek text as used by Wilson in the Emphatic Diaglot. If it isn't *lalein*—I would be glad to have you examine that.

I wanted to show the people that you were mistaken in what you said about it. I usually have the authority on hand when I quote an authority, to prove that I am quoting that authority correctly.

Now, what he said with reference to Abraham Lincoln and the bull, and who started this business, if anything is calculated to injure the looks or the appearance of your debate in book form, such an anecdote as that certainly will do it. But, my friends, I wish to mention the fact that, in discussing questions of this kind, that when a man has nothing better to offer he usually resorts to something like that. However, the point in hand was, who caused the division. He says that the instrumental music folks caused the division because they introduced the innovation.

Just so Brother Sommer and his brethren are the ones who commenced it, or caused a division by introducing the class system and women teachers in the assembly of God's people when they had been assembled to teach the Word of God. Then I claim to have taken everything in in his last speech away from him, not leaving him one thing upon which to stand. Even, my friends, I have engaged a little more in referring to the hard names and epithets that he has given me and my brethren than I like to, and shall not do this very much more. This shall settle the question so far as that is concerned, and I shall

only refer from now on to things that are germane and that are relevant and shall discard those irrelevant things that do not belong to the discussion.

This much stated, as my time is up, I desire to thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Affirmative): I just wish to know how much my friend knew about Greek. *Guna* is the word, and *ikos* added is the genitive form and he uses them all together as if they were the same verb.

I was going to read my Robinson on this question, but it doesn't make much difference about that.

Guna is the word. The *ikos* is the genitive form and that is put here to show that it is a feminine noun. Says, a woman of any age, whether a virgin, married or a widow Then, second, the wife; then goes on and tells of a betrothed woman, and then the stepmother and so on. My Robinson tells that it is generally a married woman, but I laid it up and didn't bring it. I don't know that it is worth while to go and get it.

I have some notes here, friends. When I started out in this debate, I said, if my opponent and I would come together and be in harmony, we must avoid three false assumptions: first, the false assumption that the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth does not need to be considered in order to impel us to the right conclusion.

And then the false assumption that whatever is not expressly allowed in Scripture is forbidden.

And then the false assumption that we may safely adopt a method of interpretation of law, so restricted that it will prevent full execution of such law as we all admit to be true and applicable; in one form or another, I stated that.

I knew very well that my opponent's position was on the common principle, that whatever is not allowed is forbidden. If it is not allowed in so many words, it is forbidden. That is the reason I mentioned the twenty-one items last night of things that he admits are allowed in the church that we admit, don't have any trouble on, none whatever, but they are not mentioned in so many words,

Now, when it comes to the twenty-second, classifica-

tion. why. there is trouble on hand. Why? Somebody objects. Well, who objects? Why, my opponent and his people, those who stand with him.

Now, somebody may come up and object, friends, to any one of these others at any time upon the very same principle. Where is the authority for calling a man for protracted meeting? Where is the authority for having this debate? Paul wrote against debates in the last chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians. Now, where is the trouble. Certain of his brethren have made a great deal of trouble over attitude and time of prayer, and one of them said, "If any man comes and says to your audience, Let us stand while we pray, send that man home." Tried to introduce all the difficulty they could on that subject. It is just the technicalities of certain individuals, friends, and a man who will admit as he has twenty-one items that are not any more definitely required and not any more generally spoken of, we may say. than this question of classifying, and just as soon as we come to the classifying he objects. And the conscientious objector here must be respected, it doesn't make any difference what befalls the congregation.

Now, there is the intolerance, there is the tyranny of this sort of procedure, don't you see? And there is the reason we are having this discussion because this man goes in this manner and so will the others who are of the same order, and consequently, the difficulties are introduced. Now, he will apologize for all of these others, and he will say, "We have them because they seem to be necessary in carrying out what the Lord has authorized."

Well, here the Lord has definitely authorized, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." He comes in and says, "Let the children hear at home, and the older women shall teach the younger women at home." Well, when he puts in "at home", he adds to the Word of God. I called his attention to that and it doesn't affect him a particle, that he is in opposition to the Word of God, that he has added to the Word of God. That doesn't affect him; that is the reason *I* made the speech I did. I didn't say he didn't care for God, man nor the devil. But I said he *seemed* not to care for God, man nor the devil, just so he

could break clown the speech I made, and how long did the speech stand—until I got hold of it, and then comes in more of the same method of speechifying.

Now, he won't say anything harsh about me, of course not, but says I was so confused and addled in the state of mind. Think of a man being confused and addled, and wouldn't say anything harmful of him' Oh, no, he wouldn't do anything of that kind! Now, the more you look at that, the more you see, friends, that is balderrash, like the man who read the passage and got mad because it condemned him, so with him. I don't think in the first place I would have called it madness. He said he didn't move more than six inches out of his place. I would like to know why I heard him in my left ear at one time and at other times over yonder, and you can judge whether he moved six inches or six feet. I will leave that; I won't discuss it, but as far as madness is concerned, I don't think I have shown any signs of it, but I have been a little emphatic a time or two.

Now, the ten dollar proposition. I never knew a man who offered money before the public who didn't slip away from it. He knows very well when he says we have a secretary that he is saying what isn't true. He knows very well when he says we have a collection, that it isn't true. If they have literature at Cloverdale that is the first place I have heard of in these parts, and I will not dispute it; he may have evidence on that subject. I will inquire about it and endeavor to make due correction.

Then he knows very well that they haven't any treasury. We don't have any extra treasury for the Bible classes though they have them at the Sunday School, and though they have the literature and they have the clerk and the treasury, four distinct officials, or rather two officials, and two distinct arrangements that we don't have. I claim truth, honor, justice causes him according to his proposition to owe me forty dollars, upon that principle, friends, and he can't get away from it.

He tells about the Apostolic Review. I am glad he gets hold of some of my writings occasionally for it sounds well. It is a relief. "No one to regulate." Of course, friends, somebody needs to regulate; an elder of the

church needs to regulate, but that doesn't make him an elected superintendent, nor an assistant superintendent, nor a clerk nor does it make him a treasurer. He is that because he is an official in the Church of Christ, and by reason of that he is doing what the church itself is required to do, namely, to have the truth taught young people, as well as old people, and all of this effort of his to make officials out of the elders of the church, Sunday School officials, friends, is simply that much of a strained effort, and the more he does of that, the worse it is for him and his report.

He said I made him glad a while ago because I made such a tremendous mistake. I have forgotten what it was. It makes me sad when he makes these mistakes because I have my doubts whether he is going to repent of them, and he is going to go before the Judgment Seat of God in reference to those mistakes, as he will in this question. It makes me sad.

I said in the beginning of this debate that it was a saddening occasion to me. We ought to be together. He is an evangelist; so am I. So we ought to think alike. So it is saddening to me to see that he is persisting on the wrong side of this question and is ruining himself, not only for the time, but for eternity.

Says the elder hears report from each of the classes. Never heard such a thing, never. Did you, in all your experiences, where they had these unorganized Bible classes? No, that is sure imagination. I say it seems to me like a man who would say anything, anything, anything whatever in order to make some kind of a break with reference to what I have said.

He says that had as much organization as any one of these sectarian Sunday Schools. I deny it plainly and simply deny it. He can't show it. He appeals to his imagination and tries to put the elders when they regulate the classes in the manner in which they do, in the place of Sunday School superintendents or assistants, that have been elected, and there is extra organization, extra officials, not mentioned in the New Testament.

As far as the unorganized Bible classes are concerned,

they don't have one single official that isn't mentioned in the New Testament, yet he says, we have as much organization as they. What are you going to do with that kind of a man? I think I know where the Lord places him.

"Talked about Dr. Trott and Mr. Harper." I think I described Harper. I don't think I mentioned his name.

"What book of parliamentary usage requires such behavior?" Why, that book of parliamentary usage which as old Brother Peter Schick said on one occasion, "That which would teach a man how to behave himself."

Such observations only serve to fill space and prejudice the audience. There he is imputing my motives. He . wouldn't say anything harmful about me. No, he is as mild and nice as he can be.

"Never can be united on the class system." Well, why not? Just simply because certain individuals have taken it into their heads that they are going to object to it, not because the Lord says, Ye shall not have the classes, nothing of that sort, but never can be united in regard to them because he and his brethren object to it. Let some other man come up and object to the baptistry, in a year or so we will have running water hobbyists around over the country. Then we can never be united if we have a baptistry, one man in a congregation of five hundred objects to a baptistry, and so on the principle of holding a protracted meeting.

There was a man in a certain church I could name who said, "I could preach to this congregation as well as any man you can get. What is the use of calling a preacher?" And he held the congregation back for years until brethren moved in sufficiently to overwhelm him and cause a different state of affairs.

Why, under those circumstances, friends, one individual can take up any kind of a notion that he sees fit to adopt, and simply paralyze a whole congregation, whether it is on the attitude of prayer or whatever it may be. This isn't an extra something brought in, no organization, but it is simply for the best advantage of those who are to be instructed..

"If you don't want an organ, stay away." That isn't

staying away from worship. The class system is with reference to the ten o'clock meeting. We generally meet at eleven for our worship. Between ten and eleven instead of staying at home and coming to the meeting house and talking politics, how much better it is to go in and form ourselves into classes and be taught by competent teachers on the principle, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

But my respondent would say, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear anywhere between ten and eleven o'clock; don't let him hear there anything more than the ordinary talk there may be in the community. The more you look at that the more you see the unreasonableness of it.

"Vain imagination," of his church not growing. "Might as well prepare yourself for it, Brother Sommer." Yes, I know exactly what they are intending to do. I got a letter the other day from Philadelphia. There was a man who brought his manager over at Philadelphia, and said, "I wonder are you the Brother Joynes that I became acquainted with some years ago, and I understand you are in favor of the Apostolic order of things, and I would like for you to make an appointment for Cowan. He is a power in the pulpit."

Yes, they are encroaching upon us to the utmost they possibly can, and their proposal is to divide, divide, divide every congregation they can not bring fully under their control. That is their purpose; it is a mission of division, and Paul says, "Mark them which cause divisions contrary to the doctrine you have learned, and avoid them."

Some years ago down in the South they had a congregation divided on the "I do" question. What is the matter with that? Certain brethren were making the confession by saying "I do." Now, if you didn't say that "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," just as the Ethiopian officer did certain ones thought you had not been properly baptized; and certain ones made their confession over again and were baptized again; and then came the running water question. Why, a man with a peculiar sort of temperament can find almost anything

to object to; even the attitude and time of prayer. Why not?

Well, he tried to ridicule me about the worldly wisdom. I will read what the Lord Jesus Christ said in Luke, show you how he endorsed what is said here. I will read in Luke 12:41: "And Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?"

"And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?"

"Blessed is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.

"Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath.

"But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the men servants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken;

"The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.

"And that sen ant which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes.

"But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

I have read from the beginning of the 41st verse of Luke 12, to the conclusion of the 48th.

Now, there the Saviour endorsed the common principle of justice among men. Worldly wisdom. The servant who knew his lord's will and prepared not himself shall be beaten with many stripes. To whomsoever much is given of him shall much be required; to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.

So if I am to be impeached because I commended

what is called worldly wisdom in regard to teaching, of course, that by implication, would impeach the Saviour because he commended worldly wisdom, and because he did say that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. The children of this generation know that they can't possibly get an education in secular things by putting all in one class. It is an utter impossibility, and, friends, upon that principle we may say it is an impossibility to be educated in the Bible by putting them all in one class. Just an impossibility.

There is the meat for those who are full of age, and there *is* the milk for the babes, and my respondent may speak as lightly as he sees fit of the difference between history, law and prophecy, but the more he does of that, and the fitness of this teaching for the different classes, why, the more he will damage himself before right-thinking people, I think I may safely say, in any community.

Teach the child first history, then law, then prophecy. Didn't Paul say that parents should teach their children? That reminds *me* of a certain church where there was a division and there was a man that had about a dozen children, and he was forbidden to teach them, because there was a racket stirred in the congregation to teach them in the congregation, and he said, "If I can't teach my children here as well as at home, I will have to go to some other place."

Now, there is a man who would teach his children at home, but they wouldn't let him teach in the congregation, not even let the man teach his own children in a special class, but he must go somewhere else. There is the idea, the intolerance of that kind of procedure.

He said I spoke as if objecting to something that I said was like sinning against the Holy Ghost. Well, as far as that is concerned, friends, the Saviour said something very severely along that line, severely along that line. It says, "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone." And if my opponent or will tell a he in this debate, besmirch the truth, he shall be in danger of the fire and brimstone; it doesn't matter which one it is.

I ask again, Why object to one or two of these items and yet admit so many more that are not definitely or directly authorized? Why do it? It is simply a technical reasoning; it is an objection, and I fear from what I have seen that the objection is based upon the difficulty that we don't want to be bothered with going to meeting at ten o'clock for the purpose of teaching these children, and we don't wish to be bothered in the afternoon by having any service of that kind. I fear it is upon that basis, in view of what I have heard, and I am not through with this subject, although this is my last speech upon the theme at this time.

Now, I am going to review this, friends. I have but one more affirmative proposition I have to present to you, and I am supposed to close this one with this speech. And afterwards, as I have been talking to my respondent about reducing the number to ten sessions instead of having the original twelve, two hours each, and if we can be united upon that, why, this will be my last speech on the subject, and I have but one more proposition that I wish to bring before you on the affirmative side, and that proposition I might as well now state.

I propose to affirm that my opponent and all who stand with him, from a Biblical viewpoint, are heretics, divisive characters, false teachers, and they fall under the heading that Paul refers to when he says, "Mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine you have learned and avoid them."

I intend to affirm that tonight and spend one night in discussing it, and if my respondent will agree—because our stenographer is going to leave us, and I have to bring in another if we continue to the original number of discussions—if we can agree on that, we will do so, and everything will be summed up, I think, here on Lord's Day afternoon. But he said he would give me a definite response to that this evening.

I make mention of that as my proposition for the accommodation of our stenographer, and then for our own good, in trying to have the same stenographer to do all the work for us on this occasion.

I thank you for your attention, and I will now give way to my respondent.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am going to refer to the last remarks of Brother Sommer relative to shortening the debate. He mentioned that question to me before we began this evening, and I told him I hadn't considered it, but I would, and give him a definite answer just before the beginning of the night session, I had not contemplated shortening the debate. Wait for my answer this evening.

He says the trouble with me and my people is that we do not want to be bothered to go to the meeting house at ten o'clock. Wonderful information, that. Brother Sommer and those who are identified with him can justly take this charge because he says one of the harms that the Sunday School does is that it causes the parents to feel that the responsibility of teaching their children is taken out of their hands, that they depend upon the Sunday School doing for them what the parent should do for them. You will find this in his tract on the Sunday School question. So Brother Sommer may send his children to the class study at ten o'clock and not have to be bothered with teaching his own children or going to church then either. So you must take that charge.

He said, All liars shall have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone, quoting from Revelations 21:8, which is true, and I think he would love to have called me a liar if it hadn't looked so ugly in him to do so, and by this I will be just like I was by the other things he called me; I will say it just makes me glad when men say all manner of evil against me falsely for Christ's sake. That is what I was glad about, Brother Sommer. Glad because I was able to undergo persecution in the name of Christ, and I am still glad.

He refers to a man that had a dozen children, who wanted to teach his own children in the congregation and somebody objected to it. Now, let's see how he could have done that according to Brother Sommer's plan. He said his objection to Sunday Schools was that the teachers had no authority over the learners. The parents should

teach their own children, and not the children of others. That is his position in his Sunday School tract. Here is a man who had one dozen children, and he says they may be arranged into classes according to age and ability. So this man would have had one dozen classes of his own family unless some of them had been twins, and only one father and one mother who had authority to teach them, so we have two teachers over twelve classes in the assembly.

Now, don't fall out with me, Brother Sommer. I am only quoting from your Sunday School tract as to who should be the teachers, and how they should be divided in order to be taught so you have got into a condition or predicament here that shows you up badly before the audience, and that is why Brother Sommer calls me names, etc.

He said concerning worldly wisdom that Christ commended worldly wisdom. Why did Brother Sommer introduce this? To prove that the class system is a worldly wisdom idea borrowed from the world, and therefore, right, because Christ commended worldly wisdom.

Then Paul condemned what Christ commended for he says. When you are gathered together in one place that one shall speak at a time and the rest judge. So we have Paul guided by the Holy Spirit contradicting the very thing that Christ commended, according to Brother Sommer.

What he has to say about the good confession, "I do," or other things that he mentions in his last speech, has nothing to do with this question. The twenty-one different things that he mentioned yesterday evening that he classed as being upon an equality with the class system, I explained that the most of them were things that we did in carrying out a command where God had not said how to carry out that command, but when God did say how to do a thing, we were hound to do that thing as God commanded. God did say for us to speak one at a time to avoid confusion in the congregation. Therefore, where God has legislated how it shall be done, we are not left to choose worldly wisdom to tell us how to do it.

This once and for all sinks Brother Sommer's conten-

tion beneath the wave of spiritual oblivion, never to rise again.

I shall just refer to the fact that he got a letter from Brother Joynes over at Philadelphia and say nothing more about that.

He says the Lord did not say we can not have the classes, and because the Lord has not said we can not have them, it is all right to have them. The Lord didn't say you can not baptize babies; therefore, it is all right to baptize babies. The Lord did not say you can not have music in the worship; therefore, it is all right to have music in the worship.

There is your argument, Brother Sommer. Methodist argument, Simon pure. But if he says we can not baptize babies because the Bible says baptize believers, if he says we can not have instrumental music because the Bible says sing, I say then we can not have the classes for the Bible says one speak at a time and the rest learn.

Now, I admit that I don't know very much, but I do know that you all can see that.

He failed to refer to the book of parliamentary usage that said a man should stand in one place and not move in a public address, and Brother Sommer complains at me about moving to one side and then to the other, and if he didn't move any more in his last speech than I have ever moved, I will leave it to the audience to say. Why is it wrong for me to move to one side and Brother Sommer can move to one side when he gets ready? I shall never say anything more about that proposition. That ends it so far as I am concerned.

He said the elder was not the elected superintendent of the classes. Well, I didn't say that he was elected. I don't care how he gets to be superintendent. He is superintendent just the same. Some men are elected to office and others are appointed to office. In this case, the elder is appointed to office, and then instead of the teachers being elected by their classes for that official position, the elder gives them their commission by appointment, and under the definition of the word "organization" you have a complete organization.

I don't know why Brother Sommer will not notice the

definition of the word, and try to explain how he can have the forming of classes without somebody to oversee it and conduct it and still not have an organization under the definition of the word. He ignores that. I will say this much, that if he should only have a part of the organized features of the Sunday School, which he has not denied, he has a part of the organization. If the whole organization of a Sunday School is wrong, a part of an organization of a Sunday School ought to be wrong. Is a whole wrong and a part right, Brother Sommer?

He could only find four imaginary differences, and I presume he admits that otherwise his class system is identical with the Sunday School, so it is part organization, Brother Sommer being the witness.

He wants to know about "at home;" the older women should teach their younger women, and Cowan says "at home," that I am adding to the Word of God. Well, I showed last night that Paul said they could not teach in the assembly. It is a shame for a woman to speak there. Then where else could she speak only in the position of a member of the home? That is the only other place.

He says, Where is the authority for this debate? Well, I have given that in the 15th chapter of Acts. And again he says that we are causing division because that we will not yield to the class system.

Then he refers to the posture in prayer, says some object to "stand to pray." Let me ask Brother Sommer if he would stand and pray if some of the brethren objected to that posture and keep on standing and praying until he divided the church over it? Would you, Brother Sommer? If you say no, and your class system is on an equality with standing and praying, then you will not keep on contending for the class system to the extent of dividing the church.

It seems like everything he says just plays right into my hands. I never had an easier time following an opponent in my life. Seems like it just fits right into what I wanted to say, and just as easy as getting money from home and not having to write for it.

Next he takes up Thayer and reads around over it a little and wishes he had Robinson, or some other book,

and finally just doesn't say anything about it. That's all. I read you the definition of that word, found in First Corinthians 14:135, that is translated in the common version women, and the definition is, universally, a woman of any age, whether married, single or a widow. When the expression is used in the revised version, it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church, that is indefinite, and means any woman, and here, my dear brother, is where I get my authority for your word *all*.

Now, let him grapple with it, or else dispute the revised version for being a correct translation, and if he disputes that translation, then let him grapple with the definition of the word as given by Thayer.

Again he says that the proposition, Whatsoever is not allowed in Scripture is prohibited, is a false position. I understand from his statement here that if the Bible does not say you shall not do a thing, that you are at liberty to do that thing. Therefore, the Bible does not say the husband shall not whip his wife, therefore, he is allowed to whip his wife, because the Bible does not disallow it in so many words.

But if he says the husband is told to love his wife and that prohibits whipping her, just so when the Bible says teach one by one, that prohibits more than one teaching at a time. So Brother Sommer is wrong, in laying down that proposition. He has gone away from that old slogan, "We speak where the Bible speaks, and we are silent when the Bible is silent." His motto is, Where the Bible speaks, I speak, and where the Bible is silent, I will also speak. There is Brother Sommer's position according to that rule he laid down in the beginning of the discussion and reread in the last speech.

Now, that completes his last speech. I am going to talk the remainder of my time concerning this imaginary distinction that is made between the so-called hour of worship and the class system of teaching. At eleven o'clock, that is usually designated the hour of worship, Brother Sommer and his brethren will say, no classes there, no women teachers there, but at some other hour, after we are through with that appointment which is the ford's appointment, we then have the privilege of teaching

in that way that seemeth best unto us, that God's wisdom said when the church assembles for worship that we must one speak at a time and have no women teachers. That is what the Lord's wisdom said was the way to teach in his meeting, but Brother Sommer can by worldly wisdom create another meeting in which he can teach in a better way, a more effective way, and thus be wiser in his method of teaching than the Lord was in putting a method into his divine worship for teaching.

I object to that arrogance that a man will possess and manifest that says, I can by worldly wisdom adopt a method of teaching an assembly that is better than that Paul laid down in the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, although I read in that chapter where Paul said, if you carry out these instructions, if one comes into your assembly that is unlearned or an unbeliever, he will be convinced of all, he will be judged of all, and he will fall down on his face and report that God is in you of a truth. So if the plan carried out by Paul and instructed to be carried out by the church at Corinth was a plan to reach the unbelievers and the unlearned, can we today by worldly wisdom, devise a better plan for reaching the hearing ears, than Paul described and commanded?

Again, let's look at this question from another viewpoint. Brother Sommer and his brethren, realizing that we can not have this division of classes at eleven o'clock, the hour of worship, as he calls it, because that is the Lord's business, and the Lord will not allow us to divide there and put women teachers there, but will go off over here another hour, either before or after that worship, usually before, and what the Lord would not let us do at his meeting, we will do it at our meeting anyway, and thus we will put one by the Lord.

Now, that doesn't look just right, does it? The Lord says, One speak at a time in my meeting. Well, there are a number of us that desire to speak at a time, and we will just leave the Lord's meeting or we will come in before the Lord's meeting, and we will have one of our own, and we will all talk if we want to at the same time, and some sister says, The Lord won't let me speak when his church meets to worship, but I am determined to speak in public,

and a brother will hear her plea, and especially some preachers that will cater to her desires, and they say, "All right, sister, while the Lord won't let you talk in his meeting, I will fix a meeting where you can talk, and you can talk all you please."

Beloved friends, does that look right? Is it right? Can you make up your minds to believe that it is right? I am quite sure that you can not.

Another thought I desire to present, beloved friends, is that when the Holy Spirit, that Jesus prayed the Father for and that the Father sent to his apostles in answer to that prayer, was to guide these apostles in the work of teaching all nations. All nations at that time certainly needed teaching, every one in the world except the immediate disciples of Christ were ignorant of the plan of salvation. The Holy Spirit is the guide to the apostles in doing that teaching.

Inasmuch as the Holy Spirit was infinite and would not select an inferior method or plan of doing the teaching, it certainly would be right for us to imitate the very plans adopted by the apostles as they were guided by that spirit. Then when you study the book of the Acts of the apostles, which is a history of these apostles' work under that guidance, you will find that in every instance where they taught an assembly of people, they taught it as an undivided assembly, not one exception to the rule in all their ministerial labors. If it had been a better plan to have divided their assemblies, certainly the Holy Spirit would have known it, and if the Holy Spirit did not know it and would not adopt that plan, that may be charged against the Holy Spirit. We would not do that. Therefore, we can conclude that the Holy Spirit guided them into the best possible method of carrying out the commission to teach, and seeing that they always taught their audiences in an undivided assembly, that must have been the best.

Suppose then that Brother Sommer and myself are commissioned to teach, and if we are here assembled, waiting for the Holy Spirit to come to us to guide us in the method of teaching, would the Holy Spirit guide us to use the same method that it guided the apostles to use? If it is the same Holy Spirit and we have got the same

message to deliver and the same classes of people to deliver it to, I claim the Holy Spirit would guide us now just like it did them then.

Therefore, in harmony with that belief, I teach all assemblies that I teach in an undivided assembly. Brother Sommer teaches many of the assemblies in the divided state with more than one teacher. Now, which one of us is guided by the Holy Spirit.

But I am not through with this argument yet. When the Holy Spirit said, "Go teach all nations," it also said, "baptizing them." Did the Holy Spirit say in that commission how to do the baptizing? No, but some one says, the Greek word *baptizo* will tell that. But what about the student that doesn't know the Greek? Now, I am talking for the benefit of that student. Would it be a good argument for me to say that the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles to baptize, but didn't say in plain English how to do that? Then I follow them in their ministry and I find Philip going down into the water and baptizing a man and then coming up out of the water. I say, would it be a good argument for me to teach this man that doesn't know the Greek, that is the way it is done, that the commission said, baptize, and didn't say how, but I find how the Holy Spirit guided men to do it; therefore, you must do it that way? But suppose some one says, Why not do it some other way? Would Brother Sommer submit to another way? Certainly not.

Then if that is a good argument, then, when the Holy Spirit said teach, and it didn't say how to teach in that place, and I go to where the Spirit directed these apostles to teach and see how they did teach, is it not just as safe for me to do it as if they did? And if Brother Sommer would not admit another way of baptizing, why should I be called upon to admit another way of teaching in an assembly?

I wish to say in conclusion, friends, that when these apostles taught audiences, that were all unbelievers, they did not divide them. When they taught audiences that were all believers, they did not divide them, see Acts, the 20th chapter. When they taught audiences that were composed of believers and unbelievers, they did not divide

them, see 14th chapter of First Corinthians. Then having the guidance of the Holy Spirit, over the apostles, and the methods they employed of teaching assemblies as my criterion, I can not go wrong, my friends, if I imitate these divine examples, commands, precepts and precedents that I find in the Word of God.

Then I say in conclusion that if you think more on your humanly devised class system, founded upon reason and human wisdom, than you do of the peace and unity and harmony among the people of God, you will stay in the class system; but if you love peace and harmony more than you love it, then you will discard the class system, and we will all unite upon those things for which we have both command and example in the Word of God.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Last Affirmative): Brother Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I address the one chairman because I haven't been told yet who is the other one and didn't know whether he had been chosen or not, so I say Brother Chairman.

Those of you who were present last evening recollect that my respondent offered ten dollars for each one of the differences that I could show between an organized Sunday School, on the one hand, and our unorganized Bible classes on the other.

I will state for the benefit of those who were not here this afternoon that I pointed out four specific differences between the two. One of them is that the unorganized Bible classes don't take up any collections; another is that they don't have any treasurer or treasury, and another is that they don't have any secretary to keep books in reference to the attendance of the school and the money matters, and the fourth is that they don't have any extra literature besides the Bible, and the hymnbook that the church has.

I made mention of these and claimed ten dollars for each one of these. My respondent thought I hadn't found those four differences. I believe I have, and I made mention to you for you to decide here tonight in your own

minds whether I can't justly claim ten dollars for each one of these items.

You understand that the organized Sunday School has an extra collection, has a treasury, has literature peculiar to itself, and then furthermore, has a clerk or a secretary to keep accounts so that they can make reports to the Sunday School conventions. I made mention of these and he said that over at Cloverdale they have the literature. I don't know anything about that, but if they have, I repudiate it; it doesn't belong to the unorganized Bible classes such as are common among the Churches of Christ that I am acquainted with, and that one case, if it really exists—I don't know whether it does or not; I haven't a word of testimony on the subject except what has been brought here, and I will inquire afterward, and what I wish to say is this: That I claim ten dollars for each one of these points and intend to keep on claiming these ten dollars to the close of this debate if they are not handed over. That is all on that subject.

Now, my special proposition under the general proposition for tonight is this: My opponent and all that stand with him are heretics when measured by the New Testament. Now, that is very saddening to me, to need to make a declaration of that sort, and there are those who may think, Well, he doesn't like us very well.

Now, don't be deceived. The Saviour said in Revelations 3:19: "As many as I love, I rebuke, and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent."

Certain people have the idea that if you love anybody, why, you must never rebuke anybody, and many parents have the idea that they love their children too, much to chasten them.

The Germans call that monkey love, because it is said of the mother monkey that they sometimes squeeze the life out of their baby monkeys by over-embracing, and when parents are so indulgent as to let their children go to ruin, and they say this is because they love them so much that they can't correct them, the Germans say that is monkey love, and I haven't criticized them for it.

I think I have seen children of that sort. So I haven't,

any monkey love, my friends, for you. I am not going to leave you be deceived if I can possibly undeceive you with reference to these questions, so I have this proposition. "My opponent and all that stand with him are heretics when measured by the New Testament." Of course, I don't mean to say they are heretics in every respect, not where they are right, but where they are wrong.

Now, you, of course, need to have the definition of heresy. I have a copy of the Greek New Testament here with a lexicon in the back part, and that tells me that *hiresis*, as we have it in the Greek, strictly means a choice, or option, hence a sect or faction by implication, discord, contention. That is the noun. *Hiretidsos*, the verb, is to choose, choose with delight or love. That fits exactly, choosing with delight a certain course, that will disturb the church. *Hiretikos*, that is the noun form also, referring to a person, one who creates or fosters factions, Titus 3:10.

We turn over to Titus 3:10, and there we read this: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject;

"Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."

Now, I turn and read Romans 16:17-18: (As I have them here in the common version.)

"Now, I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

"For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

Now, we will take that as the text with which we will start and I will begin to tell you what I found in the brotherhood that falls under this heading.

First I wish to tell the story of what occurred about twenty-five years ago in North Indianapolis. A little congregation there was meeting in a rented chapel. My eldest son was then about twenty years of age, and he had charge of a Bible class. There was another brother that had charge of the New Testament class of young folks,

and a sister in the back part of the house, that had charge of a company of little folks.

One Doctor J. C. Holloway came in and took his seat in the Bible class, took part, answered and asked questions, perhaps. Everything went on well until they came to the close of that session, and then they turned to the regular worship. My son still had charge. After introductory reading and prayer, maybe another song, he said, "Has any one a word of exhortation, anything to say that will contribute to the edification on this occasion?" or made some such speech, he gave a general invitation, and this Dr. Holloway, who was a preacher of some considerable ability, arose and said that he liked that kind of a meeting, "This is according to Scripture. I can't say so much about that other meeting you had a little while ago when several were talking at the same time. That leads to confusion," and he made a speech along that line. When he finished, my son said to him,

"Now Brother Holloway, you came in here and sat down and took part in our Bible class. Were you confused then?"

"No," he said.

He turned to Brother Lee Allen, who had charge of the young people that were ten or twelve years of age, perhaps, and he said, "Brother Allen, were you confused."

He said, "No."

"Sister Deehart, (that had charge of the little folks) were you confused when we were having this other arrangement?"

And she said, "No."

"Now, Brother Holloway, according to this testimony there was no confusion, we all modulated our voices in a respectful manner toward each other, and there was no confusion. Now, Brother Holloway, isn't it true, that when Paul wrote about confusion, he referred to several people addressing the same audience at the same time? You know that it is," and he hadn't a word to say with reference to different persons addressing different audiences.

"Now, I have one audience here; Brother Lee Allen

had another audience there; Sister Deehart had another audience in the hack part of the house, and consequently all that you have said about confusion resulting from different ones speaking in the same house at the same time is just simply misapplied, because only one was speaking to an audience at a time, each one had a separate audience."

Dr. Holloway, I am glad to say, according to the report that was given to me, didn't have anything more to say. But I will follow him a little farther. What did he do? Went down to St. Louis when a man by the name of Atkinson there had a church assembling in his own home, and he taught one class in one room, and his wife taught another class in another room in his own house, before the time or the hour came for worship, he had them to meet there so that they could be instructed by him in the one company, and his wife in the other.

Dr. Holloway came and spent a Lord's Day with them and he saw this going on, and when they had finished the introductory or rather the ten o'clock teaching, why, they were all called together then in one assembly, and they had Dr. Holloway preach to them. And what do you suppose he did? Preached against Bible classes, Bible classes, Bible classes, as if they were the greatest heresy on the face of the earth, took that occasion and denounced them, and the man Atkinson said to me afterwards in telling about it, "I have had trouble on hand here ever since."

Now, there is a fair specimen that I tell you about, my friends. That man could have selected any one of a dozen or two different themes that would have been edifying on that occasion and favorable for that congregation, but he was so full of this extreme notion that he struck at that little struggling company and the only company of Disciples meeting in St. Louis at that time, appealing for Apostolic simplicity. All the others had gone off after the innovations, but he must endeavor to strike that a death blow, if possible, when he had but one opportunity to preach there.

What became of Dr. Holloway? He endeavored to do all the harm that he could with us, started a paper; certain of you have seen copies of it, and when he broke down in his efforts at success in dividing churches of Christ, went and joined the Christian Church in Galesburg, Illinois, and lived there until his death.

Now, there is a fair sample, friends, of a man, though he had good ability, but he became full of those notions that are filling my respondent, and certain of his adherents, and that is the course he pursued.

Now, I proceed a little farther. Along about the year 1911 I was in Marietta, Ohio, in a Bible reading. Brother A. E. Harper, who is here tonight, was there with me, and he well recollects that there were three men whose names I will not mention, though I could. The peculiarity was that the surname in each case was a name of just three letters. Two of these men, at least, one of them, was connected with the church there—maybe two of them, but I am sure that one was, and the others were visitors there for the purpose of attending Bible reading.

They united for the purpose of confusing the reading. They plotted and planned, so I was told before I was thinking or suspecting anything of the kind, privately, "I will ask him that question; you ask him that question; if he answers such and such a way, somebody else will ask him such and such a question," and they were all technical questions along this line that I have been talking about.

I went on there day after day, night after night, and answered those questions. They were all old questions to me, because I had been called upon to go over that ground, and one brother came to me and said, "It is dreadful the way that certain ones are plotting and planning."

"What do you mean?"

"You will find out pretty soon."

And after a while, sure enough, it became so evident that the elders of the church became acquainted with it, and they instructed their home preacher to state to the audience that all of those technical questions should be asked in the daytime, meeting when only the maturer

brethren were there, and not to disturb the minds of the younger people with those questions that were beyond their understanding of the Bible.

The home preacher there made the announcement and just as soon as he made the announcement, I saw one of those men throw his Bible down, shove it off on the seat, and every interest that they had in that meeting was ended then and there. Brother Harper has told me since he came here that one of those men who was a member there, went to the elders of the Church and endeavored to get them to close the doors of the meeting house against that reading. It was held through the week there, but it wasn't possible to close the doors of the meeting house against that reading. They would not do it. They went on, and what was the result? All three of those men, I think I may safely say, within a week if not within two days, lost all interest in the reading and wouldn't come back any more.

If they could not make a success of their technical notions and could not close the house against the one who was leading the reading, why, they lost all interest in the matter. What were they intending or trying for? They fell under the heading of Paul's language of causing divisions and offences contrary, to the doctrine which Christ has authorized, and friends, what was the further result? Why, all three of those men were preachers. I learned afterwards that one of them was excluded from his home congregation because of his misbehavior. He went to a certain place where he was called on to preside at the table and he looked at the table and he said, "Brethren, what are you doing with these dishes on the table?" They had some plates to take the bread around. "What are you doing with these dishes? No Bible for them."

One of the elders arose and said, "Brother _____ (calling him by name), if you are not satisfied with the way we set the Lord's table, you may sit down." He did. The last I heard he was excluded from the church. I don't know what for.

The other one of them, the last I heard of him, was back in the honorable business of digging coal. I think

that was the place he should have stayed in the first place because that was honorable; going around and trying to divide churches was not honorable. I don't know what became of the other one. I haven't made it my business to find out.

There is the difference on the part of those individuals. They caused divisions on the part of the Church of Christ, and if they can't do that, they lose all interest.

I was at another place in the Bible reading. There was a brother there who showed some special interest. He attended and went on, and showed some degree of interest until we came to the New Testament. And when we came to the New Testament, I noticed a little difference in his manner, and when we came to the question of divorce, as set forth in Matthew's account of the gospel, Matthew 5th and 19th chapters, in both of which places we learn that there is a Scriptural cause for divorce, and, consequently, a Scriptural cause why a man divorced for that cause may marry again according to the just construction of the language. He didn't believe that.

What did he do but go into Mark's account of the gospel, where the Saviour didn't make the exception "except it be for fornication," where he didn't make the exception, and proposed to take Mark's record and break down Matthew's. When I saw the disposition on the part of that man, I said, "Brethren, I see that this needs to be considered" (maybe I said thrashed out, as the common expression is) "and I will take this right in hand now," and I turned attention to the fact that Matthew was the apostle and eye witness of Jesus Christ and Mark was not, Matthew, an inspired apostle who was a witness and Mark not a witness of much of the earthly life of the Lord Jesus Christ, but he was an inspired reporter like Luke was, and that we have two inspired apostles, Matthew and John, and two inspired reporters, as we may call them, judging from what Luke said, Mark and Luke."

Then I said in Matthew's account of the gospel, how many men filled with demons are mentioned in the latter part of Matthew 8? The brethren looked and they said two. Turn over to Mark, how many do you find? One.

"Now," said I, "Does the greater number include the less or is the less number or smaller number to include the greater, or so set aside the greater?"

Well, they, of course, said, the greater number includes the less. If there were two, why of course, there was one, some reason for Mark mentioning only one; maybe he was the chief speaker as we say, but be that as it may, we took the question of the Saviour riding into Jerusalem. According to Zachariah and Matthew he rode how many beasts of burden? The mother and the colt, and when that was brought out, I said, "What does Mark say?" "He mentions only one.

"Well," said I, "Shall we beat Matthew down according to Mark, or shall we consent that Matthew told the truth and included what Mark mentions?"

Well, with one accord, they said "Matthew's record is the more complete, and he is inspired apostle, and we will take him, and he and Zachariah agree."

I said, "On this divorce question, shall we take Mark's less complete record and use that to beat down Matthew's or use Matthew's to include Mark's."

And one other item I mentioned was in Romans 7th chapter. There, I said, was no mention made of divorce, but simply of life and death. That was taken away from him. He lost all interest in the reading and a brother told me since he never came but once more. There is a further indication, brethren, on this very question, and I will say in addition to what has already been stated: Paul is a pattern to us according to First Timothy, first chapter and 16th verse: "Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting."

Now, I would like to know where the Apostle Paul has ever set any example of that kind, where he has shown himself to be a pattern that whenever we can't have our own way, whether it is right or wrong, we will lose all interest in the Word of God that may be taught at some place, and go off and occupy ourselves with something else?

In Phil 4:9 we find this, The Apostle Paul wrote here after this manner, and this will be a good scripture for me to close with. He says: "Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you."

And after reading that, I will turn back to Ephesians 4, and read this: "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,

"With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing, one another in love;

"Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism,

"One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

Now, here is an exhortation for the oneness of God's people, upon what basis? The basis of the seven units that the apostle here mentions, and he says, "With lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace."

"Did those men that I have told you of, endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace, or were they bent in the direction of dividing the body of Christ to the utmost that they had the power to do so? That is the question for you to consider. If they divided according to their technical notions, they were engaged in the business of causing divisions in and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and that brings them under the condemnation of the Holy Spirit in its exhortations for the oneness of God's people.

I thank you, friends, for your attention. I trust you will listen with equal care to what my respondent may say.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: According to our agreement, and according to a statement published by Brother Sommer in

his paper of recent date, there were only three questions to be discussed in this debate. Brother Sommer has undertaken to bring in the fourth, and from the force and power of this last speech that he has made, I judge he might not have brought that in as for the effect it will have. However, I am going to allow him to have his way and follow him wherever he goes. If he had chosen to speak upon the divorce question, or have Christians a: right to vote, or any other question, I would have followed him. I don't want it said that I hindered him in the defense he is making for the congregations he represents. First, we shall notice the ten dollar proposition, as there are some here tonight that did not hear that today. I offered ten dollars for every point of difference in organization between the sectarian Sunday School and the class system that Brother Sommer advocates. He claims to have found four points of difference, and therefore, claims that I owe him forty dollars. I explained that this afternoon; we will take it up again this evening. The point of difference concerning the collection really is not a point of difference in organization. The matter of collection is what the organization does after being organized, and if they did not make a collection, it would not detract from the organization of the body meeting.

I trust you see that. Hence there comes off one ten dollars. I proved conclusively from Brother Sommer's paper that this class system had to have somebody to direct it and control it, which makes a superintendent so there he loses another ten dollars, and I referred him also to a congregation that did have the other points of difference that he tried to dissect from his Sunday School, and will be prepared before this debate closes to furnish him several other congregations within easy reach of here which have the literature and collection, and even elect superintendents, and congregations associated with Brother Sommer and his work, and that he is engaged to defend, so for these reasons I do not owe him ten dollars.

I have done everything that I knew how to do to get Brother Sommer to notice the definition of the word "organize" or "organization" and to see that his forming or arranging of classes is nothing more nor less than that

word means in all the dictionaries, but he will not. notice it, totally ignored everything I said about that, and still persists that he hasn't any organization.

I leave it to the minds and hearts of the audience and the readers of the book to take their dictionaries, turn to the word "organization," read the definition, and then the application to their class system is easily made.

His proposition under the general proposition as stated by him, if I have him noted correctly, says: "My opponent and all who stand with him are heretics when measured by the New Testament."

Well, if that proposition is so, we ought to know it. We thank Brother Sommer for undertaking to show us that we are heretics, and I trust that he would not fall out with me should I undertake to show him that he is an heretic, and would not say I was trying to besmirch or besmear him. (These terms are his, not mine.)

He refers also to the fact that whom the Lord loves he rebukes, and the father rebukes his son, and therefore, he is going to rebuke me and my brethren, referring then to something he calls monkey love, where the monkeys so dearly love their little ones that they hugged them to death, and that he does not propose to have that kind of love for us. Well, I am certainly glad to know that. We are certainly not inviting any hugs from you, Brother Sommer.

He next takes up the Greek word *heresis*, found about nine times in the New Testament, and in the 24th chapter of Acts Paul says, "After that way which they call heresy, so worship I God." So I will state this evening after that way that Brother Sommer calls heresy, I worship God, because there isn't one of the practices of the churches I represent but what Brother Sommer will endorse. He may say, "I do not endorse your objections to our practice." Certainly not, but our objections to your practice are not a part of our practice, and I challenge him to name one affirmative practice that we engage in that is heresy.

I desire to turn to the definition of that word in Thayer's Greek lexicon which gives practically the same definition as the abbreviated lexicon in the back of the Greek Testament from which we read, and we read the

following definition: "That which is chosen, a chosen course of thought and action. Hence one's chosen opinion, tenet, according to the context, an opinion varying from the true exposition of the Christian faith, heresy."

Again, under the definition of the word *heretikos*, we read: "Fitted or able to take or choose a thing, schismatic, factious, a follower of false doctrine." Titus 3:10.

From this definition we learn that a man is a heretic who chooses his own way of doing things, a choice strictly of his own, for a man that chooses to do what God says could not be called a heretic. Then a heretic is a man that chooses his own way, backed by his own wisdom or reason, and as Brother Sommer says that reason and worldly wisdom are the principles by which he establishes the class system, and as he says there is no command or precept or example for it in the Bible, therefore, the class system is a method of his own choosing and brands him as the heretic in this debate.

What need I say more, my friends, in refutation of the speech to which you have listened?

He next refers to Romans 16:17-18. I will notice that in some negative arguments I shall presently present.

He relates something about a congregation in North Indianapolis with which his son had something to do, some sister in the back of the house was teaching children, and relates quite a little story about that, and then refers to Dr. J. C. Holloway, and has a great deal to say about how ugly and un-Scripturally he acted.

The audience may not know that the man of whom he talks has been dead quite a long while, and if I must refer to the actions and conduct of a dead man that is not able to take care of himself in this life any more, I think my cause is desperately in need of some proof. This, together with the other incidents that he relates that come under his personal knowledge, has not one thing to do with proving that I am a heretic or that my brethren are heretics. I would not for a moment defend the practice of all who claim to stand identified with me individually, neither will Brother Sommer defend a character or a reputation of all who are in the congregations that he represents, but we are talking about the congregation as such; is it Scrip-

tural? Is its doctrine Scriptural? Is its practice Scriptural? Are its works Scriptural?

I might find as many men on the class system side of this question who have given trouble in congregations where they did not have any classes, where congregations were going along in peace and harmony until one of these advocates made his approach, first privately sowing seeds of discord among brethren, agitating the question of classes, until finally it burst out in open division in the congregation and then the same preacher go off and commit some ungodly crime, and of course, lost his reputation, and lay that to the charge of Brother Sommer and the congregations he represents, and I would only be treating him like he is treating me.

So, with these remarks relative to these experiences that he relates, I will pass them up and go to something else.

One thing he said with reference to the man who preached on the class system and caused division, and that was, could he not have chosen some other subject that would have edified those people rather than talk about their class system?

Yes, he could have chosen another subject. Suppose Brother Sommer goes into a congregation where they are playing the instruments and he sees that they are un-Scriptural in that practice and Brother Sommer gets up and condemns that very thing of playing instruments, and thus causes them to dislike him, would he not be doing just what the man did that he described? Couldn't you choose some other subject, Brother Sommer, to preach on besides instrumental music when you go into a digressing congregation, and let their musical instruments alone?

That is feeding him out of the same spoon that he was trying to feed me out of, and I mention these things to show you that there isn't one bit of argument in them.

He refers to First Timothy 1:16, where Paul said he was a pattern. I take Paul for a pattern, and I find when he went to Ephesus and found the church assembled there on the first day of the week that he went in and preached to them without dividing them into classes and appointing teachers over any of those classes, and if Paul

can visit churches and do that way, I will follow the pattern.

What you need to find, Brother Sommer, is where Paul divided any congregation into classes and allowed the women to teach some of those classes, and then you would have a pattern, and I would not object to you following the pattern. But in the absence of any such pattern given by the Apostle Paul, I must raise an objection to the practice.

Philippians 4:9, Paul says, "Of things heard, learned of things seen of me do, and the God of all patience shall be with you."

Now, whoever heard Paul instructing people to form the churches into classes? Whoever heard Paul instructing some of the sisters to teach those classes in the assembly. Whoever saw Paul do anything like that? Nobody. Then how can you claim him for your pattern when he never set: any such pattern?

Then his last passage in Ephesians 4:1-6, where Paul mentions the seven units, among those seven are the one body. I insist that we can be perfectly united in that body. I preach but one body. But when Brother Sommer organizes (or to use his word, forms) classes at an hour set apart from when the church, the one body, meets, he has established another body, and he divides people by the advocacy of two bodies. I stay with just the one body.

So I will take all of his passages away from him. I have replied to all the argument and much that is not argument in his speech, so I shall now take up some other arguments of a negative nature that I think are worthy for our consideration.

The first passage is the one I omitted a while ago, relative to Romans 16:17-18: Paul said to mark them which cause divisions among them and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them.

The divisions were caused about things that Paul had not taught them. Inasmuch as Paul had not taught them the class system of teaching, and inasmuch as he had forbidden it in First Corinthians 14:31-35, I can not see how that we could be charged with causing division about things that we had learned from the Apostle Paul. We

are only contending for the things that Paul advocated, and when Brother Sommer says you may have more than one speaking at a time and your women may speak in the congregation or in the assembly, he is the man that is causing divisions over things that he has not learned from the Apostle Paul, so the text is mine and is not his.

And we are told to avoid them. The word "avoid" is from the Greek *eklinete*, to turn away from, keep aloof from one's society, to shun one. Romans 16:17. Thayer. That is why, my friends, that we believe that the true disciples of the Lord should turn away from and have no fellowship with those who teach and advocate things they did not learn from the Apostle Paul.

That is dividing the church, I will admit, but as Brother Sommer said in his first speech, it is dividing it from the world, and we are commanded in the Bible to come out from among them and be separate, saith the *Lord*.

Again in Second John 9-11: "Whosoever transgresseth. and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." The word "transgress" is from the Greek *parabano*, "to go beyond"—Thayer.

The class method is not found in the doctrine of Christ, and all the class method advocates admit that it is not found there, and as Brother Sommer has admitted that there is no command or precept nor example for it, that human reason and worldly wisdom is authority for it, therefore, they go beyond the doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ, and have not God.

Well, what are we to do with such people as that? Hear the apostle, "receive not such a one into your house, neither bid him God speed,

"For he that bids him God Speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

So when Brother Sommer comes to us with a strange doctrine, one not found in the gospel of Jesus Christ, we are told 'to keep him out of our houses and to not bid him God speed. But if we give him the right hand of fellowship, if we welcome him as a member in good standing with our congregation, we are contributing to the evil that he is advocating, and become equally guilty with him

according to this passage. So it seems like the proposition has revolved around and now Brother Sommer is the heretic and I am the one that is offering him the rebuke because I love him.

Again we read in Colossians 2:21: "(Touch not; taste not; handle not:

"Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?"

"Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh."

The expression "will worship" means a self-devised worship. It is from the Greek words "ethelo theskea," defined "will worship, worship which one devises and prescribes for himself," Thayer, on Colossians 2:23, this very passage, we read.

Brother Sommer admits that the class method is not commanded, nor we have not the example for it, but that we act upon worldly wisdom and reason in order to bring it into existence. Therefore, it is a self-devised worship, a self-devised work, planned and instigated and formed by human wisdom, and Paul says we are not to touch it, taste nor handle it. Why? Because it is an unclean thing, and if we partake of it, we are going to perish with it.

Therefore, I admonish my brethren who are identified with that kind of work and worship that is called will worship, self-devised worship, to come out from among them and be separated, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing.

Again, if we stay with that kind of work and worship with that kind of a congregation, we are supporting with our means and endorsing with our presence that that we know is not found in the Scriptures. The class method can not be an act of faith because not found in the Word of God, and by the Word of God, faith comes. How can you, brother or sister, indulge in the work or else acquiesce in the work when it is not a matter of faith?

And you remember Paul says, Whatever is not of faith is sin, and if the Sunday School or class method is not of faith—and it isn't—therefore, it is bound to be a sin, and

if you participate in it, or even endorse with your presence and support with your money, that kind of an institution, you are committing sin, and I admonish you to turn away from it.

We read again Philippians 3:16, where Paul says we should all walk by the same rule. Paul laid down the rule of decency and order for public assemblies in the 14th chapter, First Corinthians. The word "transgress" means to go beyond. Those who go beyond the rule laid down by Paul are walking disorderly. Why? Because he said that all things be done decently and in order and just before that verse, he had described what is decency and order, for one to speak at a time and the women to keep silent, which he says is a commandment of God, and if you comply with that, you are walking orderly. To violate that command is to walk in disorder.

All right, here is Second Thessalonians 3:6: "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us."

What is the tradition not received of Paul? The class method of teaching an assembly is a tradition that did not come from Paul, but was born hundreds of years this side of Paul's day, and if you have that system, it is a tradition that did not come from the apostles, and the man that adopts it is walking disorderly and God's people are commanded to withdraw from them, and that is why we do it. It is separating the church from the world, that is all.

I like that motto, Brother Sommer, of separating the church from the world.

If I have time for another argument, I wish to give you one or two passages of Scripture. Second Peter 1:3: "According to his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. '

What is God's divine power? The gospel. All right, has the gospel furnished us with all things pertaining to life and godliness? Does the gospel furnish us with the class method of teaching? No. Therefore, it does not pertain to life and godliness. What does it pertain to? Death and ungodliness, of course. That is the only thing

it could pertain to. It is not an act of faith, not being found in the Word of God. It is evil, then, because when introduced it causes division among the people of God.

Thank you one and all.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Last affirmative on this subject) Brethren and Friends:
(As I said on a former occasion, I am a little informal in addressing you.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: arose, as you saw, with a smile on my face, because, just as I said on a former occasion, I was amused. My respondent put the worst construction that he possibly could on it, as some of you recollect, and said I was confused. He further said I was addled, and so on. But you can see whether or not I am confused on this subject.

I was amused because I thought of the time when my respondent in order to find reasons on the question of baptism for purpose and design of baptism, found design in so many places that he just played exactly into my hands, and he didn't have to go to Acts 2:38 to find design, but could find it anywhere else, so in this instance, my respondent has presented the Scriptures that he has taken hold of and has handled the arguments that I presented after a manner that he has committed suicide. He doesn't see it, doesn't understand it, but it is here. Take this last portion of Scripture pertaining to life and godliness. "The classes were not furnished by the Apostle Peter nor any other apostle, and therefore they do not pertain to life and godliness."

I laid before you twenty-one items which were not furnished by any Scripture, not furnished by any one of the apostles, in a former speech, and I showed that as they were not furnished, and we had to have them in order to carry on the teaching of the church, do the work of the church, they were under the heading that "all things be done unto edifying," and "let all things be done decently, and in order."

One of those was that we are not furnished with any authority to call a man to preach in a protracted meeting. Yet we called him. The Apostle Peter didn't furnish any example in that direction. He didn't furnish any

authority, any precept for a church calling a man for a protracted meeting. Therefore, according to his reasoning it does not pertain to life and godliness for all things are furnished that pertain to life and godliness, and the preacher, friends, is not furnished by the inspired apostles with any authority to go to a church unless he is invited.

I think we may safely say that because we are not of the inspired ones unless it is the church we ourselves have built up or established, we might find some example in that respect by the apostles visiting the church that they had established.

But now we come to a few others of the consideration: Where is it that the apostle advocated or in any wise set the example for giving an invitation, a formal invitation, for sinners to come forward? Where did he give the example or precept for taking a sinner by the hand and asking him about his faith in Christ?

Where is the example or precept for meeting upon the first day of the week to attend to the worship and having a man to preside at the Lord's table, somebody to take the bread and wine around, or anything else of the twenty-one items that I mentioned?

Now, his reasoning on this question implies that we had divine authority just simply for one meeting. That is upon the first day of the week, and that is the meeting, in which one is to speak at a time, and only one, and if anything is revealed to another, why that one must remain quiet who was speaking, and if a man there with the gift of tongues, he shouldn't speak if there was no interpreter. And more than that, in that same case we find the directions given to the inspired men there with reference to their wives, and said "your wives," and those inspired men who had had wives, why, their wives were to ask them afterward.

Now, we are bound up and down and in and under to the inspired men there and their wives, asking them questions. We can't get away from that. No authority for any other meeting. No authority for this protracted effort. No authority for this debate.

Paul said that he was afraid that he would find the Corinthian brethren in debates, and I spoke of that when

I first began my speech or my part of this discussion, that it was saddening to me to think that my respondent, claiming to be a member of the Church of Christ, and I, professing to be a member of the Church of Christ, should be engaged in a debate or meet here for that purpose. He says we have authority for the debate over in the 15th chapter of Acts. It isn't there. They had a consideration of it, but not one man set against another with a proposition. It was different ones speaking, and then one of the apostles made the final speech, and they decided upon a letter and sent it to the churches in order to settle that question of circumcision.

Now, I again say according to my opponent's reasoning, he is shut off, shut out, shut in, shut under, with a reference to everything except just one meeting and that is on the first day of the week for the purpose of breaking bread. He hasn't any authority for announcing a meeting even for Lord's Day night.

He said Paul went to Ephesus and stayed there and preached for them. I suppose he meant Troas, and he went there and set what example? Well, he preached to those people. As far as we know not another individual opened his mouth there at that time except the Apostle Paul. He was there and he preached to those people.

Now, according to that, when a man goes and preaches to a congregation, he hasn't any authority for calling upon any other individual or having any other individual to say one single word in that meeting. It is all in his hands for he is to follow the Apostle Paul. He is bound up and in and under as I said, to the apostle's example in that respect, and such being the case, you see that in his extreme desire to damage the position that I occupy, he commits suicide, just as he did when we were dealing with the first proposition, as I told you before.

He charged upon God and Christ that they were murderers because every killing of a human being in his estimation was murder. Now, when a man goes so far in his desire to sustain himself, and to break down an opponent that he will commit suicide, I will tell you what takes place. This undoubtedly, in the estimation of right-

thinking people takes place. It is the smoke of the priest that ascends instead of the smoke of the intended victim.

In this instance, I am the intended victim, and he proposes to break down whatever I may have said, doesn't make any difference what it may be. And I have thought that I might offer a considerable sum of money for somebody to give me one single declaration in any way, shape, form or fashion, that can be made that my opponent can not bemean or besmirch or break down in his method of reasoning. But you see, it is a method of reasoning that finally reverts upon himself, and does him the final harm, as will be seen when this debate will be published. It is the smoke of the priest that ascends in such a case instead of the smoke of the intended victim.

Where did Paul go around among the churches and divide them on such questions as he is talking about? We haven't been entering the division. We have been just simply carrying out the Scripture which says, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

My opponent would have him restricted, or have people restricted, children restricted, to hearing *at home*, not taught anywhere except in the home. There is an addition to the Word of God, and when I made mention of the older women teaching the younger women, as you recollect, the doctrine was *at home*. Well, at home would be a good place if you could get them together, and the meeting house at some hour not connected with the worship would be a good place, and there is authority for a teacher teaching a special class. There is the beginning of it, and where are they to be limited in regard to time and place?

I will turn to Titus and read that in order that you may have it before you, just as it is here recorded. I will begin to read with the first verse of Titus, second chapter, "But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine:

"That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience." Not a word said about them teaching, but listen: "The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things;" Something said of the women being teachers:

"That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,

"To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the Word of God be not blasphemed."

This is a special class of women to teach a special class of women, and there is the classifying indicated in the clearest possible manner.

My opponent says that it isn't given to us among the things that pertain to life and godliness, and therefore, it is heresy, and the one who advocates it is a heretic. Thus the Apostle Paul was a heretic because he advocated the special class business to be taught by a special class when he wrote to Titus, so Paul is a heretic according to my opponent's method of reasoning, don't you see, just as he made out God and Christ murderers in the first part of tin's debate.

Now, what confidence can you have in a man like that?

I again say, friends, that it is the smoke of the priest that ascends in this instance instead of the smoke of the intended victim.

Now, I turn a little farther, and read in First Timothy 1:5-13. Just listen and hear how the Apostle Paul directed that preacher of Christ to proceed with reference to this subject of teaching:

"Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:

"From which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling;

"Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.

"But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully;

"Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

"For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves

with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine."

There was the Apostle Paul giving this preacher instructions with reference to what he should do and how to proceed, and he left him at Ephesus for the purpose of instructing these people, that they should not live by any other doctrine. I read that as an example of the kind of principles that Paul gave to a preacher. Did he instruct or tell us at any time that he was bound up and down and in and under to the meeting on the first day of the week, and that was the only meeting that was divinely authorized? Did he do anything of that kind? No. But my respondent in order to magnify that 14th chapter of First Corinthians—I am not done with that yet; I calculate on the negative to show more closely than has been shown here yet, what that does mean, and does not mean. But my respondent has so emphasized that chapter that he hasn't authority for any other meeting, either on the Lord's Day or any other time, for the purpose of either worship or work bound up to that all together.

Well, such being the case, the inquiry arises, How long will a church live if it binds itself simply to that meeting and doesn't do or have any meeting for work as well as for worship? I read a little farther.

My respondent did not fairly represent me with reference to the case of Dr. Holloway. He said I "told about how ugly he acted." I told about the speech, and then when he was plainly shown that he had made a mistake, he acted the gentleman and kept quiet. I didn't say he acted ugly. My respondent, I don't think, would have kept quiet under those circumstances but he would have arisen and continued to speak on the subject and perhaps divided that congregation if it had been possible.

There was a man at Neosho, Missouri—I will not call his name; can't do that other man any harm; I mentioned his name, I wanted to let you know that I could mention names). The other evening because I read something here and didn't mention the name of the author, there was a reflection against me on that. Well, it was my

eldest son who had written the article, and I was modest with reference to my son having written anything that I regarded as worthy to be read on an occasion of this sort, so I didn't mention it. So there was a reflection. Now, because I mention another man's name, that is a reflection.

That reminds me of the man that had a door at each end of a box trap. Somebody asked why he put a door at each end, and he said, "To catch them coming and going."

So my respondent has that disposition. It doesn't make any difference what is said, he is bound to say something against it, and besmirch and bemean it some other way and goes to such extremes that he commits suicide before he gets through. There was a man in Missouri who lived a wicked man until he was over fifty years of age and then obeyed the gospel, got hold of some of the literature such as my respondent is disposed to endorse and send out, and he caught the idea of no classes. He came to Neosho, moving in from the country, where he had been merchandising at a certain crossroads there, and he found a goodly, flourishing congregation there with four or five classes, bright, intelligent people teaching the children between ten and eleven.

Now, he couldn't endure that. Well, they didn't wish to offend him and there were those who said, "Can't we, dispense with these," and after some discussion they set the classes aside. And they took him in there (he was a banker), and they made him an elder, and what was the result? When they tested him he showed he wasn't capable of teaching the congregation, and when they had given him a full, fair opportunity, and the congregation was dying under his hands, they decided they would introduce those classes again, and they did so and he left. The last I heard of him, he had left.

There is the idea, you see. It is the dictatorship. It doesn't make any difference how large a congregation is, it must submit to the dictatorship of this one individual. Paul's doctrine, forbearing one another in love, they seem just simply to despise, and that is the trouble, and there is the disposition of my respondent, and those that stand with him.

At Hammond, Illinois, there was a brother who had been in the Christian Church, and he became a member of the Church of Christ. He became so strict he leaned the other way and was so afraid of Sunday School he wouldn't have any Bible classes. I was there and I said, "Brother, you wouldn't object to one class."

"I don't know. If you have only one, maybe that will do," and he consented to one class, and I showed how different ages of pupils could be taught in that one class by putting the little ones in front and asking questions and if they couldn't answer, pass on back. I did well and there was a very excellent system. A brother first and then a sister took that class in hand, and after this old brother died they carried that class on, and I went there in a meeting and four or five out of the class obeyed the gospel, and yet there were the parents of these that obeyed the gospel still not wishing even that one class. When I said, "What is the trouble?" they said, "I think they had one class too many."

That is the disposition of these people—one class too many, because it was conducted between ten and eleven, and didn't interfere with the other part of the service!

At Rigdon, Indiana, there was one man, a very excellent man in many respects, who had seemingly questions in his mind on this subject, and a brother went to him and said, "See here, suppose we have a house here in which there are four rooms, and I have a class in this room, and that in another room, and that in another, and the question arises, we teach these in the different classes, don't you think that could be done in a private home, for instance?"

He said, "Well, I haven't any objection to that; between ten and eleven."

"Suppose we take the partitions out and still have these classes. Any objection to that?"

"Well, I don't know about it. Well, anyway, I don't want to see it in the meeting house, and through deference for him they kept the classes out of the meeting house, and that church has just barely had an existence for the last fifteen or twenty years. I went there and the most I could do in a week's preaching was to baptize one

individual, and others have gone there with the same result. They have just simply let the sectarians take away; the young people, and we can't reach the people.

At Hammond the children felt they would go somewhere and went to sectarian Sunday Schools, and after a while certain of the children went over there and joined the sectarian churches. That is the way these things go, friends.

I will make mention of this in conclusion. Over at LaMar, Colorado (this brother has recently been there), there was a brother active in the congregation and doing well, helping the brethren. He married a woman who was full of the ideas of my respondent. What did she do, but talk to her husband, talk and talk to him, until he stayed away from meeting.

They wished this brother, Brother Harper, to go there and talk to this man and he was reasonable. He said, "Now, you have this without any special command, and this other and this other; why do you object to the classes because you are not specially ordained or mentioned," and he was yielding. His wife came in and looked at Brother Harper, "I don't want you to talk to my husband."

Brother Harper said, "He hasn't said so."

"Well, but I don't want you to talk to him."

"But he hasn't said so."

"Well, but I say to you that I don't want you to talk to him." And she showed that she was the boss right there. That is the disposition now. Bossing her husband right there, a woman who didn't believe in a woman teaching, but when she came to her own home, took her husband away from the church and bossed him and said to Brother Harper, "I don't want you to talk to my husband."

"Well, but he hasn't said so."

"But I want you to go away."

This is the disposition. I say to you it is intolerant. It is the dictatorial disposition that we are talking about. There is the disposition that one individual will have a hundred or two or three or four or five hundred all to

bow to this one's particular notion, and that notion based upon the idea that there are no classes, when the Apostle Paul commanded Titus that the aged women should teach as a special class, should teach a special class of pupils, and that they could teach them what nobody else was fit to teach them because they had the experience.

There we have the classifying indicated. My opponent has thrown it all overboard and says, "Where is your authority for the classifying?" and because I have mentioned reason and because I have mentioned nature as authority for doing certain things, he endeavors to magnify that idea and say it is worldly wisdom, worldly wisdom, and the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, and that kind of talk he is giving you. Now, we will hear him once more on the negative and then he will be called upon to show himself on the affirmative, friends, through the remainder of this debate, and when the laboring oar gets into his hands, we will be able to see how far he can maintain himself with this extreme, extreme, extreme method, which results in committing suicide in the estimation of all those who are capable of seeing a man contradict himself.

Now, friends, I have engaged in this debate rather reluctantly and for several reasons: I will not make mention of them to you, now, but one of them was that my brethren here didn't want it. They have yielded with reference to this matter in a measure. I have felt much better than if they had not yielded. I kindly thank them for the disposition that they have shown, and I wish to thank you all for the very excellent behaviour that we have had here at this place, and my respondent has not interrupted me when I have spoken, and I have not interrupted him when he has been speaking, and thus far everything has moved along, I think, in a very dignified manner with the exceptions of what I have complained of heretofore. My respondent has used my name too frequently for my comfort, and I propose to show him by this proposition that we are now discussing that I regard him as a heretic and he has tried to make out **that I** am a heretic, and I trust

that he will not regard this heretic that he has endeavored to make me out as Brother Sommer any more. I am just simply his respondent, as he has been mine. I thank you for your attention.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Negative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will close this session of the debate in exactly thirty minutes.

I first will call your attention to the fact that Brother Sommer objects that I call him "brother." Hence to please him, I will refrain from as often as I can think of myself, but will still regard him as my erring brother all the time, in my mind.

I will next call attention to his statement that Paul commanded a special teacher and a special class. He says this justifies special teachers and special classes all going on at the same time. You change number on me there. I believe tonight I am a special teacher at this moment, and this audience is my special class. Yet that is a long ways from dividing this audience into groups in order to teach them. There is no proof there yet, but if this does serve my opponent for proof, then he has contradicted himself when he said that the wisdom of this world was wiser than the children of God because they would classify the congregations into groups and that God's people in olden times had not so classified themselves; that we have the right to use this worldly wisdom that shows that we are smarter than those that did not so divide their audiences, and if the apostles ever divided their audiences in order to teach them, he has never cited the passage that says so. I do not care how much you may have loved the practice, how long you may have been engaged in it, please lay that idea aside, and just look into the Bible to see if there is Bible authority for it. That is all I ask of any one to do.

He refers to one married woman that was so full of no-class ideas that she kept nagging at her husband until she got him to quit going to church, and when one undertook to talk to him, she forbade it, and that showed, my opponent says, that she was boss. I will change this with this kind of an illustration:

We refer to another woman that was so full of the

class idea that she kept nagging at her husband to take part in the classes until he quit going to church, and when a no-class man undertook to talk to him, she forbade him talking to her husband, so now you see, there is another woman boss, and I want to know what kind of proof you call that. That is feeding him out of the same spoon.

He talks about a certain place that had a house with four rooms and somebody objected to the manner of procedure, and they put it out, and the congregation has barely existed now for fifteen years, as if that would prove anything. There are many places where they have had the class system for longer than fifteen years, and they have totally died out with the system in vogue. I refer to a little place just west of Montezuma, Iowa, and Brother— my opponent is acquainted with that place where class preachers undertook to establish a class system, and did do it at the expense of peace and unity, causing two congregations, and the class congregation has died out long ago. They don't even meet for worship, and those who are opposed to the class system are still going along fine and growing stronger every day.

Now, I don't offer this as an argument, but showing you how I might turn such speech as he has made back on him and let him feel the force of it.

Now, you people can be the judge if or not I look like a man who has committed suicide. If a man who has committed suicide can handle his opponent like I am handling my opponent, what would a real live man do for him?

Again he refers to a place where there was one class with the little folk up in front and wanted to know if that would not be all right to teach them all in one class with the little folks in front. Yes, that would be all right, and I am going to prove by my opponent that it is all right from a tract written by him entitled, "Sectarianism," and on Page 55:

"In other words, the preachers of Christ, and all other public speakers in the church who are capable of so doing, should always adapt their discourses to their audiences, setting forth, as far as possible, such truths as each listener, should hear."

Then in this audience where there were little children

and older children and grown folk, my opponent says that they all may be taught in one class, and their preacher may deliver his discourse in a manner that every one who has "ears in that audience may hear and understand.

On Page 56 of the same tract we read:

"Therefore it may be safely said that a mixed audience calls for a mixed discourse on Lord's Day morning, *and at all other times.*"

Then in the name of reason, what is it? If my opponent teaches as this tract has been teaching, that the mixed audience should always be taught by a mixed sermon, then why classify that audience and then preach your mixed sermon to the classes?

So I just accept that as being good testimony, that preachers who preach the Gospel of Christ should address their audiences in a manner that every one present may get that truth that belongs to them, which can be done, and is done, without the classification.

He speaks about some man walking into a room where there were five or six classes being taught and he just could not endure it. Well, suppose my opponent steps into a ladies' aid society where they are reading and teaching the Bible to one another, he would say, "Ladies, I just can not endure it. You have no authority for forming this society. God will frown on you for doing it." Yet my opponent will turn around and countenance another one in equal rank and importance. Consistency, thou art a jewel. But where is it? Way down in Egypt, and ought to be brought up into America where my opponent could get a look at it.

In First Timothy 1:5-13, my opponent reads instructions given to Timothy, a young preacher, by Paul, and remarked that Paul did not bind him down to just one meeting on Lord's Day. Now, here is where my opponent has misrepresented me, not willingly, but he is mistaken about the position I occupy. I did not say that we were confined to one speaking and the women keeping silent, to one assembly, and this on Lord's Day at eleven o'clock, but my position is upon any day, when people assemble together in one place, that the same method of teaching should be employed as the Holy Spirit directed

the apostles to employ upon all days and in all places where they taught public audiences.

So I am sorry that I was misunderstood there. If you could find an audience of people divided into classes on Monday or Tuesday, day or night, I would accept that as good authority.

He talks about a man who had a double trap, and on being asked why he had two doors to it, he said because he wanted to catch the rabbits going and coming. He says I am the man who owns the trap. Well, I surely can not be the rabbit. Hence I have caught Brother Sommer, the rabbit, in the trap, even if I did have to commit suicide to do it, and as I am dead now, according to his position, and he is in the trap, how in the world is he ever going to get out of it? Nobody can get him out of it. That isn't debating, friends, but I am following him, and that is all I have to do in this last speech.

He said again that Paul advocated a special class and yet refers to the fact that the wisdom of the children of this world and human reason and nature were the principles upon which he founded his class system. Now, there is a contradiction there, sure.

Then he asked, Where is any one limited to the time and place to teach? Well, I will say that women are prohibited from teaching at some time and place, and that time and place is when the church has come together in one place. First Corinthians, 14th chapter. My opponent no doubt will become sick of that chapter if he is not already sick, but it is still there.

He then says he would love to see somebody or hear somebody make a statement or declaration of any kind that I could not break down. He seems to think that I am a terrible hand to break down the truth even. I am glad that he has recognized the fact that I have such power, if I have it, but the trouble with my opponent is, he has said so little in this debate that was the truth, that it was so easy for me to break it down, that he thinks that I could break everything down that a man would say. And what he said about the smoke of the priest going up instead of the victim—we will let that pass without notice; leave it to the audience whether I am smoking or not.

He wanted to know something about authority for calling a preacher in, invitation and invitation hymn, having a man preside at the table, and divine authority for one meeting only—(I will notice that)—debates, protracted meetings and preaching on Lord's Day night.

These are a few of the twenty-one items he has enumerated for which he claims we have no authority. It will be remembered that I referred to a number of these, not all of them, (did not think it necessary) and made this argument: That where God has given a command and has not given the method of carrying out that command, we are left to choose that method, and this covers about all he said, some things excepted, however.

When God gave the command to teach, he did not leave the method but only commanded us exactly how it should be done in a public assembly. Fourteenth chapter First Corinthians. Therefore, these things that we must supply where God has not supplied the method, are not at all on equal footing with teaching, because God has supplied the method in that instance. Now, I trust everybody can understand that. Hence his twenty-one items fail to serve his purpose, but as I have nothing else to do, this is the last point that I have noted that he talked about, I wish to call attention to a few of these twenty-one items in particular.

First, calling a preacher: I remember one time that Paul heard some one say, "Come over to Macedonia and help us." Was Paul a preacher? Yes. Was he called? Yes. Well, now, if you could find just that much authority for the Sunday School or class system, I would take it.

Then he wants to know where we have authority for the invitation. Revelations, the last chapter. "The Spirit says, Come; the bride says, Come. (The bride is the church.) And let him that heareth say, Come, and whosoever will, let him come and take the water of life freely."

In this passage we have the Spirit, we have the church, and the bystander who sees it is his duty to come; all saying, Come; here is your invitation, and inasmuch as that is the truth, and every time we sing, we ought to sing the truth, why could there be harm in singing the invitation?

If you can find that much authority for the class system, I would be glad to accept it.

Again, "for the debate," and he said there was no debate in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Now, it isn't pleasant for me to expose my opponent here, but I must do it. The truth demands that I do it.

Beginning with the first verse of the fifteenth chapter of Acts: "And certain men which came clown from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved.

"When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders, about this question."

Do you sec a debate there. I do. Some of those brethren were still contending that circumcision should be bound on the people, and further, follow them on to Jerusalem, and you will find that there had been much disputing before that question was settled in the church at Jerusalem. So my opponent is mistaken about saying there was no discussion or debate there. That settles that question.

Then he wants the authority for the protracted meeting. Philip went down to Samaria and preached Christ unto them. He stayed there many days, too, and many believed and obeyed the gospel. We find Paul began holding a protracted meeting in the School of Tyrannus in the lecture hall that he had gotten permission to use to preach in, and we find him again holding a protracted meeting of a year and six months' duration in the city of Rome. How many more cases do you want me to cite? If my opponent could cite that many or just one passage for his class system of teaching, this debate would never have been, or it would end immediately at the citation of such passage.

Now, you can certainly see, my friends, that his objections have *fallen flat to the ground*.

One more: He says where is authority for preaching on Lord's day night. Acts 20th chapter and 7th verse.

Paul met with the brethren there on the first day of the week and he preached unto them and continued his speech until midnight. Is that good authority? With all of these facts before us, my friends, who is it that looks to you like he had committed suicide?

That finishes his speech, and I wish to go over some other matters in this same connection for the benefit of those who have been hearing us in this debate, not new matter, but matter that has already been presented.

Do you remember what he said in his last speech about the definition of an heretic? And how he met the argument I made on the definition of that word, and didn't say a thing about it? Do you remember, too, my friends, when I quoted that passage that God's power has given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness? Inasmuch as God's power had not given us that power of teaching for which he contends, that it could not pertain to that, then he refers to these twenty-one items and says, God's power hasn't given us them. But we have seen it did give us a good many of them, and when God does give a command and doesn't give the method or condition of carrying out that plan, that command, then the methods we adopt for the carrying out of that, then they become a part of that command in that sense so they are authorized, but when you do a thing that is not essential to carrying out the command, like the classifying system, you are doing that for which you have no command, no precedent, no example, and more than that, your doing that divides the Church of Jesus and drives godly men and women out of the worship and not only that, but you are flatly contradicting a passage of Scripture that tells you to do it otherwise, which is the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

I wish to call your attention again to my opponent's tract written on the Sunday School question. My opponent has this objection to the Sunday School as maintained by others. "The teachers do not have authority over the classes in their teaching." Page 6.

On Page 24, we read: "If parents or other guardians wish to begin to do this private teaching, expounding in a meeting house by calling their children into little groups

or companies in different parts of the house, they are only carrying out what has been begun by the ones who did the public reading and expounding."

Here we conclude, my friends, that parents should teach their children only, and not the children of other parents because they have not authority over other children. Where is the congregation which maintains such practice? If there be no such congregation, then how can the church that my opponent is identified with be Scriptural in doctrine, work and worship?

Again on Page 23, my opponent argues that it is wrong for parents to commit the spiritual training of their children to others. We quote him thus: "If it was not for what is promised by the Sunday School, there would be multitudes of parents who would study the Bible until their heads would ache rather than commit the spiritual training of their children chiefly into the care of others."

I insist that the same objection can be brought against a Sunday morning class system. If parents did not think that their children would get the training and teaching there that they ought to have, they would study until their heads would ache in order to be able to teach, themselves, so the same objection brought by my opponent to the modern Sunday School, I also urge against his modern class method of teaching, and I say modern because it is modern. It isn't ancient.

One other reading that I have read before and then will close this reading and my time will be about up.

In my opponent's tract, Page 8: "I believe that we may do so with great advantage forming a separate class of each grade of learners, and in a certain sense privately explaining the lesson just considered in public."

Page 24: "Parents or guardians are to be teachers."

Page 6: "Others have not authority over these learners."

Therefore, my friends, we conclude that in a family of ten children, no two would be in the same grade unless (wins. Therefore, if they are separated into grades, there would be ten grades in this family to be taught in as many groups or grades and only the parents to teach ten classes.

So you see, my friends, that he has gotten himself into a terrible contradictory predicament. If he had not written this tract, maybe he could have made a better show, but when he wrote this tract, he was fighting sectarian Sunday Schools, not thinking that the same arguments could be brought against him.

In the remaining two minutes of my time, I shall talk to you about the advantages and beauties of the Lord's system of teaching. When you teach them all together, there are husbands in that congregation, and I need to teach them in their conduct daily toward their wives, and I want their wives to hear it, and when I speak to the wives in the audience, the husbands ought to hear it so they will understand the duties of wives to them. When I speak to children, their fathers ought to hear it, and mothers, so that they would know what to expect of their children. When I speak to the fathers and mothers, the children ought to hear it so they would understand what" to expect of fathers and mothers. In all of my preaching I have never found it necessary to take a bunch of learners off to one side because I was to teach them something that was not appropriate for other folks to hear. I never did like the preacher idea, of preaching special sermons to men, or special sermons to women, where men were not allowed to hear what the women were being taught.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. J. N. COWAN (**Affirmative** on the proposition, the difference between the war spirit and the Christian spirit):

Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: After having enjoyed some more of the good things of this life, and the protection and blessings of our Heavenly Father through another night, we are privileged to resume this debate. The general proposition I will not state:

"The church that I represent is in origin, name, doctrine, faith, practice, worship and work, authorized by Jesus Christ."

As has been explained before, there are many thing's that are common to us both that have been eliminated from

the discussion. We have agreed to discuss three leading or characteristic differences, namely, the war question, the class question, and the re-baptism question.

The debate having now shifted, throwing me into the affirmative, places the laboring oar in my hands. So following my opponent's order, while he was leading, I shall take up the war question first, and shall give this specific proposition under the general proposition: "The spirit of Christianity and the spirit of war are antagonistic, one to the other."

Before beginning my argument upon this proposition, I wish to state that war is becoming very unpopular in the public mind today. Every religions journal of any note, the secular journals, and periodicals all over the country are decrying war. People are talking peace all over the world, and as far as their minds have been able to reach, they have been reaching out for some plan by which war can be eliminated and peace reign. They have been trying to discover some way that wars can be averted and a settlement of disputes between nations brought about by a more sensible and mild means than to fight.

I wish to state, my friends, that war must be objectionable to the majority of people. When we see such a sentiment created against war, the majority of mankind must believe that it is something to be dreaded, something that should be averted, that men are created in the image of God should not have to give their lives to execute or prosecute war.

I will state further that war never did settle differences between nations. After a war has been prosecuted, and hundreds and thousands of lives have been sacrificed, before there can be peace, it must be brought about by a treaty. Then why not have the treaty first and avoid the war? War has never been the means of redressing wrongs or settling disputes between nations.

I am going to read this evening from a book I have, called *Popular Lectures and Addresses* by A. Campbell. I use this reading because it is the latest data that I have on the number of people killed and the amount of money in the execution of war.

On page 356; "From the results furnished the Peace

Society of Massachusetts, it appeared that after subtracting a number of petty wars, long since carried on, and those waged by Christian nations with tribes of savages, the wars of real magnitude amounted in all to 286. The origin of these wars on a severe analysis appeared to have been as follows:

- 22 for plunder and tribute
- 44 for extension of territory
- 24 for revenge or retaliation
- 6 for disputed boundaries
- 8 respecting points of honor or prerogative
- 6 for protection or extension of commerce
- 55 civil wars
- 41 about contested titles to crowns
- 30 under pretense of assisting allies
- 23 for mere jealousy of rival greatness
- 28 religious wars, including the Crusades,

not one for defense alone, and certainly not one that an enlightened Christian man could have given one cent for in a voluntary way, much less have volunteered his services or enlisted in its ranks."

"War is not now, nor was it ever, a process of justice. It never was a test of truth, a criterion of right. It is either a mere game of chance or a violent outrage of the strong upon the weak. Need we any other proof that a Christian people can in no way whatever countenance a war as a proper means of redressing wrongs or of deciding justice or settling controversies among nations?"

On Page 342, we read: "If with Dr. Dyke of Scotland, we should put down the slain victims to the minimum of fourteen billion, or with Burke of Ireland at the maximum of thirty-five billions, or take the mean of twenty-four billion five hundred million, what imagination could picture all the miseries and agonies inflicted upon the slain and upon their surviving relatives and friends?"

I will pause here long enough to state that since this address was made in 1848, that a dozen or more wars of real magnitude have been carried on. and mud) greater sums of money have been spent, and a larger number of lives have been lost. Without reading any more, this gives you a faint idea of the devastation, bloodshed,

cruelties and immoralities, that have been thrust upon the world on account of war.

I then ask the question, Has one Christian nation the right to wage war against another Christian nation? First, there is no such thing as a Christian nation in the strict sense of that term, but there are nations in which there are Christians. Then I will reduce the question to this form: Can Christians in one nation Scripturally kill Christians in another nation because of the fact that they are enlisted in opposing armies? If so, then God has authorized his people to kill one another, and we know the Bible teaches that they should love one another and that they should prefer one before the other.

There are two standpoints from which we might look at the word "right"—*political* right and *divine* right. Certainly no Christian would claim a divine right to kill anybody.

Then can we afford, as Christians, to violate God's command, "Thou shalt not kill," and kill people because of some political right that we may claim to possess? I answer no. What does the Bible say upon the subject of war? It should be our final authority. It commanded, authorized, war among the Jews. "He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Genesis 9:6. God gave authority to only one family or nation to wage war; the Jewish kingdom was a typical institution. It was prospective of a kingdom, not of this world. The enemies of Israel were typical of our enemies, and the judgment inflicted on their enemies are typical of the eternal judgment that shall be inflicted upon our enemies.

Therefore, we are forbidden by Scriptural right to go back to the wars that Israel conducted under divine warrant, and try to apply that to this age of the world, since the Lord Jesus Christ has received the scepter, and God Almighty has turned over to him all judgment and authority. Unless, then, we can produce a divine warrant for war from the Lord Jesus Christ, it would be nothing short of apostasy for us to go back under the old Jewish law to try to justify the practice of war.

The wars of the Jews were waged under special divine command or commission, therefore right. Where it, the

divine warrant from Christ, our ruler, to wage war? ' Whatever God did by Abraham, Jacob, or by any of his sons before he gave the scepter to Christ, is of no binding authority now. Matthew 28:19, Acts 2:36.

Has the author of our religion enacted war, or has he made it right for the subjects of his government to go to war with one another? Has he made it right for them to go to war against any nation, or for any national object at the bidding of the present existing political authorities of any nation in Christendom? I answer no.

The next point I will mention is, Can an individual morally do that in obedience to his government that he can not do in his own case? If it is wrong for him to kill in his own case, would it be right for him to kill if the government asked him to do this killing? Or should he say to his government, Our Lord forbids it, and we can not afford to submit to that which contradicts the will of our Lord?

In Romans 13:1, we are told to be subject unto the powers that be. So-called Christian nations claim the! same God, and Christians in all of these nations that are at war one with another, pray to God for victory, pray to the same God. Suppose that England and the United States are in war, and Christians in either of the two nations that recognize the same God, are praying to that God to give them victory, and they are both subject to the powers that be while they are righting for their respective countries. Which one of the prayers would the Lord answer, and how could they claim, my friends, to have authority from the same God to fight one another unless God was contradicting himself?

To illustrate: The government of Germany is as much ordained of God as that of our own country. German soldiers in the World War were as much carrying out the will of God in respect to submitting to the powers that be. as were the soldiers in the United States army. A Christian soldier (?) in Germany would be directed to obedience to the powers that be, to kill American Christian soldiers (?) that were obeying the powers that be over here, and hence, in order for both to carry out the will of God, both Christians would have to kill another Christian.

Now, something is badly wrong with a system that will accuse Jehovah of authorizing one Christian to kill another Christian and make it legal and neither party be guilty of killing. To farther illustrate: Should an American youth, who was a Christian, and his father and mother, both Christians, as well as brothers and sisters, move to England and become a citizen of England, and should a war occur between the two countries, if he enlisted in England's army, he would be obligated to kill his father, mother, brothers and sisters in the flesh, as well as in Christ. That would be honoring father and mother with a vengeance!

Christ instructs his disciples in two respects: First, their duties to him as their law giver and Saviour;

Second, their duties as respects civil government.

Under the first head he tells them if they were persecuted not to seek revenge. Under the second question, they were to pay their taxes for civil protection and if their citizen character is defrauded they may appeal to Caesar.

As respects the life of a soldier, they have no commandment; they were under the principles of peace. Here I desire to describe the armament that our Saviour gave to the disciples. For a helmet, the hope of salvation; for a breastplate, righteousness; for a shield, faith; for a girdle, truth; your feet shod with the preparations of the gospel, and for a weapon, the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God.

That is the equipment of a soldier for the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, can you imagine a soldier thus equipped going into carnal warfare with that armor on and righting in that army? To ask the question is to answer it.

We understand that this armor is not befitting a man who would be qualified to engage in carnal warfare. In the Sermon on the Mount we read, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." All the beatitudes are against war. See Matthew 5:1-12.

I will now quote a few passages from the Sermon on the Mount. "It was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, but I say he that is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment."

The Lord here refers to the law of Moses, which said, Thou shalt not kill, and gives us an additional cause that you are in danger if you have the spirit that will make you want to kill, and I am going to insist that no soldier can be of service in carnal warfare on the battlefield if he has no desire to kill. It takes the preaching of chaplains and all of the encouragement that they can muster up to go into battle and shoot down their fellow men. Wonderful peacemakers!

It was said in the Old Testament, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you that ye resist not evil." In war, wouldn't you be resisting evil? "But whosoever shall smite you on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. It has been said, Love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven."

"Ye can not serve two masters." The God of war is one master and the Prince of Peace is the other master. And you can not serve them both. I want to know if you would instruct a soldier who was upon the battlefield and ready for an engagement, *Love your enemy?* Do good to your enemy, overcome his evil with good; if he thirst, give him drink; if he hunger, feed him? Or is that a time that you would have to suspend the law of the Lord respecting loving your enemies?

I am going to tell you, friends, that the spirit of loving your enemies would take all the idea or thought of killing out of the mind of a man in the battle. Therefore, you do not hear such language quoted by the chaplain in the army. No commanding officer ever tells the soldiers before battle, Be careful now to love your enemies and render to no man evil for evil. That would be one place a man would get into, where the law of loving your enemy would have to be suspended, else that man would not fight. Hence, I claim that establishes my proposition.

I desire now to read a number of passages setting forth the spirit of Christianity. I shall give the passages first.

John 13:35: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

Ephesians 4:2-3: "With all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love;

"Desiring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

First Peter 3:8-9: "Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous:

"Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing; but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing."

First Thessalonians 5:13: "And to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. And be at peace among yourselves."

First Thessalonians 5:15: "See that none render evil for evil unto *any man*; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men."

Now, from these passages, my friends, we see that this loving one another is not confined to the church, but we are to love one another and also follow after that which is good among yourselves and to all men. I want to know if you think it is good to another man to take your rifle and shoot his brains out.

First Corinthians 7:15: "—But God! hath called us to peace."

Second Corinthians 13:11: "—Live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

Are you living in peace when you are living in war?

First Timothy 6:11: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness."

Titus 3:1-3: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work,

"To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, *shewing all meekness unto all men*.

"For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another."

From this passage, my friends, we see the spirit of war manifested on the one hand, and the spirit of Christ on the other. Those who live in malice and envy are those soldiers who have been taught and educated up to the point that we must hate Germans; we must hate the German army; we must hate the German soldiers; we must hate the German Kaiser, and if you get a chance, kill them outright. There is the spirit of war, but, my friends, the spirit of Christ says, Do good to all men; love your enemies.

Colossians 3:8: "But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth."

I want to know what would become of fighting armies should you eliminate anger, wrath and malice from the heart of every soldier. There would never be a gun fired in battle if these principles were eliminated. I must insist if war can be carried on according to the will of God, that you would have to eliminate these truths, that would be one time they would not be appropriate, and this part of God's law would have to be suspended for the time being; until they got through fighting.

Ephesians 4:31: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice."

Romans 12:19-21: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

"Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head."

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." _

This passage, my friends, puts an eternal veto upon war. I am going to state, my friends, that in my next speech I shall take up another line of argument concerning the prophetic peaceful nature of the law of Christ, but let me here mention the spirit of war in just a few terms: Hatred, wrath, strife, sedition, envy, murder, drunkenness, revelings, and such like. Galatians 5:20-21. A

spirit of hate and revenge is cultivated in the heart of every soldier, and because of that spirit of revenge and hate for the enemies, the people whom they have trained their guns to kill and upon whom their batteries are directed are killed because the spirit of hate and malice and envy are in the hearts of the one that is firing the gun. For that reason I must say my proposition is established by a thus saith the Lord.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: My opponent has learned a little something since this debate commenced, judging from his speech. But I am now going to make an arraignment of him based upon his former speeches on the negative first, and then on the speech that he has just made.

My first charge against my opponent is that he is not a man of his word on the money question. You may not be able to judge of the value of his arguments in other respects, but you can judge on the money question. In order to indicate that he is not owing me forty dollars, he has adopted a method of reasoning which is to this effect: that if a father will say to his son, Go do thus and so, and to another one, Do thus and so, and if a mother will say to her daughter, Go do thus and so, they have formed an extra organization right in their family. That is the force of his reasoning, in order to avoid being a man of his word on the money question.

I told him I would keep on mentioning that, so as to let him know who and what he is, and if he isn't a man of his word on the money question, then you know how such men are generally estimated. How much can we rely on what he says in any other department, that is, when he is speaking of himself and for himself?

Second, my second charge against my opponent is that he was guilty of blasphemy or something of that order by declaring that all killing is murder. That was in his former speech. I think he has modified a little on that.

Now, blasphemy, friends, is misrepresenting the Deity.

I could read the Greek on the subject if necessary, but we have the statement in the New Testament that when certain ones misrepresented the Holy Spirit, why, they were charged with blasphemy, thus misrepresenting God is blasphemy, and when he misrepresented God in regard to killing, that that was murder, why, he was guilty of blasphemy or something very closely related to blasphemy.

Third", my third charge against my opponent is that he was guilty of blasphemy by what he said of war being legalized murder, the Most High ordained wars, and here I am reminded that he has told you that we are not to take the wars of ancient times. But the God of heaven then ruled in the kingdoms of men. He rules in the kingdoms of men now, and we found when we were dealing with this question that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah is a warrior, and that he sent forth to destroy the nations.

Fourth, my fourth charge is that he was guilty of blasphemy or something of that order by implying that the Prophet Samuel was a murderer when he hewed King Agag to pieces in the Old Testament; also that the Prophet

Elijah was a murderer when he had 450 Baal's prophets killed there near Mount Carmel.

Fifth, I charge that my opponent was guilty of blasphemy when he implied that the Lord Jesus Christ was a murderer when he killed Ananias and his wife for lying also when he killed King Herod for receiving honor due only to God.

Now, he wants to know whether the war is authorized or the killing is authorized since Jesus took the throne. Well, all of that is answered by the fact that Jesus Christ after taking the throne, killed Ananias and his wife for lying, and killed Herod for receiving honor due only to God.

Sixth, I charge that my opponent was guilty of blasphemy when he, by implication, charged Michael, the archangel, and the angels that fought with him against the devil, charged them with doing wrong when they fought against the devil and his angels.

I here read in Revelation 12, a few verses, beginning with the seventh verse; "And there was war in heaven;

Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels,

"And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.

"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

That is sufficient to indicate, friends, that war began in heaven, and while I have this in hand, I will read in Revelation 19, what will take place hereafter, beginning with the 11th verse: "And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he shall judge and make war."

Now, you see that what he has said against Christ having anything to do with war is a misrepresentation, to say the least. The word "balderdash" came into my mind, and I think it is applicable.

"His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but himself.

"And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God.

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.

"And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.*"

I have read from the beginning of the eleventh verse to the close of the sixteenth.

Seventh, I next charge that my opponent has been guilty of sacrilege when he ignored the distinction that the inspired David made in First Kings 2:5 between the blood of war and the blood of peace, for after I had read that distinction, he went on declaring that all killing is murder.

Eighth, I further charge that my opponent was guilty of sacrilege when he ignored all that I offered from the

Old Testament by declaring that what is found in the Old Testament concerning war has no bearing on *us* in the Gospel age, though in Romans, 13th chapter, we find that Christians are reminded of their relations to civil government. He has already referred to that chapter.

Ninth, I next charge that my opponent was guilty of sacrilege or something on that order when he read Matthew 5:21-22, and said it was against war when it was and is only against a person taking personal vengeance and cherishing anger.

Tenth, I charge that my opponent has misrepresented the spirit of soldiers generally for hatred in war is artificial, in most instances. Do I need to indicate? I learned in Missouri some years ago in the time of the war between the North and South, as much as the southern ladies hated what they called the northern Yankees, and I heard bitterness of speech during the war from certain of them, yet there was a Yankee boy sick of the typhoid fever with soldiers that were camped on their father's farm, and their father appealed to them if they were civilized they would bring that boy in and nurse him through the typhoid fever and save his life. They went out and looked at him and brought him in and took care of him, and when he was nursed back to life, he asked them, "What do I owe you ladies? I owe you my life. What can I do for you?"

They said, "Never take up arms again against the South."

He said, "I am under age. I can get out. I will comply with your request."

At Gettysburg, a soldier who was there that I baptized in the state of Ohio, told me he was wounded in the foot, and when the home guards were gathering up the wounded men or the prisoners, why, they took him and tried to make him walk, one of those prodding him with a bayonet. There was a federal officer that passed by. He saluted him and said, "I am wounded in the foot, sir, and here is a soldier, a guard, that is prodding me with a bayonet in order to make me walk, and I can't do it." And with some very emphatic language the officer said to that guard, "You are nothing but a home guard, anyway, and don't know how to treat a soldier. Send for an ambulance."

Southern soldier, yes; prisoner, and as soon as he was wounded, why, he was ready to take care of him, and, friends, they have been known throughout the war to stint themselves in regard to water for a wounded enemy. So the hatred of war is artificial and it is because the leaders in it have made a demand upon the common people. I would like to make a longer speech on that, but my time will not permit.

Eleventh, I charge that my opponent misrepresented me by charging me with encouraging a man to volunteer for war. Never did that, and explicitly stated that I had said in the *Review* in the course of the war when it was dangerous for a man to express himself, that I would not enlist and wouldn't advise anybody else to enlist because that would mean an individual selection of himself, but when the government would draft me and put me in the army, I would say my responsibility on this question is at an end, and certain of you recollect that he endeavored to ridicule that. "The way for a man to get rid of his responsibility is to go into the war." That is the way he spoke of that.

Twelfth, I further charge that my opponent is the one who misrepresented the divine record concerning Cornelius when he said that Cornelius quit the army after his baptism. He is adding to the Word of God. The Apostle Peter did not, according to the silence of the Scripture, say a word to him about quitting the army. More than that, think of the splendid character that Cornelius had before God previous to his baptism.

I will turn and read Acts, tenth chapter, beginning with the first verse: "There was a certain man in Caesarea, called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band,

"A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway.

"He saw in a vision evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius.

"And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and

said, What is it, Lord? And he said unto him, Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." Told him where to send for a preacher. He has ignored the splendid character that Cornelius had after the gospel age commenced before his baptism.

Thirteenth, I further charge my opponent with making light of the sacred text concerning the red horse and his rider, mentioned in Revelation 6th chapter, when he said the red horse does not represent Christians, and thus tried to dispose of that part of the divine record. The white horse and his rider were sent out with a bow, and the crown, but not the missile of death, indicating the mission of truth in all ages, to control people without hurting them, and the red horse and his rider were sent out to take peace from the earth, a great sword was given to him, and that people should kill one another, and the Lord Jesus Christ sent them both forth, according to the Revelation that is made in the sixth chapter of the last book of the Bible.

So you see the Lord Jesus Christ was responsible for all that the red horse and his rider would do because he sent them forth, that they should kill one another, and such being the case, all of this talk about Christ after having ascended the throne not having anything to do with war is more misrepresentation.

Fourteenth, I further charge my opponent with ignoring what he said in Revelation 19:12-16 which I brought before the audience in my first speech concerning Christ as a warrior, and I turned and read it a while ago, all of which will indicate to anybody that will pause to reflect that my opponent is strictly and emphatically wrong when he represents Christ as not having anything to do with war.

Fifteenth, I further charge my opponent with the crime of both blasphemy or sacrilege, or some such offense, when he said in his second speech on the negative of this question, "If there ever was a time for war it was when the mob came against the Saviour." But Jesus said, "How then can the Scripture be fulfilled?" He could have prayed for more than twelve legions of angels to fight for

him, but how then shall the Scripture be fulfilled? He came to fulfill the Scripture, and war in his behalf would have prevented Christ from being put into the hands of the Jews, being taken by them before the Roman authorities, prevented him from being' condemned and prevented him from working our salvation by his blood. And yet my respondent said that if there ever was a time for war, why, that was the time.

My friends, I repeat that he was guilty of the crime of blasphemy and sacrilege when he made that speech with reference to Christ that if there ever was a time for war, why, that was the time, and represented me as one that would say, Why not fight? I wrote down here, "This was horrible."

Sixteenth, I charge also that my opponent was guilty of a subterfuge when he said in his second speech on the negative of this subject that he did not have any authority to send a man to hell. I refer to Matthew 10:28 where the Saviour said, "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

He can't send anybody to hell except himself. He might betray those who would follow him in his wrong course and lead them to hell, but as for killing a man, there is nothing in that to send a man to hell if he had been obedient previous to his death.

Seventeenth, I charge my opponent with setting himself in direct opposition to God when he declared in his second speech on the negative that capital punishment is wrong. He said it. Today he admits the Lord said if a man sheds blood, by man shall his blood be shed, but wished to get it back on the other side of the gospel age to such an extent that we can't use it now. I suppose he would say that it died "out with the Jewish law there under the gospel. That capital punishment arrangement was made several hundred years before the Jewish law was introduced. It was given to the man Noah just after the flood. "He that sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood he shed." Why? Because in the image of God created he him.

In other words, the man bears the image of God, and whoever makes a deadly assault upon one of his fellow mortals he makes a deadly assault upon a being bearing God's image, and when he does this, he is guilty of so insulting God that the God of Heaven said long before the Jewish law was given, that man shall die, and man shall kill him. Could anything be plainer than that?

Eighteenth, I charge by opponent with gross perversion of truth when he referred in his second speech on the negative to the case of the Prophet Daniel and his three friends. The worship of those men was in question. The same was true of the Apostle Peter when he said we ought to obey God rather than men. When the king demanded that the Hebrew children should bow down to his image and they defied the king, they were thrust into the fiery furnace, and it wasn't a question of war, and when the man Daniel was instructed that he should not offer any prayer to any God or man for thirty days except the king, why, the Prophet Daniel defied the king, and he was put into the den of lions. And when the Apostle Peter said we ought to obey God rather than men, it was a question of when his duty to God as a religious servant was in question. And all of this talks that he has been guilty of along that line, and would mislead, mislead, mislead you, dear disciples, if he possibly could on this question, why, all of this talk you see is strictly wrong, to say the least.

Nineteenth, I charge my opponent with misusing the passages when he said, "Thou *shalt* not kill, and Thou shalt not commit adultery." They are both in the Old Testament, and they still apply. In Leviticus 20:10, God declared that the adulterer and adulteress should both be put to death. So that there was capital punishment not only for killing, but for the crime of adultery. His reference to that as found in James was exceedingly unfortunate.

Twentieth, my opponent was guilty of a subterfuge when he stated that for the first three centuries primitive Christians did not engage in war. This means that Cornelius went out of the army, and that in course of the ten persecutions of primitive Christians, they were called upon

to go into the war of their enemies, which isn't true. They were under persecution a large proportion of the time, friends, and I don't believe that any of the authorities regarded them as fit to go into their armies.

But I have never examined the special statements on that question so I will not go any farther on the subject. Besides in course of the first three centuries of the gospel age, nearly all the heresies arose that laid the foundation for the Roman Catholic Church. That means that the first three centuries of the gospel era was an unfortunate domain for him to secure testimony from.

Twenty-one, I charge my opponent with making a mistake in saying war never did settle differences. It is about the only means by which to settle differences when men become wrong-headed and want to fight.

Nothing under the shining sun would have stopped the kaiser except the war that compelled him to stop.

He says there must be a council afterwards. Yes. There was the Revolutionary War. We had a George on this side and there was a George on the other side of the Atlantic and these two Georges were put against each other and our George won. And after the George on the other side had been defeated, he was ready for a council. But you couldn't cause him to be ready for the British Parliament to consent to a council until after the Battle of Yorktown. That is the only way you can teach certain people anything.

I charge that he made a mistake in what he read from Campbell. Campbell said war was never for justice. What were we fighting for in the Revolutionary War, but for justice? Campbell didn't know what he was talking about, and that was after the Revolutionary War long enough for him to understand, but he was a rhetorician, friends, and not a logician.

Twenty-third, I charge God has authorized people to kill one another. He says I charge that they did that in the Jewish age, and that he is the same God. He is the same God. God gave authority to only one nation to wage war. There is where he was wrong again. He meant the Jewish nation.

We turn to Isaiah, tenth chapter, and there we find that he gave charge to the Babylonians to come against Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian kingdom to come against the Jewish nation and overthrow it.

Twenty-fifth, I charge that my opponent was wrong when he said we must have a warrant for war from Christ. Well we have it indirectly in Romans, 13th chapter, which tells us to submit to the powers that *be*.

Twenty-sixth, I charge he was wrong in saying (I come now, of course, to the last speech) that we can't do as individuals what we can't do as nations. Now, that is unquestionably a mistake because we are called upon to obey the nations that are over us, or the civil governments that are over us.

I charge that when he said, "Whose prayers would the Lord answer that were offered by Christians on one side and Christians on the other?" Well, if they offer prayers, Lord, give us victory, and don't do as Joab did, that wouldn't be a Scriptural prayer on either side. See Second Samuel. I turn back here and I find that Joab, David's chief, came with his brother, Abishai, and went into war with the Syrians, on the one hand, and against another nation here, the children of Ammon, and he said, "Be of good courage," speaking to his brother, "and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God: and the Lord do that which seemeth him good."

Now, friends, that is the kind of a prayer to offer. That is the kind of a prayer that I have offered with reference to this debate, that truth and righteousness might prevail. The Lord doest that which seemeth him good, and let the people on both sides pray that kind of a prayer, and it will be in harmony with the Saviour who said, "Not my will but thine be done."

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I believe Brother Sommer would make a right good debater if he had about a week to study on a man's speech before he replied to it. Instead of replying to the speech that I made this afternoon he

read notes that he had gotten up since his affirmative on that question and since he heard my negatives, and of course, filled in his time pretty well, and now if he hasn't enough notes to carry him through, we might expect to hear about some more of I as experience in his next speech or else re-read those notes.

The first thing I will mention is, what Joab did and what was done by the Babylonians, and in fact all of the killings and wars under the Jewish dispensation or under the patriarchal dispensation do not apply to us today, and I showed if Brother Sommer—if my opponent had been debating with a musical instrument man, that when this advocate of music went back to the law to justify the practice, Brother Sommer would have said, "Hold on there, we mustn't go back there; that is not in force now," but when he comes to debating with me on the war question, he seems to get all the proof he has from the Old Testament Scriptures and God's dealings with the Jews. I am willing for that to go before the world just as it is.

He says Campbell didn't know what he was talking about. He is a rhetorician and not a logician, but when he can quote Campbell in such tracts as "An Unfortunate Man Exposed," he quotes him pretty copiously when he can make Campbell fit his idea, but if Campbell doesn't happen to fit what my opponent thinks, he doesn't know anything. My opponent is to be the judge and the jury and the whole court on any testimony that is offered. He says that war is the only way to teach some people and he describes the kind of people that ought to be taught. He says when men become so long-headed—

MR. SOMMER: Excuse me, wrong-headed.

MR. COWAN: When men become so wrong-headed that they can not settle disputes any other way, then fight. I wonder if Christians can afford to become wrong-headed in order to fight. Now, haven't you fixed it I told you the spirit of war was antagonistic to the spirit of Christ, and now my opponent has said that war belongs to those who have wrong heads. Might as well sing the doxology because that establishes my proposition. And now all that Brother Sommer has begun his objections with in the way

of words such as blasphemy, and other words that he applies to me, I shall pay no respect to them. As many times as I have shown him to be opposed to statements in God's word, I have never stopped to say you are a blasphemer or anything of that kind. That looks ugly in debaters, to use that kind of language, and I don't use it. That's all.

Brother Sommer, just call me anything you want to call me. If you want to call me a liar, blasphemer, ignoramus, murderer or perjurer, just go ahead and call me that. I will take it. There is one thing maybe you had; better not call me. If you should happen to call me an advocate of carnal war or Sunday School man, I might jump on you, but these other things you might call me if you wish to. (Of course, you all will pardon levity.)

He said the first three centuries was an unfortunate domain for me to go to find how Christians did. Well, I always thought the nearer the fountain head of a stream that you would go the more pure you would find the water, but it seems my opponent thinks if you get right close to the fountain head the water is liable to be more corrupt. That is an unfortunate domain to find water. That is the reasoning he gives us. He knows very well that every historian that writes of the first three centuries and especially the first and second centuries, say that Christians did not engage in carnal war, and that is why he is trying to muddy the water a little before I bring that authority before the audience.

What he said in reference to killing and adultery as quoted by me from James did not meet my argument there. The same verse that said it was wrong to kill said it was wrong to commit adultery. If we may get into that position where we can kill without being responsible, then why not get into that position where we could commit adultery and not be responsible? What is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander! That was my argument, and that is what he has not met.

Concerning Daniel and the three Hebrew children, he says that was a personal matter, and had respect to their' religion. Just so today when we are asked by our govern-

ment to take up arms and kill our fellow man, that is contrary to our religion and we have as much right to deny ourselves the privilege of warfare as Daniel did to deny worshipping a false God, or the three Hebrew children. But according to my opponent, Daniel could easily have clone what he was commanded to do. The law came from the powers that be, from King Darius, "You must not worship any other God for thirty days." They conscripted Daniel or drafted him under that law. He could have entered into the worship of that king and lost his responsibility.

The three Hebrew children were asked by the civil authorities to worship the image the king made, and they certainly were drafted, and they tried to compel them to worship. They could have reasoned like my opponent, "Well, if I do that, since they have drafted me, and are trying to force me to do it, I will just go ahead, and worship that image, and because I will lose my responsibility God will not hold me responsible for it."

There is the matter of my opponent's argument when reduced to its last analysis.

Matthew 10:28 where the Saviour said, "Fear not him that is able to kill the body, but can not kill the soul, but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Here we learn, my friends, that God Almighty is the one to visit punishment and to take vengeance on the disobedient. That is why the Book said, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. That is my passage, not my opponent's.

But in connection with this he said that I could not send anybody to hell. I didn't say I could send them to hell, but if I were to take my gun and kill a sinner, one that is not prepared to die, he would go to hell, wouldn't he?

Honest, now, my opponent, don't you believe if I would kill a sinner while he sins, his life then being ended, he never having obeyed the gospel, that he would go to hell? And if there be a place of torture between this and the final place of that man, he would be in flames, tortured, like the rich man. while Lazarus, was in the

Lord's bosom, and I have killed him, and he was unconverted, therefore he was in hell.

Then every time we shoot down a German, an Englishman, a Frenchman in carnal warfare, unless that German or Frenchman is a Christian and ready to die, we are the cause, indirectly of every one of them being in hell today and suffering the tortures like the rich man was suffering. My opponent can not get around that. Whenever you take a man's life you cut off every opportunity that he would ever have to get right with God. Do you think that is right, ladies and gentlemen? You that have immortal souls to save, suppose that you have a boy, and that he is not a Christian, he hasn't obeyed the gospel. He is drafted into the army and carried over into a foreign battle field and there shot down by a German bullet. Do you think that is all right? All, you know it isn't.

Well, turn it around. What about your boy who is a Christian killing that German over there who is not a Christian and fixing him to where he never could be one? Fixing him up for a crime that has no end, eternity is its meets and bounds. Now, when you can persuade yourself to believe that that is right, you may believe most any old thing.

Following my opponent closely, he says that the Lord Jesus Christ had to fulfill Scripture, and that is why he did not call on the twelve legions of angels to come and help him out. Well, suppose that was the reason, although Christ didn't state that was the reason. His reason was, My kingdom is not of this world, therefore, my servants won't fight. That is the Lord's reason, and to teach the disciples that lesson he said, He that hath not a sword let him sell his garment and buy one, and the disciples said, Here are two swords, and he said, That is enough. Two swords for eleven men; was that enough? Not for carnal warfare, but he had enough swords to serve his purpose, and to teach the lesson once and for all that the servants of Jesus Christ, the citizens of his kingdom should not fight, and *I* believe it is right for me to abide by his decision.

He said I made light of the red horse. No, I don't

think I made light of the red horse, but I did contend that the red horse represented the spirit of persecution that arose along with the spirit of peace, represented by the white horse. Now, my opponent has both horses sent by the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord sent the red horse to destroy the peace that he made. Now, you fixed it.

A man that has had the experience and Bible reading and opportunity that my opponent has, and then accuse the Lord Jesus Christ of destroying the very peace that he made himself. It is bad enough for the enemy to destroy peace and take it from the earth, much less to charge the Lord Jesus Christ with destroying the very peace that is brought by the white horse. Now, if I were a mind to, I could say that is blasphemy, but I will not say it.

Cornelius: He says Cowan did not notice what a splendid character he had been before his baptism. Certainly I have noticed that, but what has that to do with this question? He wasn't a Christian. My opponent wouldn't say he was a Christian before his baptism. What we are looking for is what he did after he became a Christian. Lots of men have splendid characters who are not Christians. We don't deny that, but when my opponent says he remained in the Roman army and continued to prosecute war, he says that which the Bible does not say, and of course, adds to the Word of God by implication, and he says that is one way you can add to it.

He says, I don't advise anybody to enlist or volunteer, but if they are drafted, to go. Now, my opponent, why is it, if war is right, if the spirit of war is the spirit of Christ, why is it not right to volunteer to do what the Lord's spirit says to do, or are you going to wait to be forced to do what the spirit of Christ leads you to do? Now that is a just conclusion arrived at.

He says, I wouldn't advise them to enlist, "no, don't volunteer, but if you are drafted, go." Yet he says the spirit of war is not contrary to the spirit of Christ. Then he is advising folks not to volunteer to submit to the spirit of Christ, but if you are drafted, then, of course you will have to submit to the spirit of Christ, and then you will lose your responsibility. Worse and worse!

Now, it is easy to do that when you have the truth on your side.

He refers to hate in war being artificial. If the hate in the soldier's heart is artificial hate, and would cause him to kill five hundred of the enemy, I wonder what real hate would cause him to do. All, that won't do. Who authorized my opponent to call it artificial hate? In fact, my friends, I don't believe that artificial hate is in harmony with the spirit of Christ, and to make the spirit of war and the spirit of Christ harmonious, my opponent will have to say the artificial hate in the soldier's heart is in perfect harmony with the spirit of Christ, so that ruins his position again.

Romans, 13th chapter: "Submit to the powers that be." Certainly we are to submit to the powers that be, and wives must submit to their husbands. The same apostle said so. But suppose the husband asked the wife to do something contrary to the will of God, must she submit then? Oh, 110, that would be an exception. If the powers that be asked me to kill a man and I know the law of God asked me not to kill, I say, "Excuse me, government, I can not do it." If they force me, I still submit; they can do what they please with me. I am as submissive as I can be. If they send me to penitentiary for not going to war, I can't help it. I just submit, and if you will read enough of that passage in Romans 13th, you would find the conclusion of the thought is, "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord."

All he said about First Kings 2:5, and all other Old Testament examples, I have already answered.

Then he goes to Revelation again where the Lord was to be a judge and make war, Revelation 19:11. He says no doubt this is literal, carnal war, that Jesus Christ is charged with making carnal warfare. Then if he is, he is *particeps criminis* to every war that has ever been waged in the world's history. There can not be a war unless there are two opposing factions, and Jesus Christ being the one who made the war, he must be the one who created the faction that caused the disturbance, Talk about blasphemy *I*

But he certainly does know that Revelation is a book

of symbols because in this very passage, the 19th chapter, he read too far—"the vesture of the Lord was dipped in blood, and out of his mouth a sharp sword."

I suppose the Lord Jesus Christ literally had a literal robe dipped in blood and a literal sword sticking out of his mouth. Now, that is the kind of reasoning and Scriptural exegesis that my opponent would have you believe. If this sharp sword is a spiritual sword, and not a literal sword, then the Bible interpretation that says, If one part of the passage is literal it is all literal, and if one part is symbolic, then it is all symbolic, then the war is symbolic, and not a literal and carnal war at all.

So I may say with all the passages he has introduced in Revelation. He says that Christ was the lion in the land of Judah and that meant Christ was a warrior. Of course, Christ is a warrior but it is a Scriptural warfare he is conducting, and the warfare about which he expounds is not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of the stronghold.

I welcome all these passages, but they don't teach what my opponent says they do, and that is why we are having this discussion.

He speaks again about legalized murder. I want to know if a man is killed, and the one who killed him has hate in his heart at the time he kills him, if that is murder? And he has done admitted that the soldier has artificial hate in his heart when he kills a man. Then, if it is legal for him to kill a man because of hate in his heart, if that doesn't make it murder, I would love for you to tell me what the word murder means.

So carnal warfare is nothing short of legalized murder in the Christian dispensation because it is antagonistic to that principle, "Love your enemies," and "do evil to no man;" "pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."

I wonder how many soldiers ever went into a battle praying for the other side. Not one, of course.

What he has said about the money question, if he will promise to bring that up again when I get on the class question—I will just omit that for the present, and you will have an opportunity to do it, my opponent. We are

not discussing the class question this evening, and we shall not be led away from war now.

We shall next read some prophecies concerning the prophetic peaceful nature of the Lord's kingdom. Isaiah 2:2-4: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

"And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

"O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord.

"Therefore, thou hast forsaken thy people, the house of Jacob, "

From this passage, my friends, we learn that when the Lord's house, which is his church to be established, and Jesus Christ shall begin to reign, that his servants shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; in other words, destroy their weapons of carnal warfare, but if the spirit of war ever was in harmony with the spirit of this age, then they would have need to keep their swords and their spears in order to obey the mandates of the spirit of Christ. But here is a prophecy that says you must beat your swords into plowshares and your spears into pruning hooks, destroy your weapons of warfare for they shall not learn or, I will say, study war any more. That prophecy is enough, my friends, to settle the entire question.

I shall read Isaiah 11:6-9: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fading together; and a little child shall lead them.

"And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

"And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

From this passage, my friends, we learn that they shall not hurt or destroy in all the holy mountain. I will not have time to read another prophecy, so I shall spend the remaining minutes of my time enlarging upon these two prophecies.

First, we have here predicted a set of principles that were to obtain in the Christian dispensation. I claim that the spirit of these principles will eliminate war if imbibed and put into practice. If the set of principles herein announced by the prophet to be fulfilled in this age, will not eliminate war, are we to still look for a set of principles .. that will do it. Are we to look for another Gospel or another set of principles in the future that will extirpate war? Certainly not. Then if the principles of Christianity that are believed and practiced by Christians would eliminate war, then, of course, the spirit of Christianity is opposed to war. That is as clear as a demonstration.

Let my opponent tell you if people would imbibe and practice the principles of Christianity, would that exterminate war? He is bound to say yes. Well, if it will, then the principles of Christianity which is the spirit of Christianity in another form, are diametrically opposed to war, and hence my proposition is proven beyond all question of a doubt.

In conclusion, then, beloved friends, do not forget that in my other speech I introduced a number of passages setting forth the spirit of Christianity, and that they were all opposed to war, that my opponent did not refer to a single one of them in his last speech. Not one was referred to. He has passed them all over and has preferred to read from some notes that he had taken two or three clays ago.

Maybe a week after the debate is over, he will be prepared to reply to this speech and the one I made before this speech this afternoon.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Yes, I will bring up that money question at a later date, and further show that my opponent is not a man of his word on the money question.

But I thought I would reply first to what my opponent said last, that I did not notice certain Scriptures that he presented that have peace in them. I know every one of them referred to how it should be with us in the church, writing to churches, to Christians an individuals, and to churches, telling them how to behave themselves, and thus that my opponent and myself should not have debates, Paul was afraid he would find debates among the Corinthians, so he especially used the word according to the common version, and it didn't refer to our relationship to the kingdom of this world. That is all an effort, you know, to draw your attention away from what is really in the subject and what is before us.

More than that, the Saviour said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" then he stopped. The remainder of the passage is "Else would my servants fight." If his servants were citizens of this world. We are citizens of this world and can't get away from it. We may act the coward; we may vote and vote so as to bring on a war, vote for a man that will introduce a war, and then play the coward. Pay taxes, yes, to uphold everything pertaining to the war, everything pertaining to the making of ammunition, working in factories for wages, make ammunition, as many of you did who were opposed to war. Work for money and then play the coward when it comes to the fighting part. That is the kind of Christians he is talking about.

I wrote, Why has not my opponent defined his proposition? He has said Christianity; hasn't said what Christianity is. The spirit of Christianity embraces all so-called Christendom, embraces the Catholic Church and all the Protestant and denominations. That is Christianity.

He doesn't mean Christianity in that sense; he ought to have defined it. That word came into existence after the New Testament church had departed very largely from the primitive faith.

Having said that much as it recurred to mind, I now turn back to the place where I left off reading.

I charge that he made a mistake when he used what Paul wrote of Christians. What he wrote with reference to Christians pertained to them individually and collectively in the church, the Christian's armor. Put on the whole armor of God that you may be able to stand, fight against the will of the Devil.

Why, friends, that referred to us in our spiritual warfare, and doesn't touch the question of us as citizens of the kingdom of this world. Can't you all see that? The Scripture touches the question and gives the connecting link with reference to being citizens of this world, when the apostle in the 13th chapter of Romans said, "Obey the powers that be," or submit to the powers that be.

My respondent said a while ago that was all summed up in the verse, "Avenge not yourselves, neither give place unto wrath; Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

As we have talked considerable about the 13th chapter of Romans, perhaps I would better turn and read a little so that this talk may be understood by the audience.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God;" What power does he mean? Civil government. It is of God, the arrangement called civil government. My respondent, I suppose, would think that it is of the Devil.

"For there is no power but of God: The powers that be are ordained of God."
(That refers to civil governments.)

"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God:" Why hasn't he read that? "For they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

Now, you play the coward, will you, when your government calls to you to do something, and you receive damnation,

It says, "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

"For he (referring to the officers of the civil power) is the minister of God to thee for good." (Could anything be more definite?) "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God (now, listen) a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

This just simply annuls all the balderdash that my respondent has given to you on this subject. A revenger, just like the man under the Old Testament that was appointed was the avenger of blood to kill the fellow that had committed murder.

"Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

"For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: (refers to the collectors of tribute) for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

"Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

MR. COWAN: You didn't read it all..

MR. SOMMER: Didn't read it all?

MR. COWAN: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves—"

MR. SOMMER: That is in the preceding chapters. You said it was summed up in this.

Now, you see very clearly, friends, how this matter

stands. This opponent of mine is a misleader. I don't mean to say he is deliberate, that he is intentional. I wouldn't impeach his motives. No. Just as soon as I saw my respondent, I saw that he had a nervous eye, phrenologically, large perceptives, big memory. He has shown that; I didn't miss it. His reflectives of comparison not near as large as his perceptives, or his memories. That is his constitutional make-up. I didn't venture to put my hand on his head, but I saw what Nature had done for him, given him a higher degree of firmness and self-

esteem than he had reverence, and then I glanced over the side of his head, and I saw he had destructiveness in him, knock down and drag out, and with his nervous eye, if it wasn't for the religion he has, I would not like to cross his path personally. I think he has religion enough to keep him from doubling his fist on me, but he is constitutionally made up after that manner, just looking at him from that manner.

Now, that kind of a man needs a great deal of religion of Jesus Christ to keep him from misleading himself because when he gets into a conflict, the idea with him is to break down, break down, break down his opponent, cost what it will, and that is the reason I said in the previous part of this discussion that he seemed as if he didn't fear God, man, nor the Devil, just so he breaks down his opponent.

Now, I am following him and exposing him.

Twenty-eighth: He said no soldier can be of any service if he does not desire to kill. I say what of taking part in civil government? He said the God of war is one master and the Prince of Peace another. I have shown to you in the plainest possible manner from Exodus 15th chapter in the early part of this discussion that God declared himself to be a man of war. And I have shown furthermore that my opponent was wrong when he said that God never ordained but one nation to go to war. He ordained the Babylonians. You can read that whenever you see fit by looking at the tenth chapter of Isaiah where God ordained that the king of Babylon should go against the Israelites. Even though he didn't think he was doing God's will, yet he was. He didn't mean it in his heart, but his idea was to overthrow nations, but God was using him.

Twenty-ninth, Loving enemies would take all the spirit of killing out of man. Well, dear friends, what does loving our enemies cause us to do? Does it cause us if a man would come, as I presented in the earlier part of this discussion, or a set of ruffians would come to our homes to outrage our wives and children, does it require that we shall love our enemies so that we put not any

violent hands on them? Does it mean to love them that we would not put violent hands on them? Decide it for yourselves individually.

That is what my respondent would like to impose upon you, and if you are not on your guard, friends, you will imagine, or be led to think that you should love your enemies so that you would allow them to come in and outrage your family. I say to you that you ought to hold that kind of a doctrine in contempt, and when the advocate of that over in the state of Virginia, as I said earlier in this discussion, when I said I brought this before him, he said, "I wouldn't like to be tried."

His religion, his religious scruples, his false notions, why, the better nature in the man to protect his wife and children would simply overcome his foolishness, and I believe the same is true with reference to my opponent. He would not allow anybody to come in and outrage his wife and children and simply try to use moral suasion.

I charge that he made a mistake in referring to John 13:35, Ephesians 4:31, First Peter 3:8-9 in reference to this question, because it pertains strictly to us as Christians and not as citizens of the kingdom of this world. The Saviour said, "If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight." We can't avoid being citizens of the kingdom of this world. We may play the coward. We may refuse, but if they don't pay taxes, then what? The government levies taxes upon us and upon all of these non-combatants, and use the money of those taxes to feed and clothe the soldier, to take care of the soldier, the hospitals, and to enable the soldier to fight, and when we do come to this, the question arises, Isn't the old aphorism true,

"Whatever link of Nature's chain you strike,

Tenth or ten thousandth breaks the chain alike, "

And whatever link of war's chain you strike, tenth or ten thousandth breaks the chain alike. And if my opponent has more property than I have, he was taxed in the time of the war, and all of you who have property, were taxed, and severely taxed, to cause this war or that war

to be carried on, and if you were not disposed to buy government bonds, which you could refuse to do, why, you were branded as a slacker and perhaps your house painted over after a very unfortunate manner.

Now, that is on the side of the war, but we can't get rid of that, and my opponent and I as citizens of the kingdom of this world may be liable in the very next presidential election to cast a vote (if he votes—I voted once for a president, and I don't know how often he voted; once in a municipal election). I am not opposed to voting, but haven't had time to be at home at the time of election and turn away from the Lord's work in order to register. I believe voting is all right with the best judgment we can exercise. But between voting and holding office in civil government on the one hand, and carrying on war on the other, I wouldn't give the snap of my finger as far as the difference is concerned, no more than giving the testimony, as a good citizen must, that would hang a man and being the sheriff that would hang him, not a particle.

Old Brother Lipscomb in the South had a right idea on a wrong proposition. He refused even to vote, and he said that a vote was not worth anything unless it was backed up by a bullet. That is the way he viewed it. So all Christians must refuse to vote, refuse to hold office in civil government, refuse to do anything, we might say that the government might require, if they are going to adopt this principle that my opponent advocates.

When a brother down there in the South who had taught school for seventeen years refused to vote or hold office in civil government, I said, "That is strange business, Brother So-and-So," calling him by name. (I will not name him because my respondent is liable to cast some slur on that question about naming a dead man and naming a living man that is not here. I will say that the brother was a preacher.) I said, "It is very strange for a man who has for seventeen years been voted on as a school teacher and has been elected as a school teacher and has received his salary from the state which he is serving, that he would be opposed to voting and holding office in civil governments."

Now, there is a sample of the gross, grievous dreadful

inconsistency that men on that side of the question will adopt, and I don't care which extreme my respondent takes. Why, undoubtedly he is under condemnation because he must pay taxes, and if he doesn't pay taxes, if he has property that the government can take hold of, it will, and leaves him without anything, and so the taxes will go to carry on the war.

And here I read in Romans, 13th chapter, that the powers that be are ordained of God. My respondent has told you that these powers are of the devil.

Well, now, believe him or believe the Apostle Paul just as you see fit.

Forty-two: Made his reflections on me as a debater, started with that. If I had time enough I might do pretty < well! Of course, he wouldn't say anything that is unpleasant! But give me plenty of time and I will arrange things pretty well!

Forty-three: Made a mistake when he referred to the Old Testament. Charges me with that. The God of Heaven rules in the kingdoms of men, and I pointed out that the Lord Jesus Christ now as King of Kings and Lord! of Lords, what did he do? Killed Ananias and his wife for lying, and killed that man Herod for receiving honor due only to God.

Now, you may talk about what is said in Revelation that is figurative. What is this, the figure of which I have spoken concerning Ananias and his wife and King Herod, what is that a figure of? He is very good in passing over the blasphemy question.

Forty-five: Again, but he does not hesitate to cast reflection upon his opponent individually in a personal matter not pertaining to the speech as such, but to my mentality.

Forty-six: He says the nearer your fountain you get, why, the purer the water. Well, I say if you are going toward the fountain, go to the New Testament, and there we find Cornelius in the army before he became a Christian, so highly esteemed that the Lord told him where to send to have a preacher to teach him what he ought to do, and we find after he became a Christian the Holy Spirit,,

according to the divine record, left him where he was and Paul in a certain place declares "Let every man abide in the same calling where he was found." Necessarily I bring that up hereafter and thus Cornelius remained.

Wanted to know why not get into the position to be not responsible for committing adultery. Now, that was his question. When I said that in the army we are not responsible if we kill somebody under the directions of the government which he has. Now, as far as that is concerned, friends, the matter stands in this shape: stands in this form: God said, Thou shalt not kill. He that sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. That referred to personal vengeance. That referred to personal vengeance. And God said, "Avenge not yourselves."

Well as far as the adultery is concerned, that refers to another personal crime, another personal crime, another personal crime, and such being the case, you see they are both on the same, what we may call the same principle. The one who said you shall not do the one, said you shall not do the other, and I referred to the passage in Leviticus in my former speech which plainly declares that both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death, and there is no position where a man can get in that his personal vengeance against an individual will be justified. I suppose that the United States Government would treat a man very severely if he would take a prisoner that is disarmed and in his possession and yet kill that prisoner. It would be personal vengeance, but while the battle is raging, why, of course, the government doesn't authorize him to avoid killing people.

"I say the nearer we get to the fountain," he remarked, "the purer the water."

Get to the New Testament and find the pure water there and not try to go down the stream of what may be called the so-called "Apostolic Fathers."

Talked about Daniel and those Hebrew children being conscripted. There was simply a proposition made 'to them, and they had an opportunity to show their loyalty to God, and they preferred to be loyal to God, rather than to be taken, not to be put in the army, but they had the

privilege either of bowing to the idol on the one hand, or going into the fiery furnace on the other, and that is the spirit that the Christian is required to have now.

Forty-eight: Said we would send people to hell when we end their life. Nothing of the kind. We don't have anything to do with that, and when the time comes for a man who has lived in disobedience and maybe rebelled against God and rejected a thousand invitations to the Gospel, and given over to hardness of heart, and there are such individuals, if a man kills them in war the idea of my opponent is "he is sending them to hell."

Forty-nine: He appealed to the feelings of the audience by telling them of their boys. That is the procedure of a demagogue, appealing to the feelings of the people.

Fifty: But Christ said, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." I have already brought that before you; in response to what he said, I wrote that down here, "Else would my servants fight," and we learn that according to the 13th chapter of Romans, the powers that be are ordained of God, and he who, "resists the powers that be resists the ordinances of God, and brings upon himself damnation."

Now, choose between following the style of my opponent and his false reasoning, or follow what the Apostle Paul says.

Fifty-one: White horse and his rider—sent them both, one for peace, and then sent the red horse to destroy that very peace. You couldn't imagine anything, friends, a greater perversion. The mission of truth in all ages has been to conquer people and to control them without hurting them, but there comes a time in the case of nations when the truth doesn't have any effect upon them and when they fill up the measure of their iniquity and then nothing else will do, as in the history of the past so in the present, and the future, nothing else will do but to use physical force. And the God of Heaven has ordained that in both the Old Testament and the New. The Lord Jesus Christ sent an angel of might to smite that man Herod and he was eaten of worms and died miserably. The peace-loving Saviour, the Prince of Peace, did that.

Fifty-two: I again referred to Cornelius; according to the New Testament he remained in the army or else the silence of the Scripture on any other subject isn't worth anything.

We can't take those household conversions and put babies in there, and have them sprinkled upon the same principle that my respondent won't respect the silence of the New Testament and would say that Cornelius got out of the army. I leave him where the Scripture left him. I am not going to add to nor take from.

. Fifty-three: Why not volunteer if it is right? When I volunteer I choose myself. I don't prefer to do that, but when my government tells me what to do in regard to a matter where I am not supposed to be the best judge, and I regard the government as going to war in a righteous way, and I should say, in a righteous cause, why, then my responsibility ends. I believe that is the correct position.

He said of something when he had besmirched me, "Worse and worse." Easy to do that, I said: "Yes, easy to ridicule." Friends, if I had any disposition to ridicule, I could ridicule, and I prefer to call it by a plain name that you can all understand, and not to engage in anything like ridicule and a little sneering.

Fifty-five: Yes, he said, and I say, can not kill. There is the conclusion of Romans 13th chapter, Avenge not yourselves. I have already corrected that. It isn't in Romans 13, but is the last of Romans 12th chapter.

Fifty-six: "If Jesus Christ is one, he must be the one. yes, if Jesus Christ is in favor of war, then he must be the one that caused the facts that brought on the war." Now, there is where he forgets the Devil altogether. He forgets human nature. The idea that Jesus Christ who would cause a faction that would rise up in a civil government so as to cause war and then send forth the red horse to overthrow that, the more you look at that, friends, the worse it becomes. He endeavors to set Christ against Christ just as he sets God against his own word in a former part of this discussion.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your kind attention.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before we advance with our replication to my opponent's last speech, I wish to preface this speech with a few sayings that can not be successfully denied.

First, the guilty make war; the innocent fight.

Second, the innocent suffer with the guilty.

Third, Avarice, graft, jealousy, greed, money power, trust, are the causes of war.

Fourth, The money spent in war would clear every acre of land, build all schools and churches needed, relieve all afflicted, feed every hungry one, and enough surplus would be left to evangelize the world with the gospel.

Fifth, War never proves who is right. Brute force has often suppressed the right.

If my opponent can contradict successfully either of those statements, we would be glad to have him make the effort.

The proposition that I am discussing is that the spirit of Christianity is antagonistic to the spirit of war and the spirit of war is antagonistic to the spirit of Christianity.

I showed according to the prophetic nature of the kingdom of Christ that the principles to be advocated in the Christian dispensation were principles that would exterminate war, if those principles were applied, and if those principles would not end all war, then I called for a set of principles that will end it. If my opponent would admit that if everybody were Christians there would be no war, which I think he will be forced to admit, then that proves as clear as a demonstration that Christianity and war are opposed to one another, and I might close my argument here and claim my proposition proved. So let him give us a straightforward answer. If everybody were Christians would there be any more wars?

If he says no, then Christianity is opposed to war and would exterminate it. If he says yes, let him bring the proof that a world of people, all Christians, would have occasions to fight.

I now briefly review the speech to which we listened this afternoon. I quoted a number of Scriptures setting

forth the principles and the characteristics of God's people, or in other words the spirit of Christianity. In his reply he said that referred only to the church and its members, and did not have reference concerning our attitude to the world. I shall re-read a few of these passages to prove that is a mistake.

First Thessalonians 5:15: "See that none render evil for evil *unto any man*; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, *and to all men*."

Question: Does that apply only to the inward workings of the church?

Titus 3:1-3: We find this language: "*Showing all meekness unto all men*." Does that apply just to the church?

Again: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

"Therefore, if thy enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head."

Does that apply only to Christians? Certainly Christians are not the enemies one of another. Therefore it applies to our conduct toward those who are not Christians, and hence my opponent's statement is proven to be false.

Another point I wish to mention is, he referred to there being war in heaven, reading from Revelation 12, and he applied this to literal or carnal warfare. If this is a literal passage, I mean if it has a literal application, then this was really God's dwelling place, heaven, where the war took place, and they were literal angels fighting with literal canons, gatling guns, swords and pistols in heaven. You only have to refer to such an application as that to show the absurdity of the thing. It is symbolical language and can not be used to apply to literal, carnal warfare, so I take the passage from him.

He made one argument, that to one who hasn't studied the question, seems reasonable. That is, we pay our taxes when we know these taxes go to support war and other institutions of the government, and he argues if we pay

taxes and those taxes are used to prosecute war, that makes us guilty of war. He illustrates it by voting for a sheriff. He says, if I vote for a sheriff and that man hangs a man, I am equally guilty with that sheriff.

Now, I shall answer that, and show that his conclusion is not right. While our Lord was here upon earth, he paid taxes. He paid taxes to a government that was going to crucify him. He paid taxes to a government that was using that tax money to support idolatrous religions. He paid tax money to support a king that would use part of that money to satisfy his own vice and sensual pleasures and sometimes worse passions. If my opponent's argument is good, then Jesus Christ was equally guilty with the king, to whom he paid taxes, for all of those crimes and vices that he committed.

Now, I will admit that is hard, but that is the conclusion of his reasoning. Then I argue, if Jesus Christ and the early Christians could and did pay taxes without being equally guilty for those corrupt institutions for which the taxes were used, then I may pay my taxes, and they may be used to prosecute war, and yet I will be no more guilty of that war than Jesus Christ was guilty of contributing to the sensual pleasures and appetites of an earthly king.

Now, if the tax question comes up any more, I ask the reader to please refer to this speech and get the answer.

He wanted to know why I didn't define the proposition. What I meant by Christianity. I thought I did when I said it did not mean a Christian nation, but it meant Christians in every nation. I suppose he forgot that I made such a definition.

When I read Paul's language, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal," my opponent says that refers to the weapons that we use as members of the church, and not weapons of carnal warfare. Sure, I knew that, but the question is, Can you lay off these weapons that are spiritual and don weapons that are carnal, and do that with these carnal weapons that you could not do with these spiritual weapons on? My argument is, that the soldier's armament furnished by the Lord Jesus Christ which consists of a helmet of hope, a breastplate of righteousness,

a shield of faith, a girdle of truth, feet shod with the preparation of the gospel, and the Word of God, the sword of the spirit, is not equipped in that armor to go into, carnal warfare, and must lay it off in order to don the carnal weapons.

Romans 13th, he quotes, "He that resists the power shall receive damnation."

I answer, my friends, that in a general sense, we so understand that passage, but there are exceptions to that, and I am going to prove to you there are exceptions just as I have illustrated about the husband and the wife. God has ordained that the husband shall be head of the wife and says, "Wives, submit to your husbands." Then if the husband commands anything of that wife that is not right, should that wife still submit? Certainly not. So we are to submit to the powers that be, and if we resist that power in anything that it asks us to do that is right, then we should receive damnation, but if that power asks us to do something that is not right, and we resist, then we will not receive damnation. That ought to be sufficient on that. Then he refers to the kind of a man he would take me to be if he had a good chance to phrenologize my head. Of course, that was all out of place, but I am going to mention this about it: While he said according to what he could see of me, or words to that effect, that he would be afraid to be caught out just him and me alone on account of the disposition I manifested in this debate. Now, if I stand before him and plead, love your enemies, do good to them that despitefully use you, pray for them that say all manner of evil against you, and all of that class of passages, if that puts the idea into his head that I would be a bad man, what could I say to him that would prove to him that I was a good man? He certainly has got a glimpse in the mirror and saw his own reflection, because he is the man who is arguing fight, fight, fight—war, war, war. I leave it to the audience who it is that will be the safest man to meet out in some desolate place.

He refers to the ruffian. I shall not pay any more attention to that. It has nothing to do with carnal war. I never said that the powers that be were the powers

of the devil. I believe the powers that be are ordained of God just like the church is ordained of God, but men can. so corrupt the church that we can not afford to do which the church tells us to do in every instance. God ordained the church, but the church has been corrupted. God ordained civil governments, but men have corrupted civil governments, and God no more expects us to bow to those corruptions in government than he does for us to bow to corruptions in the church. That meets that argument.

He refers to the Lord killing Ananias and Herod. Well, the Book says, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Do you think you can do anything the Lord can? Do you mean to make a lord out of yourself and say, if the Lord can kill a man, so can I? He will say there is another reflection, but it is his own position, not mine.

Again he reads concerning Cornelius and says that Cornelius was not taken out of the Roman army, and then quotes from Paul where he says, Abide in the same calling wherein you are called. Never placed any qualification on it at all. Then if a man is. called in a profession of gambling, let him remain a gambler and live a Christian life. You can see that kind of reasoning will not do.

He says that the Hebrew children were not conscripted yet they were taken from prison and forced to go out into the congregation, and three times were they asked to bow to the image that the king had made, and they refused to do it.

Now, he would call them cowards, I guess, but I call them brave men. I think any man that has enough nerve to stand up for the principles of his heart, even if the government of the earth demands that he forsake them, is a braver man than the one who will submit, although he must sacrifice principle to do it.

I believe that is all in the speech that I consider worthy of notice.

I desire to continue reading God's Word on this question. Second Corinthians 10:3-4: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:

("For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but

mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds;)

"Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; "

This one passage shows that the spirit of Christianity is opposed to the spirit of war.

Again in James 3:14 and 4:1-4: "But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not; and lie not against the truth.

"This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.

"For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.

"But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

"And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

"From whence come wars and fighting among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?

"Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and can not obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not."

Here we have a passage telling you where wars come from. They come from the lust of men's flesh. The lust of an individual's flesh makes him fight another individual, the lust of nations for that balance of power, or for that extension of territory, or to protect that big loan that some New York banker has made to a foreign country, will cause them to summon all the innocent and strong young men of our country and have them fight that we do not lose the money we have invested in enterprise over there. Yet my friend says that is the spirit of Christianity.

I wish to read you just a few statements along this line from "Scholars and Warriors."

One of the greatest warriors the world has ever seen was Napoleon. He says that, "war is the trade of barbarians." My opponent says it is the trade of Christians.

"War is the father of other wars."—Colonel Gadke.

"War is one of the principal causes of the degradation of the human race."—J. Noveko.

"War is nothing less than a temporary repeal of the principles of virtue."—Robert Hall.

"War is not the triumph of righteousness; it is the triumph of brute force."—Bishop Frazier.

"I can not bear to go into the presence of God so angry as I always become in battle."—A Soldier.

"War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war, you would pray God you might not see another."—Wellington.

"War, the expression of unreasoning anger, coordinated and legalized violence to accomplish political ends."—David Starr Jordan.

"War is the concentration of all human crimes. Under its standards gather violence, malignity, rage, fraud, rapacity and lust. If it only slew men, it would do little. It turns man into a beast of prey."—Dr. Charming.

I wish to read one or two more statements, one from General Grant. He says, "War is hell."

One from Robert E. Lee: "I have given four years of my life to leading the youths of Virginia to battle and to death. I want to give the remaining years of my life to teaching the youths of Virginia how to live."

I have many more statements from *Scholars and Warriors*, people that have actually been engaged in it, but that ought to be enough to show you what they think of it, and I offer you this just as supplemental, not that I think the Bible has failed to prove my proposition for I have given you abundant proof, and quite a bit more than my opponent has ever undertaken to notice.

In the remaining moments of my time I wish to call your attention to the fact that early church writers and historians have said something of the attitude of Christians during the first three centuries. I will read from Lardner, Volume 7, Page 597, who wrote in A. D. 361.

"The Apostate Julian, then Emperor, refused to give the government of provinces to Christians because as he said, their law forbids the use of the sword for the punishment of such as deserve death. Julian not only deprived

the Christians of magistracy and all honors and dignities, but of equal rights as citizens."

This man Julian was an apostate, but he was well acquainted with the law governing Christians. He knew what they taught and would not appoint them to office because that was their position.

Let me read you from Justin Martyr who wrote in A. D. 250 to the emperors in behalf of Christians. He says: "Taxes and customs we pay the most scrupulously of all men, to those who are appointed by you as we are appointed by him, Jesus."

Tertullian lived about 200, born within fifty years of the death of John. He says, "The image of Caesar which is on the coin is to be given to Caesar, and the image of God which is in man is to be given to God. Therefore the money which thou must indeed give to Caesar, but thyself to God, for what would remain to God if all were given to Caesar," and says you give all to Caesar when you go into the battlefield.

But again, I want to read from an infidel, not because I think so much of an infidel, but because his testimony in a case like this is good testimony because he is forced to admit the truth concerning the Christians whom he fights. Gibbon—"If we seriously consider the purity of the Christian religion, the sanctity of the moral precepts and the innocent as well as austere lives of the greater number of those during the first ages embraced the faith of the Gospel, we should naturally suppose that so benevolent a doctrine would have been received with due reverence even by the unbelieving world, that the magistrates instead of persecuting would have protected an order of men who yielded with most passive obedience to the laws though they declined the activity caused of war."

Now, Gibbon certainly ought to have known what these people taught and what they practiced in the first three centuries, and coming from an infidel source, he certainly would not have admitted so much had the facts not forced him to it.

I read again from Gibbon, Volume 2, Page 255: "The humble Christians were sent into this world as sheep

among wolves, and since they were not permitted to use force even in defense of their own religion, they should be still more criminal if they were tempted to shed the blood of their fellow men in disputing the vain privileges or sordid possessions of this transitory life."

I believe I will have time for another or two: Gibbon, Volume 2, Page 275: "The Christian subjects of Armenia and Iberia formed a sacred and perpetual alliance with their Roman brethren. Christians of Persia in time of war were suspected of preferring their religion to their country."

Now, I believe that I will leave off reading and just tell you a few authors that I have here that I have not time to read. Mosheim, an ecclesiastical historian; Orchard, a Baptist historian; Armitage, a Baptist historian. I will not take the time to read of them.

Now, my friends, knowing that the debate is shorter than we had at first calculated, this shall be my last affirmative speech on this question unless I refer to only a few statements of my opponent in my next speech, and then I shall take up my next affirmative proposition. I ask you to take these arguments into your careful consideration; think about the principles of peace, think about the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the power of God unto salvation, and don't ever let it get into your minds that Jesus Christ is going to use force to convert the world as my opponent would have you believe. Keep in mind also that he has said that war was brought on by people who had wrong heads. Then every time that you hear him say that Jesus Christ is the cause of these carnal wars, you see he is contradicting himself. Every time that God and Christ are referred to in the New Testament in connection with war, it means a spiritual warfare, and Christ is sending forth the sword, the Word of God, to fight spiritual wickedness out of the hearts of men, and at no time do we find in the New Testament where we are authorized to take the life of our fellow men, and especially would we be sorry if we take the life of a man who was not prepared to die, and my opponent knows that if a man is killed in battle, and he is not prepared to meet his God, he will never have an-

other chance to meet that God in peace, and his destiny is sealed for all eternity.

Can we afford, my friends, as followers of Jesus Christ, to shoot down men and take their lives when we know we are robbing them of the last opportunity they will ever have of obeying God and making preparations for eternity, the eternal home of the soul?

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I enjoyed that speech, but he arranged considerable of it and it was highly interesting to me, and certain of you may have a wonder in your minds as to what I am going to say with reference to it. It simply rounded up so nicely—long preparations, extensive preparations, quotations, not all correct—charged to General Grant what Sherman said, that war is hell, and seemingly endorsed it. I don't know enough about hell to say that war is hell. That celebrated saying of William Tecumseh Sherman, friends, has been adopted by a great many people, but I don't know enough about the eternal world to make any such statement as that.

But you haven't any idea how many misrepresentations my respondent has made. I refer to the last one: "Don't let my opponent lead you to believe that God intends to use force to convert the world." Never had such an idea and never set it forth.

But that is a sample of the manner in which he treats what I say; all the way through this has been done. Just leave off enough to misrepresent me, and lead the people to think that I am in a predicament. I haven't felt myself in any unfortunate predicament from the beginning of this discussion until the present time.

I ought to say that my opponent and I have an agreement on that money question, that it will come up at a later date, so I needn't mention it any more until we have the class question before us again.

I wish you to bear that in mind, and I will try and think of it when we come to the class question, and I wish to say that I don't wish him nor anybody else to think that I

wish his money, but I just simply wish him to be convinced that he is a reckless asserter and that *is* the reason I am proposing to press that question. I don't think that he has any more money than I have, and that he is any more able to give me forty dollars than I am to give him forty dollars. Consequently, remember that I am not after his money, but I wish him to be honorable enough to make a legal tender of it at the proper time. Then you will see what I will do.

And his last appeal to you was that all those Scriptures that refer to warfare mean a carnal warfare.

Well, I will turn again to Romans 12th and 13th chapters. The 12th chapter, we are all aware, I suppose, gives Christians much detailed information concerning themselves as Christians. In the conclusion of that chapter, Paul wrote thus, beginning with the 18th verse: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

"Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Thus far the 12th chapter. Now, of course, the division into chapters is a human arrangement. That is artificial. Man has arranged that, and so we will just simply pass from the 12th to the 13th. Paul gave these directions for individual Christians that I have just read and then no doubt in order to prevent them from misapplying them, and extending them beyond what he intended, the Holy Spirit directed him to say immediately:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the

evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

"For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

"Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

"For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

"Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour."

My opponent would teach you not to fear any command of the government when it calls upon you to help to defend it. He would teach you that you should be very glad to have the government to put a hundred or a thousand or ten thousand or a million men in the field if necessary to protect you, but if the government calls on you to help it to protect itself against an enemy, then you can say, I have conscientious scruples; my religion doesn't permit me to do that!

Now, let me point out what the Apostle Paul did. He said, "I appeal unto Caesar," when he was in danger of being killed by the Jews. He made that appeal though soldiers were necessary to protect him, and a mob might have come in contact with those soldiers and there might have been a hundred or five hundred men killed, just to protect the Apostle Paul.

Now, the idea that the Apostle Paul taught by his example that he could appeal to the government to take care of him, regardless of what it might cost, and yet if the government would call upon him or any one of those whom he taught, to help it in its struggles to protect somebody else, that he would say, "I have conscientious scruples!"

Now, friends, that just simply teaches every man to act the part of a coward as soon as it comes to doing unto others what he would have others to do to him on this question, and the idea that a man can live in a government

and that he can secure all the benefits from the government, and a blood-bought government and yet if the government would call upon him to shoulder a musket or a rifle for the purpose of helping it, even to put clown outlaws who might be ravaging the country, why, he would say, "I have conscientious scruples!"

Now, friends, my position is this: I have told you this before. He charged that enlisting upon me again though I have told him over and over again, and told this audience what I might say I risked in the time of the war on that question of enlistment, that I wouldn't enlist, wouldn't choose myself, but if the government chose me and called upon me, I think I would not be a good citizen if I didn't respond, and now my position, briefly, is this:

I don't believe that anybody can obey Romans 13th chapter, the part that I have read, I mean refuse to obeys that, and yet be a good citizen. I don't believe that he can be a good citizen, especially of a country like this, and yet be a Christian. If he is not a good citizen—what I mean to say is I don't believe that he can be a Christian. If he can be a Christian and dodge the draft, then he could be a Christian and dodge the assessor, and in either case he would act the part of a coward, and he would act the part of a dishonest and dishonorable specimen of humanity.

Now, this is the way this, impresses me. I wish you all to consider it, and see whether you could either dodge a draft or dodge the assessor and yet be a good citizen. I think if I take a standing vote of this congregation that three-fourths of nine-tenths of you would be compelled to say, "We can't do either one or the other and be good citizens."

Now, with that much understood, I come back to look at these notes. But before doing so, I wish to mention what Brother Harper called my attention to this evening. There was a man named J. N. Armstrong. He isn't here tonight. He and I have had considerable controversy. He was a professor of a university in Cordell, Oklahoma, and he taught and taught his pupils that they should resist the

draft, should not go into war, and the young, vigorous. men, not having any dependents, were called, and they refused and they were sent to Leavenworth, Kansas, and kept in prison. When the authorities there found out that those young men had been taught at Cordell that kind of a doctrine, they went down there and said to Professor Armstrong, "You close this school or we will put you in prison." He closed the school, played the coward, played the coward, played the coward. He wasn't willing to go to prison. He taught the young men what led them to decide to do what led them to prison. He played the coward. Another man did not play the coward, saw fit to go to prison and stayed there until they let him out, and played the man after he came out.

Now, friends, I want to warn you against this sickly sentimentalism because it isn't founded upon the Word of God. My respondent can not possibly make out his case and respect the Bible with reference to Cornelius. We are silent where the Bible is silent, and we must leave Cornelius in the army of Pagan Rome, doing his duty there as a soldier. We have to leave him there because the Scripture leaves him there just as we might take another half dozen instances and leave every character just where the Scripture leaves him.

Now, having said that much as a preliminary, I come back.

He said the war mentioned in Revelation is symbolical. What does the symbol mean? Most easy way of disposing to say it is symbolical and then pass on. Symbolical? Symbolical of what?

What of voting? My opponent keeps clear. I said suppose we vote and we thereby elect a man who brings on a war and then we step back and say, "No, I beg to be excused; I can't fight." Do everything to bring on the fight and then. step back and play the coward and say, "I can't fight." "My conscience won't allow me to fight."

Well, friends, that reminds me of a German who had scruples on that subject, and the war broke out between the North and the South. He had forgotten the word

scruples, but he didn't wish to go into the army, and thought he would go to the examining surgeon and make an effort to get out.

He said, "Doctor, I no like this war." The doctor said, "None of us likes it." "Well, but doctor, I feel bad in here, wherever I think of going to this war. It makes me feel bad in here whenever I think of this war and killing someone." The doctor said, "Oh, you have scruples." "Yes, doctor, dat's it; I have the scruples, and my wife says when I dies, I dies with the scruples."

Now, friends, I think that those who receive all the defense that their government can give them, and who will vote to elect a man who may bring on a war, and elect a considerable number of men, a senate that will bring on a war, and then when the war is brought on, say, "My conscience will not permit me to go any farther"—I don't think they will ever die with the scruples. They are not related to that old German.

He referred to Isaiah and the teachings that Isaiah presented with reference to the beauty of the New Testament arrangement just in proportion as it prevailed and referred to certain passages where he, says, When the Lord begins to reign, then they will beat the swords into plowshares. How much has been done? He has been reigning for over 1800 years. Does that apply to the gospel age?

Friends, I might show in a discourse on that subject that must refer to the millennial age after the devil will be bound. He isn't bound yet. Isaiah 11:6-9. I say, Is that literal? When will this occur? After the same manner I answer.

He spoke of a set of principles in Christianity and the spirit of these principles will eliminate war. It hasn't done it yet. He says, Are we to look for another set of principles? No, I say, but think of the millennial age. We haven't come to the best of the period of the reign of Jesus Christ, friends, and will not until after the end of the gospel age when Christ will take unto himself his great power.

Why, friends, the gospel hasn't yet eliminated war between Cowan and Sommer, and besides Paul wrote to Timothy to fight the good fight of faith and about warring a good warfare, and finally said of himself, "I have fought a good fight." So, of course, this is a spiritual warfare and as I said, these various Scriptures that he referred to, whatever their application is to us in the gospel age, it refers to that which is spiritual. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down images and every high thing that exalteth itself against God, wrote the Apostle Paul.

And he laid down certain statements, aphorisms, I suppose: The guilty make war and the innocent fight it out. That means to say that our Revolutionary fathers in this country made the war, they were the guilty ones, for if they hadn't resisted old England's encroachment, we wouldn't have had any war. Where would we have been? All under Old England, I suppose, yet bowing down. Not the worst government in the world, but we wouldn't have had any American freedom, so the guilty make the war and the innocent fight it out. He thought that was an aphorism. The guilty are the promoters at the start, but there wouldn't be any war if nobody resisted, but Solomon said, "Oppression maketh a wise man mad."

That is the reason the Revolutionary fathers rose up and made that big tea party over here. The guilty made the war, or started it, but there wouldn't have been any war if Solomon's saying had not been verified there. There were men then different from my respondent. There were sufficient men here then to resist the abominable encroachment of Old England and made a declaration that the inalienable rights of man are the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Then he said the innocent suffer with the guilty. That may be admitted. He says, greed, money power and so on, these are the things that make war. There wouldn't be any war, friends, if nobody was to resist the greed and money power of the world that may introduce war. There wouldn't have been any World War, friends, if everybody

had just bowed to the Kaiser. Why not? All we need to have done, Belgium, France, England and all these, just bowed to him, and let him be universal monarch. There wouldn't have been any war. I can tell people how to eliminate war. All lie down and let the enemies of truth and righteousness and uprightness and honor just ride over you. I can tell you how to avoid lawsuits. Every time a man suffers or starts a difficulty with you in regard to financial matters and threatens to sue you, just say, Don't sue, I will pay the bill! And if he wishes to sue you for your farm, on some pretext, Well, I won't have a lawsuit; you can just take the farm!

No, we don't need any legal battles or any other; all we need to do is just to give way, bow.

"Principles of prophecy, if applied, would end all war." If everybody were Christians, then there would be no more war. Now he is talking about something that isn't contemplated in the Bible, that everybody will become Christians, and yet, friends, if all were Christians how long would it take before somebody would come and turn them away?

Read what we have in Revelation, 20th chapter. After the devil will have been bound for a thousand years and the beloved city and the camp of the saints will have had sway, and the devil will be loosed and all he will need to do, I have sometimes thought, will be to go out and whistle and he will have an innumerable company gathered to his standard, and to go and encompass the beloved city, and go and introduce the last war. And then God will take a hand, and cast the devil and all of his hosts into the lake which will burn with fire and brimstone forever. My opponent hasn't gone far enough on this subject.

Re-read a few passages. First Thessalonians 5:15, telling Christians how to act toward each other and all men. That is all right. We are told how to treat outsiders.

Titus 3:1-3 tells us how to act toward Christians and all men. That is all right. We understand that. But telling us as individuals.

Another word he said about the powers that be that are

ordained of God. Avenge not yourselves. Does that apply only to men? In our individual life as Christians we are not to take vengeance on each other. God requires us to imitate him in goodness, love, mercy, kindness and gentleness and long-suffering, with restriction on vengeance. We don't know how much punishment should be administered; God reserves that to himself.

And with reference to the war in heaven, God's dwelling place. "Did they have cannons and gatling guns? and it was a symbolic war, no literal, carnal warfare." Well, they had a warfare there, and the devil was cast out and in Luke, 10th chapter, we find that the Saviour made this declaration, we are told in the 17th and 18th verses, Luke, 10th chapter: "And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name.

"And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

Michael and his angels took the old fellow up and pitched him out, and the divine Word was there to view that battle. Read Revelation, 12th chapter, with care and see what took place. And there was war, actual conflict though by spirit beings one with the other—just as literal with spirit beings as my opponent and I are having a literal warfare of a mental kind. It is a warfare only it isn't with carnal weapons, so they had that kind of a warfare up there, and the devil was cast out.

Well, we look a little farther and see what we can find, or as my opponent can find. See if we can find anything worth notice in this, that, or the other isn't worth noticing..

Pay taxes: He endeavored to break the force of what I said about paying taxes by referring to the Saviour paying taxes. "The Saviour said, Do the kings of this earth accept or receive custom of their children or strangers?" The answer was, "Of strangers." He said, "Then are the children free," and he was a citizen of the Roman government, yet he said, "Lest we offend, take a hook and go to the sea and cast it in and the first fish that cometh up, in its mouth you will find a piece of money. Give that for thee and me," And thus he sent Peter fishing to get the money

to pay taxes, and my opponent will endeavor to break the force of all that I said on the subject because the Saviour on that occasion in order not to offend anybody, paid taxes!

I don't know where my opponent got the idea that those Hebrew children were taken out three times of the congregation and asked whether they would bow down to that image or not. They were given a second chance. That is all I have been able to find there. Maybe I haven't read it as closely as he has.

"Weapons of our warfare are not carnal." I just dealt with that. I said Paul appealed to Caesar and by soldiers he was taken care of. I have referred to that.

James 3:17: "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated," and if he and I both had had all the wisdom we should have had, we would have seen what the Lord Jesus teaches on this. But one or the other is lacking, and you are to judge which one is lacking, and which is appealing most to the Word of God, and which is appealing most to what may be designated human testimony on this subject.

Napoleon said it was "the trade of barbarians." I recollect reading that saying with reference to Napoleon, and that is where it showed itself. But, friends, does it apply when such men as the Revolutionary fathers rejected the encroachments of Old England? Does it apply there? We had war. It was carried on between seven and eight years. Was it the trade of barbarians there? They were the Revolutionary fathers. My opponent seems to endorse Napoleon's statements without any modification whatever, so I ask for an application of it. Were our Revolutionary fathers barbarians because they resisted the encroachments of Old England?

He appeals too much to human testimony, friends, and that other testimony that he referred to, and that he quoted, and that he made use of, Grant and Lee and several others. Why, the question arises, Were they not all human beings? Were they not likely to come to wrong conclusions?

Paul said, "He that resisteth the power, receives to himself damnation, "

I would rather accept that and insist that we must be good citizens in order to become good Christians.

I thank you heartily, friends, for your kind attention.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Just a few words now with reference to the last speech. We shall then take up the study of the next question. Really I don't need to refer to but one thing that came up in the last speech. I have asked my opponent if the principles of Christianity would exterminate war. He says they haven't done it yet. Then I asked him if we were to look for a new set of principles. He says no.

Then he says that these principles will exterminate war during the millennium, a thousand years reign. Or at least when they had exterminated war, the millennium will set in. I don't think I misunderstood him. Are we to look for another set of principles, then? He shakes his head.

MR. SOMMER: You have that wrong. That is all I shook my head over.

MR. COWAN: Anyway it matters not which way you shake your head, you have said there is going to be no other set of principles. Then the same set of principles will obtain during the millennium as obtain now, only they will have become universally accepted.

Then, the spirit of these principles that I am advocating now, the spirit of Christ, the spirit of Christianity, is opposed to war, and will finally extirpate it. Let's shake hands on it, Brother Sommer, and we will turn to the next proposition.

MR. SOMMER: Too much involved; too much confusion.

MR. COWAN: Too much involved. I leave it, my friends, to the candid minds of every thinking person if that doesn't prove my proposition that the spirit of Christianity is opposed to or against the spirit of war, and my opponent has admitted it by saying 'we will never get another set of principles, and that when this set of principles are in vogue and are carried out, war will end and a thousand years peace will ensue. So the principles of

Christianity are opposed to war, the spirit of Christ is opposed to the spirit of war, and he ought to shake hands with me on that question and give it up. That is all there is to it.

Just a few words with reference to his last speech. I accept the correction. It was Sherman instead of Grant that said war is hell. When I find out I have made a mistake, I am glad to correct it. However, it would have been just as true if Grant had said it.

He tells you people that you have no idea how many misrepresentations that I have made of him. Wonderful he told you! You might never have found it out had he not been here to inform you.

He says in Romans 13th that we are to submit to the powers that be and ignores my argument concerning the wife obeying the husband, and he would place a limitation on that; the husband must not ask her to do wrong, neither must our government ask us to do wrong. If it does, we have the right to refuse to do it, ignoring the argument, and keeps repeating and repeating without noticing the argument.

He said Paul appealed to the government to protect him, but didn't give you the chapter and verse. It would be news to me to find the words of Paul's appeal.

MR. SOMMER: I beg your pardon. I gave that on a former occasion.

MR. COWAN: You gave the Scripture about this transaction, but didn't say Paul appealed to the government to protect him. You fudged. There is where you fudged.

MR. SOMMER: In Acts 25th chapter and 11th verse, "For if I be an offender or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal to Caesar."

MR. COWAN: Listen, my friends, the passage that he first introduced was concerning where his nephew told him about the Jews lying in wait for him.

MR. SOMMER: I didn't introduce that.

MR. COWAN: That is the passage I had under consideration and my replication to this passage was, that was a

special providence that Paul was to get before the seat of the Roman government in order to preach the gospel and did do it and stayed there a year and a half and preached the gospel and can not he put clown as a common occurrence of us appealing to a government today.

He said, I would not enlist in an army and have not advocated enlisting, yet he says a man is a coward who will not fight.

Now, why is a man a coward that won't enlist and waits until he is drafted, and then fights, and then he is not a coward?

It seemed to me like the man who waits to be forced to fight is the bigger coward than the man who would enlist; then why didn't you enlist or volunteer to keep from being a coward in the matter? I am using this, if it is right, it is right to enlist; if it is right, it is right to volunteer, and if it is the spirit of Christ to enlist and you don't, you are not heeding the spirit of Christ. He says, I wouldn't enlist; that means I wouldn't do what the spirit of Christ says do.

Concerning citizenship: Tie says we can not refuse to obey the civil government and be a good citizen. If there is no qualification to be placed on that, then I read, A wife can not refuse to obey the husband and be a good wife, doesn't matter what he tells you to do. Don't you see the fallacy of his reasoning?

Again he says that the Scriptures leave Cornelius in the army. No, your implication leaves him there. There is just as much said about his quitting the army as there is about his staying in it. Reader, get your Bibles and see for yourselves.

He says if I vote for a man and he is elected and that man brings on a war, that makes' him responsible for that war. Then if you give your voice in the selection of an elder of a congregation and that elder does something wrong, that makes you responsible for what that elder did.

MR. SOMMER: Yes, and I am called upon to repent of it.

MR. COWAN: And if you give your vote to appointment of an elder, and after awhile that elder becomes a

whoremonger or an adulterer, then Brother Sommer is *particeps criminis* with him in the act. Every time you put in, my opponent, it will only be worse for you.

You people can see that the men who select an elder are not to be held responsible for his acts; neither is the man who votes for an officer to be held responsible for his acts. The idea is ridiculous.

I shall now leave the war question and take up the next proposition, under the general proposition. I will now state my specific proposition.

"No one obeys God in baptism who is baptized because of remission of sins." I lay that down as a proposition. No one obeys God in baptism who is baptized because of the remission of sins.

I shall now introduce my proof. Mark 16:16: "Go preach the gospel to every creature.

"He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

Question: How could one read or hear this passage without getting the design of baptism in his or her mind?

Luke 24:47: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Acts 2:38: Peter preached repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ. How did he do it? By saying, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2:38.

I here call attention to a grammatical outline of this verse, showing that the phrase, "for the remission of sins," is a part of the command. Repentance was to be in the name of Christ, and so was baptism. That phrase, "in the name of Christ," modifies both verbs. Can one be Scripturally baptized who is not baptized in the name of Christ? No. Why? Because the phrase modifies both verbs, but the same passage that says to repent in the name of Christ and be baptized in the name of Christ, also says for the remission of sins. Leave baptism out of the passage and now let's read: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

When "for remission of sins" is following repentance, does it state the design, and doesn't every one who repents of his sins do so in order to get the remission of their sins. Is that the object of repentance, and is it to understand? It is.

But in the same passage, my friends, that says, "Repent for the remission of sins," it also says, "Be baptized for the remission of sins." The phrase, "for the remission of sins" modifies both verbs just like "in the name of Christ" did. Then how is it that one could read that verse of Scripture and understand that repentance was an order to, and fail to grasp the idea that baptism was an order to? Impossible.

Listen again, friends, "as many as gladly received his Word were baptized," which shows all who were baptized that day gladly received the truth that Peter preached, and a part of that truth was "baptism for the remission of sins." They certainly understood the design of it because they received it when he preached it, and understood it and obeyed.

Acts 2:47: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Not such as had been saved. My opponent has it, get saved first, and then join the right church. He has it different from the way the Bible reads

Again, the sects (and I mean by sects, denominations or denominational churches) confess that God has pardoned their sins before baptism. God has not pardoned their sins before baptism, Sommer. Therefore, they confess a falsehood, Sommer. They believed a lie when they believed God had pardoned their sins before baptism, Sommer. They confessed a lie when they confessed God had done it, Sommer. Therefore, baptism prompted by believing a lie and confessing a lie, makes Christians who are as yet not a member of any church, Sommer.

Believing a lie, confessing a lie, and being baptized upon that faith and upon that confession, renders them children of God, and worthy of the right hand of fellowship, according to my opponent; yet Paul says in Second Thessalonians, 2:12, "They that believe a lie shall be damned," Some difference.

There is no record of such baptism being accepted by any inspired man, or any early preacher of the Church of Christ.

Show me the place anywhere in the New Testament where any preacher ever held a meeting, preached for any congregation or church of the disciples, and some one presents themselves for membership upon another baptism. You can't find it. One instance we have where some who had received John's baptism were taught that it wasn't good in this age and were persuaded to be baptized in the name of Christ. The only place where a baptism is mentioned other than that in the name of Christ and for the remission of sins is in Acts. 19th chapter, and that baptism was not accepted as being valid by an inspired apostle.

Scriptural baptism is into one body. First Corinthians 12:13; sectarian baptism is into a sectarian body. Sect baptism is not into the Church of Christ for my opponent says they joined the wrong church, and should quit that church and join the right one. If the Bible is true, Scriptural baptism puts you into the one body, church. If my opponent is right, Scriptural baptism does not put you into the church, but you still have to join the church after your baptism. From this position he can not escape.

My opponent would not administer such baptism as those who believe a falsehood and confess a falsehood and would sin if he did. Why? Because that which is not of faith is sin. He would have no faith in baptizing a man believing his sins had been pardoned. He would have no faith in the confession that man made to that effect, and if he would baptize a man under those circumstances he would sin, yet another man can perform the very same baptism and then my opponent will say, "Your baptism is all right, if you are satisfied with it."

"The other man can just do a better job of baptizing than *I* could. I would have sinned if I had baptized him, but the other man could baptize him and be all right." That is the inconsistent position that he occupies.

Listen again, the one submitting to sect baptism is deceived. Why? Because he thinks his sins have been pardoned when they have not, That is deception, is it not?

If submitting to sect baptism makes one a Christian, then he is deceived into being a Christian. Therefore, deception would be the power of God unto salvation. The one submitting to sect baptism thinks by so doing he will get into a sect church. But gets into the Church of Christ, and doesn't know it, according to my opponent, gets made a Christian without knowing when it was done, and then commits spiritual adultery by going and joining the wrong church.

I speak of the church here as the aggregate of the saved. A man is baptized into the one body, he is in the one body, it matters not if there is but him and the preacher there like Philip baptized the eunuch. Rejoicing took place after baptism. See Acts 8:39-16:34. Rejoicing takes place before sect baptism. They not only do not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins, but persecute them that do believe it, and that too often before their sect baptism occurs.

Now, let me impress this idea on your minds. Men have been known to persecute people who argued baptism for the remission of sins. They have done all they could to disprove that doctrine, and they professed that they knew it wasn't so because their experience tells them that they were saved without it. And yet while they are thus fighting and persecuting those that teach the truth on this question, they submit to baptism, and my opponent says they were saved; therefore, they were saved while fighting the truth, saved while fighting the truth.

Sect preachers sow corrupt seed by teaching false doctrine. They tell their hearers that they must be saved before baptism. That is corrupt doctrine; that baptism has nothing to do with their salvation, another corrupt doctrine. Such preaching is believed and obeyed. Result: A good tree from a corrupt seed, Sommer.

I mean by that, he will say they have been saved, although their obedience was prompted and germinated by the sowing of a corrupt gospel.

Baptism because of remission of sins is a commandment of men. Matthew 15:9, we read, Teaching for doctrine the commandments of men is vain worship; yet by

teaching this commandment of men, because of remission, and persuading people to accept that doctrine and to be baptized for that reason, will produce great good, according to my opponent, because it will bring them of one in the spirit and bring them into relationship with Jesus Christ.

Pray tell me, my friends, how that doctrine and commandment of men which is vain worship, if practiced by an individual will bring him into the remission of his sins? If so, we ought to glory in the fact that such false doctrine is advocated, and so many people have been led to accept it, and thus become children of God, according to my opponent.

Once more, baptism because of remission of sins is a human tradition, rom on this side of the apostles. Sects set aside the law of God, "baptism for the remission of sins," for this tradition.

In Mark 7:8-9 we read: "For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men." Therefore, "Ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your tradition."

The man today who rejects the truth that baptism is for the remission of sins, rejects the truth of God, and by rejecting that truth, he holds to his tradition that baptism is because of remission, and if that tradition, my friends, sets aside the truth of God as Jesus Christ said it would, then pray tell me how it can be instrumental, or a factor of salvation to anybody.

We next desire to call your attention to Second John, 1:9-10: This passage has been introduced before, but I want to investigate it more fully, now.

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:

"For he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds."

Sect preachers transgress the doctrine of Christ by

teaching the very reverse of that doctrine. People who submit to their teaching are bidding them God speed. I mean by this, sect preachers reverse the commandment of God, like this: Jesus said, He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. The sect preacher says, He that believeth is saved and ought to be baptized. Therefore, he does not bring the gospel of Christ only in a perverted form. He is not bringing the doctrine of Christ, and a man who submits to that kind of doctrine has not submitted to the doctrine of Christ. Neither the preacher nor the convert has the doctrine of Christ, and we are commanded not to receive them into our house. That applies not to the dwelling houses but to the House of God.

Yet here comes this man who has perverted that gospel, and Brother Sommer has charge of the house in this certain locality. He says, "Brother Sommer, I want to come in with you and be a member."

"All right, we will receive you, although you didn't bring the doctrine of Christ with you. You brought a perverted doctrine," and hence you are partaker of the evil deeds and encouraging men to sin and not only that, but you will be the cause of some being encouraged to go to the judgment living in such an error as that.

Who submits to baptism without a purpose? I want you to answer that question, dear people, in your own minds. Who is it that ever submitted to a baptism of any kind without they had a purpose or design? Nobody ever did. No one ever submitted to baptism of any kind without having faith in the design. They believed they would get what they were being baptized for. People believe it essential to membership in a denominational church, and submit to it with that design in their minds, and that is certainly an un-Scriptural design. Yet my opponent says a baptism without a Scriptural, with an un-Scriptural design, is valid baptism.

The spirit of the devil puts the wrong design in the minds of one being baptized. Of course, the spirit of God never put the wrong design. My opponent says their baptism is valid, therefore, the spirit of the devil leads them to become a child of God, and when you sing, according to

this doctrine, you ought to sing a few songs of praise to the devil, and thank him for deceiving these folks and making them believe a wrong doctrine about baptism, because it makes Christians. So you can praise both God and the devil if that doctrine is true.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard my first affirmative speech on this proposition. We shall wait for my opponent to make a reply thereto.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I enjoyed that speech. I think I saw the length, the breadth, the height and the depth of one of these re-baptism preachers. I never heard a sermon like that before for nearly thirty minutes, twenty or twenty-five minutes. *I* have heard that set forth in near or about every possible form, I think. He may have something more for me hereafter, but candidly, that is interesting.

But he hasn't told you what sect baptism is. I think I can tell you. Trine immersion is sect baptism for it originated with the sect. It mangles the divine institution. Three dips of the upper part of the body, one in the name of the Father, one in the name of the Son and the other in the name of the Holy Spirit, and the lower part of the body once into the water.

I regard that as sect baptism because it originated with the sect, but the man who declares that single immersion pronounced or performed by the authority of Christ, and in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, that this is sect baptism, I fear is a blasphemer before God because he takes the divine arrangement just as it is found in the Book and gives it the contemptible human name.

Now, there is where my respondent stands. The sectarians take the divine testimony and preach it to the people with reference to Christ, they preach the gospel in its facts, yes in its prophecy, in its facts, death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Sectarians do this, and when they

do this, they produce repentance or conviction and repentance in many minds and hearts.

Then that is sect repentance according to my opponent, sect conviction and sect repentance. That is what it is. My respondent accepts that repentance. They have turned in mind and heart and life away from sin according to his reasoning. My opponent calls that sect repentance and calls upon them to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and they accept their sect repentance produced by a sectarian preacher and preached in a sectarian pulpit, and furthermore preached from a Bible the translation of which has been made by sectarians. According to his reasoning, whatever the sectarians do, why, that is sect; we have a sect translation or a sectarian translation, and this preached produces sectarian repentance and my opponent takes the same kind of a Bible and then he proceeds and denounces all that is sectarian and goes to work and denounces sect baptism as he calls it, though it is baptism performed in the name of the Godhead and the question arises, Where does he stand? I wouldn't be in his position one hour for anything that can be named from a human viewpoint. But I want to go back to his speech on another subject before going back to that other speech.

I wish to read you something that will give him and you something to consider that may do you good.

Romans 6:17-18: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.

"Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."

My opponent insists that they must obey from the heart that *purpose* of doctrine. Paul says that *form* of doctrine. He says that *purpose* of doctrine, and Paul says that *form* of doctrine.

I believe in standing with the Apostle Paul and the man who injects the word "purpose" here in place of the word "form" I regard as a gross perverter of God's truth.

Now, I go back to his few words with reference to the last speech. Much that he said was very much on the order of a reply to a speech to this effect: That war is a

nice arrangement. If I had said that war is a nice arrangement—he told you about the horrors of it—that war is a nice, pleasant, agreeable arrangement and he is trying to convince me that war is a very dreadful arrangement, why, the speech would have been in place. I never said it was a *nice arrangement*. I leave it to the audience. I never said anything to that effect, nothing of that kind. He has been replying to a speech *that I never made*, replying to a doctrine that I *never held*, replying to something that is just *the reverse of what I have said*.

War has been a dreadful something in every instance, but when wrong-headed men, like King George of England, and his parliament, forced war upon the people of the United States, I say (or rather, the Colonists) that the man who declares that we were a set of barbarians because we opposed it is not a good American citizen, and I think that he ought to be spurned out of every community to cast that kind of language about, the language of Napoleon Bonaparte at its full value a while ago. The farther you go, the worse it is. The man sinks himself every time that he undertakes to reply to the truth that I present.

With reference to the millennium, there will be this advantage for a thousand years, though the same principles will be prevailing. The Jewish people will be converted and they will have an earnestness and zeal that the Gentiles never thought of as a rule, and, friends, through that period the Devil will be bound, through a thousand years. That is when the best work of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ will be accomplished and when he can calculate that it is going to be accomplished; not while the Devil is loose and perverting people after the manner that he is through his agents.

Said the statement that war is hell, though made by Sherman—he accepted the connection that I made. That is only what we might call a historic error; I don't think it was serious—would have been just as true if Grant had said it. I say it isn't true. Neither Sherman nor Grant nor my opponent nor I can justly say we know enough about war to say, "war is hell." It is as bad as it could.

be, but, friends, we have no way whatever to decide what hell is like as far as the reality is concerned. We have a belief in it just as we have a belief with reference to a hell.

Why is a man a coward who won't enlist? I explained that. He is ready to serve his country. How often will *I* have to explain it? He is ready to serve his country when his country calls him, but he doesn't propose to select himself. There is the idea. We are not authorized to select ourselves, but to proceed along with our earthly affairs until our government calls us, and then meet the case.

Talked about "particeps criminis." That is "a participant in the crime"—if a man becomes a whoremonger that we select for the eldership.

I will let you know what Brother Harper handed to me. He says, "The men whom we elect to the Senate of the United States are our representatives; hence we are responsible."

Much obliged to you, Brother Harper. I might not have thought of that, but of course, mention was made of representative men.

Now, my opponent would have it that we are not responsible for anything that our Senators do and consequently, can just let them go on, and for that reason it doesn't make any difference. We can vote for them, and we are individually responsible.

He turned to the question of baptism when he laid down his proposition. No one obeys God in baptism who is baptized because of remission of sins. Why, suppose he is baptized because he wants remission, because he wants remission. His proposition is not well defined. Because of remission of sins in the future, because he contemplates, he desires remission of sins. Might as well say no one is baptized who obeys God in baptism who is baptized because of desire to be saved, because of a desire to have remission of sins. After defining that, I think I know what he means. Because of remission of sins; because he thinks he has received remission of sins. I think that is what he means, but didn't know how to state his proposition. If he did he made a mistake in this in-

stance. Mark 16:16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

Luke 24:47: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Acts 2:38: (I think he referred likewise to another passage, but be that as it may, the 2:38 passage he analyzed it in his accustomed manner, I suppose, and in that analysis he endeavored to fasten upon you that this modifies that and that the other and all that sort of something. Now the question arises, friends, how many of us understood that analysis when we were baptized? If we didn't understand that analysis, then we were not Scripturally baptized! How many, if I were to take a standing vote of this congregation—I suppose nine out of every ten of you would say, "I didn't." I didn't know enough about grammar, certain of you might say, to make an analysis—I just wished to obey the Saviour. I know that is the way it was with me.

I was in my twentieth year, but I had forgotten—I had been out of school for eight years—all the grammar I had learned. What I wanted to do was to do what Paul said, to obey from the heart the form of gospel, the form of doctrine delivered in the gospel. I felt satisfied.

I pointed out in my affirmative speeches on this subject that there are at least a half dozen different reasons for being baptized. I think I mentioned seven or eight, and I insisted if an individual were to be baptized to follow the example of the Saviour he would be right, and if he was baptized in order to be born of water, he would be right, and if he was baptized for the washing away of his sins as Paul was commanded to be, he would be all right; and if he was baptized for the answer of a good confession that would be a Scriptural reason. Who ever had all these different Scriptures in mind when he obeyed in baptism? Is he going to impeach every one of us and have us all go down into the water again with his analysis in mind? The more you look at that and think of preaching to a promiscuous audience any such analysis as that, the worse it becomes.

Now, he has made a tremendous speech with reference to that Acts 2:38, for the remission of sins, for the remission of sins, for the remission of sins. Why adopt that? Because it expresses purpose; it expresses design. How many of us have ever found the expression "design of baptism" in the New Testament? And more than that, "you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." How many of us understood that? How many? How many will say now that they certainly understand that? I made mention of that to my opponent. It referred to something.

I have forgotten the exact language, but I know the impression made upon my mind was very definite. I can tell him according to Galatians and Romans what it referred to, but I will save that for a later hour. I wish to call your attention to this. He has referred to "for the remission of sins." I have called your attention to a translation about which there isn't any doubt. Paul says, You have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you, and people could obey the gospel scripturally and not know anything about the second chapter of Acts. I am glad that it is there, and as it is in the original text, but I say to you very few people, unless they have been drilled by somebody like my respondent, think about remission of sins when they are being baptized, but they are thinking of obeying Jesus Christ. I am a sinner, lost, ruined, undone, without obeying Christ, and they wish to obey the Saviour in all that he requires. That is the difficulty.

A man said on a certain occasion, "I don't know what baptism is for, but I wish to be baptized. I know it is for something and I wish to be baptized for whatever the Lord intended it for." Wasn't that well enough? He had an indefinite idea, but it had the spirit of obedience in it. This idea "for the remission of sins," he did not have.

Now, friends, I am going to state something that will give my respondent something to do. I deny that the translation "for the remission of sins" is correct. I will give my opponent something to do tomorrow night on that subject. I deny that it is correct.

Later versions say unto and into. Unto and into. To

the remission of sins, unto, into, and that preposition that is there translated for, it is a strained translation and if we are going to make a consistent translation, and take that same word wherever it is found in connection with baptism, it will have to be "into remission of sins," and brought into that state or condition where we have remission of sins, and then after we have been baptized, why, if we sin after our baptism, we are in a state or condition where we can repent and pray and further secure remission because we are in that state where we are into remission of sins, or we are in that domain, and furthermore, I may mention that when the Apostle Paul tells us that those who have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to them, they were then made free from sin and became servants of righteousness, that tells their sins were pardoned and they were adopted into the divine family, and that is the reason when a man submits to single immersion in the name of the Godhead, performed by the authority of Christ, undoubtedly, friends, that individual has obeyed, if he is a sinner, from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered and the man who calls that sect baptism, sect baptism, sect baptism, sect baptism, undoubtedly dishonors himself and his profession as a Christian and dishonors the word of God.

Now, you see how that matter stands. Here is a challenge for him to take that matter up and show to this audience tomorrow in the afternoon or in the night, just whenever he sees fit to take it up, I deny that this translation is strictly correct.

He says, My opponent has it, get saved first and then join the right church. He doesn't believe in any right hand of fellowship, I judge. Doesn't believe in any local membership. Well, now, if there isn't any formal reception into the congregation, there can't be justly any formal rejection. If a man when he is sincerely baptized is brought into the local congregation, then when he gets drunk he goes out of the local congregation, and you dare not discipline him. If you do you are liable to a lawsuit, and lawsuits have sometimes been threatened when individuals

have been threatened with exclusion because of their villainous characters. I have heard of that. A vile character came in and communed and pretended to be a member of the church, never having been received, and then the elders, evangelists or whoever they were, didn't know what to do. They were disgraced by that vile character coming in and pretending to be a member, and they could not say that one isn't a member and can't exclude that one. That one acts just like a member, just like all the others on the Lord's Day.

They that believe a lie shall be damned. Goes over to where the Lord will send strong delusions, (that is over in Thessalonians) and forces that passage into this discussion about baptism. Listen: The more you see of my opponent's misuse of Scripture, I think the less confidence you will have in him. We find here in Second Thessalonians, referring to the Wicked One, in other words, the man of sin, "Then shall that Wicked One be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

"Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders..

"And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:

"That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Now, he refers to that class of characters in trying to besmirch and bemean humble and penitent individuals who have had by their preachers imposing something to that effect that feeling is an evidence of pardon. I explained that the feeling is an evidence that they have surrendered themselves to Christ, mind, heart, soul, body and spirit, ready to do his will. When they make that surrender, they feel joyous. The preacher says that is evidence that your sins have been pardoned and not knowing any better, they believe it. I will put it in that shape. They regard that as

evidence of pardon, but when they hear the Gospel preached in its evidence and simplicity, they come to different conclusions and they see the preachers had lied to them on that subject, intentionally or unintentionally. They are ignorant; they think feeling is an evidence of pardon, and later they think they should reject that and proceed to obey the Saviour by taking their position with his church.

Well, but somebody says, what about baptism? They have been sincere. Certainly if they have been sincere, they have "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine" which was delivered to them. My opponent says by implication that isn't sufficient. They must obey from the heart that purpose of doctrine, that purpose of doctrine, that purpose of doctrine and mere form will not do.

Now, the more you look at that, friends, the more you will see that my opponent has been trying to lead you to believe that I am in this, that and the other kind of a predicament. He is in the predicament. I wouldn't be there for any man's millions, not even for one hour.

I regard the re-baptism extremist, friends, a very, very dangerous character and a dangerous position, and the sooner we all banish that idea and take Paul's language that those who have obeyed "from the heart that form of doctrine" have been "made free from sin and become the servants of righteousness," why, the better it will be for us.

I wrote down sect baptism, sect baptism, sect baptism. I said, what of repentance? Is everything that the sects do, is it tainted and turned into sectism; as I said before, here is a translation made by sectarians, good enough for me with the exception where it will mislead an individual like my respondent and cause him to preach a false doctrine.

Don't believe baptism for remission of sins, and they persecute. Well, dear friends, what is my opponent doing but persecuting, and the ones who stand with him, what are they doing except persecuting those who don't accept their idea on certain questions. As far as we are concerned, we are disposed to leave them in a quiet, peaceable position and go somewhere else and build up what we hope will be right in God's sight.

"Vain worship." Went over and got that in Matthew, 15th chapter, and said that teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, why, that is vain worship. Those different denominations, they preach faith in Christ as the Saviour of the world, and preach repentance upon the divine testimony. Some of them may have peculiar ideas about faith being a special gift, but that is because they don't analyze the case clearly. But as far as that is concerned, we find they have truth, and my opponent accepts much of the truth that they have as I have already shown.

Second John, 9-11: Partaker of his evil deeds. Oh, yes, going to blacken everybody that will not accept his doctrine of sect baptism. Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ. I submit that my opponent has not abode in the doctrine of Christ when he has said, purpose of doctrine instead of form of doctrine, and emphasizes purpose of doctrine instead of form of doctrine. He doesn't abide in the doctrine of Christ; made a mistake, went beyond. He says, they come with a perverted Gospel, and that is the spirit of the devil; just simply blackening and darkening and sickening and condemning, if possible, with two-fold condemnation, three-fold condemnation, everybody who doesn't accept his ideas of sect baptism. I would like for him to define what constitutes sect baptism; then I will have a definition of what constitutes sect repentance and sect faith and what constitutes sect Bible.

They are all the same principles. The sects did not make the baptism and form of baptism, but trine immersion I have regarded as sect baptism, and it is practiced by those who are very seriously sectarian.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have my heartfelt thanks for your kind attention. May God bless you all.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The proposition is: No one obeys God in baptism who is baptized because of remission of sins.

My opponent criticized the wording of this proposition, but his criticism does not amount to anything as I see it, because that expression is so common that every one is

supposed to understand what it means which is, because of remission of sins. Of course, I mean by that, that one is submitting to baptism because they believe that their sins, their past sins, have already been remitted, and my opponent's efforts at this point were futile and without any avail.

I shall now present five questions for my opponent to answer in his next speech, as this session will close this proposition. Does one obey God who is baptized because of remission of sins?

Second, As obedience implies a command, where is the: command to be baptized because of remission of sins?

Third, Does one obey God who is baptized for the purpose of getting into the Baptist Church?

Fourth, Can one be Scripturally baptized without the design to obey God?

Fifth, If Romans 6:17-18 excludes purpose, does it not exclude baptism for the purpose of obeying God?

The only passage of Scripture that my opponent seemed to fall back on for support was Romans 6:17-18. *He* quoted that over and over some fourteen or fifteen times in one speech, I am going to state in reply to the way he quoted it to make it fit my position as he thought, that it is just *as* detrimental to his position as it is to mine. Here is the way he quoted it. "But ye have obeyed from the heart that purpose of doctrine," and then corrected it and said, form, not purpose.

My opponent contends that every one who is Scripturally baptized must have the purpose to obey God. Then I quote the passage against my opponent, "But ye have obeyed from the heart that purpose of doctrine," because he says that the purpose to obey God must always be there.

So in just a few words I have paralyzed his effort to break my chain of argument with this passage.

There is one thing that has been said heretofore that I now wish to correct. My opponent said that Alexander Campbell joined the Baptist Church after his baptism. I am going to present a reading from a book called "The History of the Reformatory Movements," by F. L. Rowe, in which he quotes from the Harbinger for 1848, on Page 344:

"I had no idea of uniting with the Baptist more than with the Moravians or the mere Independents."

In the same quotation we read: "They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches and though not a member to preach for them."

Now, does that sound like Alexander Campbell regarded himself as belonging to the Baptist Church? Every one who is familiar with the baptism of Mr. Campbell remembers that he was baptized contrary to Baptist usage. Dr. Luce, who administered the baptism, was a Baptist preacher, and at first refused to baptize the Campbells upon the simple confession of their faith in Christ, but finally consented to do so, saying it was contrary to Baptist usage, and yet my opponent will try to make you believe that he was baptized otherwise and joined the Baptist Church. Campbell speaks for himself here.

Replying to his speech of yesterday evening in which he says I had not told what sect baptism is, and he finds only one sect baptism, trine immersion: If he were to tell you why trine immersion was sect baptism, he would have to tell you that it was a baptism unauthorized in the New Testament, and one that was created since the days of the apostles. Just so then with any other baptism that had its origin this side of the apostles.

My friend will accept baptism from the sectarians today that oftentimes in its history has had to go back to some foreign country to seek for valid baptism, as in the case of Hunt and others, and they themselves realize that they have created a baptism different from that which we practice because they will not receive our baptism should we present ourselves for membership in the Baptist Church.

Certainly the whole Baptist denomination ought to know if their baptism is identical with ours. He says the sects preach Christ and different parts of the Gospel.

I wish to read from a tract written by my opponent's brother, one of their important debaters, in "Forty Reasons Why I Am Not a Baptist," by W. G. Roberts. Mr. Roberts says, "My fourteenth reason is that they (referring to the Baptists) don't believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, "

I wonder then if they have the same faith concerning Christ that we ought to have to qualify us for baptism? Mr. Roberts goes on to say that they teach that Christ is the father and eternal God in one person; therefore, he could not be the son of himself.

So Mr. Roberts must be wrong if my opponent is right, but if Mr. Roberts is right, that the Baptists don't believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, then my opponent is wrong.

Then I ask, How can the acts of obedience which follow false faith be any better than the faith that prompts them? Impossible.

He said that I adopted the faith and the repentance of the sectarians, but repudiated their confession and baptism. I have not adopted that faith which says that Jesus Christ is the very eternal God, neither have I adopted that faith when they say that they believe that God for Christ's sake has pardoned their sins; neither do I adopt their confession because they confess their feelings instead of Christ.

Concerning the note that was passed to my opponent that stated that we are responsible for Senators because of the fact that we elected them to the Senate, that we were responsible for their actions, I suppose that we are to conclude from that, every one who voted for the Senators got into the Teapot Dome mix-up, are just as guilty of trying to defraud the government in that oil scheme as they were. You can align yourselves up with them and confess that you are guilty if you want to, but please excuse me.

He wants to know how many understood my analysis of Acts 2:38 before they were baptized. That doesn't have anything to do with this proposition. Many people understand the meaning of a statement without knowing how to analyze it. A man marries a woman in order to have a wife. I wonder if he has to analyze that wife and know all about what she will be to him before he can marry her. in order to have a wife. Certainly not. One can comprehend that the blessing to be obtained is the remission of sins although they may not be able to analyze the passage that says so from grammatical standpoint.

I might tell a man to work in *my* field in order to receive ten dollars. He would know he had to work in order

to get ten dollars, but could not give a grammatical analysis of the text.

I wanted to know how many knew they had the gift of the Holy Ghost before they were baptized. If he means how many understood that they were to receive the gift, all of them did, but to ask a man to describe all about what that gift is, is a different proposition. A man can be baptized in order to get the gift without being able at that time to comprehend all that that gift may mean to him after he gets it, not any more than a man can comprehend all that a wife will be to him before he gets her, but he knows he has to marry her in order to get her. That is the initial design.

He then relates about some fellow that wanted to be baptized for something, he did not know what, but he was sincere and that made his baptism valid. That is going the limit, isn't it?

Just so, then, a man is sincere in what he does, it does not matter for what purpose he does it.

I am satisfied that Cain was just as sincere and intended as much to obey God when he brought the fruit of the ground, as did Abel when he brought the fruit of the flock, but the Lord didn't accept the offering, and therefore, his countenance was fallen. Many illustrations such as these could I give, but the importance of this point does not demand it farther.

Then he says, I deny the translation as correct "for the remission of sins," and then proceeds to turn translator and tells us it should be rendered "into the remission of sins." Suppose I accept his rendering; then we will read the verse: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ into the remission of sins." That makes "being baptized into remission of sins" a part of the command just the same as if it said "for the remission of sins," and that doesn't help my opponent one bit in the world.

I don't know who would be the best translator, my opponent or those who have given us translations of the Bible, and upon this point I wish to call your attention to how a few of the translators render this passage.

Living Oracles, endorsed by Campbell, rendered Acts

2:38 "in order to"; the King James Version, the Twentieth Century Version, the Emphatic Diaglot, the Berry Interlinear Version, A New Translation (Moffat) each read "for."

Here are quite a number of translators that translate it "for." H. T. Anderson's reads "in order to." Modern Speech reads, "with a view to."

Now, you, my listeners, watch my opponent contradict all of these translators and claim the knowledge and the ability to heat them in translating the passage. If he does so, he will manifest that arrogance that should not be manifested by one, when compared with the scholarship of the world.

He says that we don't believe in the right hand of fellowship. Well, he spoke without knowledge there. I believe in the right hand of fellowship like they gave to Paul and Barnabas when they were sending them away on a missionary tour, but I never read where anybody was taken into the church by the right hand of fellowship. My Bible said the one body is the church and that we are baptized into one body, but my opponent says you right-hand-of-fellowshipped into the one body. So different, so different!

Then he states if we have no formal reception there could not be a formal exclusion. Suppose we take it for granted that obedience to the Gospel is the best form of reception of a member and withdrawing fellowship from them if they walk disorderly the best exclusive proposition.

If it is regarded by us as a religious body, that the fact one believes on Christ and is baptized for the remission of their sins, that is the formal reception into the body of Christ, then who could bring a lawsuit if we undertook to withdraw fellowship from that party? Not anybody.

Listen for my opponent to bring the passage where the right hand of fellowship gets you into the church. That is his position. You will find it in the third chapter and the 15th verse of your great-grandmother's imagination.

Referring to sectarian preachers, telling sinners that their sins had been forgiven, he says these preachers lied. But these people whom they preached to believed the lie, and in sincerity obeyed the very lie they were told by the

preacher. Result: Child of God—Daniel Sommer. Can you think of a conclusion like that being possible? He says the common translation, meaning the King James, is good enough for him unless where it misleads folks, and of course, my opponent is to be the judge about translations. All the translations of the Scriptures comes under the scrutiny of my opponent and it is a wonder to me that he does not get out a translation that is better than all the rest that have been gotten out.

In Matthew 15:9, when I showed that to teach for doctrines the commandments of men was vain worship, and that baptism because of remission was a doctrine and commandment of men, and that the one who complied with it was worshipping God in vain, my opponent said they preached some truth. Yes, the devil preaches some truth. He preaches a part of the truth, and my opponent left the impression that if men did preach some of the truth and mixed the doctrine and commandments of men with it, that it would produce Christians if believed and obeyed.

Here is a mixture of truth with falsehood; the product, a child of God, according to my opponent. Not a word of it true, my friends, the way I see it.

Now, that covers his last speech.

I want to call your attention to the fact that instead of following my arguments and refuting them, either in forward order or reverse order, he let them all strictly alone and introduced a counter-line of argument from Romans 6:17-18 without refuting the arguments I made concerning this proposition.

No doubt if they could have been refuted he would have done so, but the best he could do was to bring up a counter line and try to show there is a contradiction in the Scriptures, and that is what makes infidels. You should have first dispensed with my arguments and the passage I introduced, and then negative or rebuttal testimony would have been in order, but he did not do that.

For instance, the sects confess that God has pardoned their sins before baptism. God has not pardoned their sins—Sommer. Therefore, they confess a falsehood, —Sommer, They believe a lie—Sommer. They confessed

a lie—Sommer. Baptism prompted by believing a lie and confessing a lie makes Christians who are as yet not a member of any church—Sommer.

This is my argument; I am reading through my argument.

MR. SOMMER: Don't attach my name to your argument, please. Tell me where that is.

MR. COWAN: I will call you opponent; then it is all right in making a quotation like that, it matters not who he is, whether present or not present.

Again I will call attention to the fact that many such arguments I presented were not noticed. The last one I will mention now. I asked the question, Who submits to baptism without a purpose? Not anyone. It is impossible to conceive of a man or woman who has intelligence enough to be accountable before God going with a preacher into the baptismal font and being immersed who had no purpose in it. There is bound to be a purpose there. Well, what is the purpose one has in mind in submitting to sect baptism? To get into a sect church. That is the object they have in it. It is a non-Scriptural object, and yet my friend will take those, that bring not the doctrine of Christ, by the hand and welcome them into his house and bid them God speed and send them clown to the Judgment unprepared to meet God.

I wish now in the remaining moments of my time to read some authority on this question. The first authority shall be from Franklin in "The Gospel Preacher." Volume 2, Page 135: (Be it remembered that Franklin was the founder of the paper that my opponent now publishes.)

"The Divine Spirit, Acts 2:38, connects both repentance and immersion in the same sentence, in view of the same thing—remission of sins. The same words here that tell us what the repentance is for, or in order to, or what men are to have in view of repenting, tell us also what they have in view in being immersed. They are both in view of the same thing, remission of sins. The object the sinner has, the seeker or subject, is remission of sins. He repents and is immersed in view of this object, "

Now, this is language from the founder of the paper that my opponent is now the editor of.

I want to read another statement and possibly my opponent will recognize the language. If not we will get it for him.

"What is the position of the Church of Christ on this subject of rebaptizing those who come to us from the sects?"

Answer: That position has already been set forth in these words, "A majority of those who have been immersed by the sects should no doubt be immersed again."

My opponent said it. This is his own language, but if the majority of those who have been immersed by the sects need immersing again, it is because they were not sincere in their first immersion, because, my friend has argued that if they submitted to it sincerely that their baptism was valid. Therefore he lays the charge to the majority of the members of sect churches that they were acting insincerely when they submitted to baptism at the hands of a sect preacher.

Now, talk about hating to stand in a man's position. Talk about being afraid to be caught out with a man of my caliber. Talk about men who are disposed to call their neighbors, their religious neighbors, hard names, but here it comes from the mouth of my opponent that the majority of sectarians should be immersed again. That means they were not sincere in their first immersion, acting the hypocrite, because my opponent argued strenuously last night that if they were sincere in submitting to baptism, or sect baptism, that they were all right and needed not to be rebaptized.

Now, we have him condemned out of his own mouth, or else his judgment is, the majority of those who have submitted to sectarian baptism need to be rebaptized, or else they were insincere in their first baptism. That is pretty hard. I don't say that, I condemned him out of his own mouth.

I read again from W. G. Roberts *in* Forty Reasons Why I am not a Baptist, "Baptist baptism is not Scrip-

tural anyway as we will show farther on in other articles." That is your brother, my opponent.

In the same book, "When I went into the U. B. church, (meaning United Brethren) I was put under water. That is, about six months after I went in I was put under the water. We waited for warm weather and warm water. I afterwards learned I had not been baptized and demanded baptism."

There never has been a person who was baptized with the understanding it was for the remission of sins ever demanded rebaptism, but thousands and thousands of brethren have become dissatisfied with their denominational baptism and have demanded baptism for the remission of sins.

My brother, my sister, you can not afford to go to the Judgment of God with that doubt in your mind, and there is a doubt. If there had not been a doubt there would have been no debate. That is why we are debating.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: With all that speech before you, I have no doubt you are wondering how in the world will he get around it? My, what a conclusive effort he has made! Sommer against Sommer, and Roberts against Sommer! And Sommer against the Bible, and various other things! What in the wide world is going to become of this man Sommer under these circumstances?

Now, in the first place, friends, I remind you that my opponent is not debating with W. G. Roberts. He has introduced him time and time and time again. He is debating with one Daniel Sommer, and he can't find anywhere that I ever endorsed W. G. Roberts' tract on Forty Reasons why he was not a Baptist. I glanced over a few pages of it once or twice and saw that it was an extreme effort, a strained effort, and one that I could not endorse.

MR. COWAN: You repudiate him, do you?

MR. SOMMER: No, sir, I put it in this shape: It is an extreme effort against the Baptists just about as my respondent has made an extreme effort in his handling of

certain Scriptures here, an extreme effort in endeavoring to make an impression, and whether he has made the right impression or the wrong impression, that is another question. I would not undertake at all to defend W. G. Roberts' tract on Forty Reasons why he was not a Baptist; I wouldn't undertake to defend that any more than I would certain of my opponent's statements because they are strained efforts.

Now, thus I dispose of everything that is said with reference to W. G. Roberts.

Secondly, W. G. Roberts is a practiced debater. He has held a great many discussions, just like my opponent, and this brother (meaning Brother Harper) said to me the other day, "I haven't very much confidence in these finished debaters," (I believe that was the expression that he used) "because they endeavor to make a point against their opponent whether the truth always demands it or not."

I wrote to Brother W. G. Roberts years ago and told him I would like for him to come and go through the Bible with me before he did any more debating. He is a good evangelist, and I regard him as a good man, in many respects, a very excellent man, but at the same time, he uses extreme expressions that I would not use.

Now, on this question of Sommer against Sommer, I propose to dispose of that altogether by just one declaration: my respondent has scrapped the writings that he has read from me, and in scrapping them he has used such sentences and such expressions as he could use. I don't propose to follow him or try in any wise to do anything by way of answering that sort of effort on his part, except just to make this statement: I trust that the debate, when it will have been published, will cause all those who are interested in the subject to send for the tract or tracts from which he has read and read for themselves and verify these statements in their connection. I say he has been what might be called a scrapper of my writings.

Now, he has presented this series of questions here, and they are shaped after a manner that he thinks, and he has what is called "a dead open and shut," and demands that I shall reply to them in my next speech. Peculiar time

for him to make a demand of that sort. Usually I have questions presented long enough ahead for a man to think over them, but these fortunately, don't require any special thought on my part. You have heard them read. In response to all of them I answer: I showed about six or seven reasons for obedience in baptism in my first speech on the subject. You all recollect that if you were here.

To imitate the Saviour who said that he was baptized to fulfill all righteousness; to be born of water; and likewise to be buried with Christ by baptism into death and to put on Christ, and furthermore, for the purpose of a good conscience, the answer of a good conscience before God, and furthermore, Acts 2:38, into remission of sins. That is the translation I prefer, and I will tell you presently why I prefer it.

Well, now, there I have mentioned a half dozen reasons. My opponent in his determination to find reasons in his first speech on the negative, said every one of these expressed design of purpose. Every one of them, design of purpose. Well, then, if a man was baptized with the design of purpose, to imitate the Saviour, that was a Scriptural baptism, according to him. It indeed accomplishes the very something that he is talking about, design of purpose. I don't use the design or the purpose after the manner that he does, and told you before that the expression design of baptism, was no more in the word of God than the expression, "getting religion." It is a humanly arranged form of speech for the purpose of trying to knock somebody down. I believe that I may safely say this.

Then in the next place, friends, you see whether an individual is baptized for any one of these reasons is baptized with a Scriptural design of purpose, according to my opponent's own analysis of those different Scriptures that I brought before him in my first speech on the affirmative of this question.

Now, you see how that answers all of these questions. Whether an individual is baptized for one or the other or for two or three of these reasons, he is baptized with a Scriptural design of purpose according to his form of speech.

Then in the next place, I wish to say this: that my opponent has passed from this and in order to make assurance doubly sure on his side, he says, What do you think of one who is baptized with the design of purpose to get into the Baptist Church? Yes, get into the Baptist Church. Get into the Baptist Church. Now, I will state what I have stated many times lief ore: If I hadn't any more confidence in the Baptist people as such than I have in their preachers, I would say, friends, that not only a majority of them, but probably all of them, ought to be baptized again. But upon whose testimony are they baptized again?

When I have gone to an individual and I have asked him with reference to his baptism, and he says, "I was baptized to get into the Baptist Church," I commonly say, "I wouldn't trust that any longer than I could get to the water." That has been my common answer when I heard anything of that sort. But I have been called upon to re-baptize as many persons who were baptized by disciples who preached "for the remission of sins" as I have been called upon to baptize sectarians taken all together, as individuals, as have been baptized by the sectarians, proving that it is an individual matter, after all.

Now, I think of something else that my respondent has ignored, and with reference to which he has misrepresented me. He said I dwelt altogether upon form of doctrine, form of doctrine.

Now, he knows, or ought to know, that in dealing with this question in my affirmative, I said that here are two ordinances, baptism is one and the Lord's Supper is the other. Now when we come to the Lord's Supper, what does Paul say? "Let a man examine himself." And if there is anything that is well understood among disciples, it is that we are engaged in a perilous business when we undertake to sit in judgment upon this, that or the other individual's fitness in the Church of Christ for the communion. We say that is sectarian, to sit in judgment upon the individual's fitness for the communion, and the one who speaks at the Lord's table, if he speaks judiciously, will say, "The apostle tells us, let a man examine himself," and the same apostle said in another place, "Who art thou

that judges another man's servant; to his own master he stands or falls. We are likely to make mistakes if we sit in judgment upon the persons who have been passing through the previous week, and we may think they haven't done what they ought to have done; when we come to examine we find they have done exactly what was right.

Suppose we see a man on Sunday morning going home with a gun on his shoulder, a dog behind, and rabbits in his hand. We infer that he has been out hunting Sunday morning, and he doesn't come to meeting, and then when he comes the week afterwards, and we look at him and have circulated this all around all over the community, why the deacons may hesitate to hand to him, if they are going to examine him, the Lord's Supper.

And when he finds out what this idea is, and why he is discounted and told about this, he says, "You don't understand this at all. My neighbor has typhoid fever, and I was up with him all Saturday night, and I did his chores and then he asked me to stay for breakfast; his son had borrowed my gun and told me if I didn't mind taking it home Sunday morning I might do so. And my dog was there and he followed me home. The son had killed several rabbits and if I would take some home, I might do so."

"That explains where I was and what I was doing; I was engaged in a deed of mercy. Now, you have drawn the wrong inference that I am not fit for the Lord's table because I was over there at that time."

That is a wrong inference; that is a mere illustration. Let a man examine himself. If that is true with reference to one appointment or one ordinance, it is true with reference to another, and the idea of sitting in judgment upon an individual after his baptism, that is as sectarian as for a Baptist preacher or a committee of deacons in the Baptist Church sitting upon an individual and hearing his experience, and after listening to it, saying he is fit for baptism. And then here is the disciple preacher on the other side, and he hears this experience, and he says, "No, you were not fit for baptism."

No, that isn't all. I called attention in my first affirmative speech on this subject to the Apostle Paul's language

in the second letter to the Corinthians, and the last chapter, where Paul says, "Examine yourselves, prove your own selves, whether you be in the faith." Not only on the question of baptism, but in regard to everything else pertaining to our lives, we are to do the examining. I brought that out.

My opponent says, "No, it is just *the form he dwelt upon*." You have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine.

I will tell you that this man needs watching every day, every hour, every minute, and he has pursued a course in reference to these matters, friends, that causes me to have a question of doubt in my mind about him in regard to every particular.

Now, you see his five questions are all answered in reference to this one declaration, all summed up in that one idea. Nothing in them. (Tearing the paper up and throwing it down.)

Now, I am going to read to you, friends, something about the Baptists. In the Reynoldsburg debate, which was held about fifty years ago, held in 1873, between Benjamin Franklin and John A. Thompson, a Baptist preacher, on page 21 of that debate I find this from Thompson concerning baptism: "This ordinance is for the remission of sins."

A prominent Baptist held a debate, and he says this ordinance is for the remission of sins.

Brother Jesse Love read sometime ago of a long article from one of the Baptist preachers, I think his name was Armitage, but I am not sure, a long article that has been copied in full in certain Disciples documents, and he said it is for the remission of sins. But now if I would stop right here, I might mislead you, but I am going to read the remainder of the quotation:

He says, "Not to put away sins in a personal or real sense, but in form, in figure, in visible representation of that gracious truth, the remission of sins through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus."

Now, there you are. Most prominent among the Baptists, has quoted a number of them, quoted by dif-

ferent ones of my opponent's side of the question in opposition to me on certain other questions. Here is a statement from one of them. I have the old book somewhere in my home, and I copied it from that when I reviewed or made an exposure of an unfortunate man, as I expressed it.

My opponent objects to the course that I pursued because I didn't consider every one of his arguments, as he called them. *I* will just say that so far as his various arguments were concerned, they are very like these questions, all summed up under a general heading, and I answered them in a general way, instead of looking after them in detail, and the audience can judge whether or not the main issues were brought before the minds of the people on that occasion.

Now, I am going to read a little something"; notwithstanding my opponent's criticisms, I am going to hand this over to the stenographer for the purpose of being copied, so many references here. He challenged me with reference to the question of translation. I am going to hand this over so that the stenographer may not be compelled to take this down just at this time at least.

"What do Greek lexicons or dictionaries say about the preposition *eis* which is used in Acts 2:38, in regard to its meaning or shades of meaning? A Greek-English lexicon to the New Testament revised 'by Thomas Sheldon Green, M. A. ' defines *eis* thus: 'into, to, as far as, to the extent of, until, before, in the presence of, in order to, for, with a view to, for the use or service of, in accordance with. ' Another which is in connection with the Greek text by Greenfield defines *eis* thus: 'On, into, upon, in, among, to, towards, upon, near to, by, towards, against, to, even to, until to, for, ' etc. Groves gives as a definition of the word *eis*: In, into; to, unto, until; among, at, before, in presence of; at, on, upon; towards, against; as to, in respect of, concerning; through, by; for, for to, in order to, to the end that, so that. Liddell and Scott say that the chief signification of *eis* is *into*. According to these definitions it is evident that the idea of purpose or design is not among either primary nor even secondary

meanings of the Greek preposition *eis*. That idea is not in the first shade of the meaning of that preposition in any Greek dictionary that we have ever seen, and very few give the idea of purpose even as a secondary meaning. Divine commands are generally, if not always, given in the primary meanings of words."

Just here I am reminded that my respondent was disposed to admit, so I don't need to read the rest of that. I have read more Greek here in these that I have just brought before you than has been brought before us hitherto. I don't like to talk very much about Greek because, friends, I well recollect the story of a negro preacher who preached, "Whar de hen scratch, dar am de bug."

After the discourse was over a sister came to him and said, "I don't believe there is any such passage that says, 'Whar de hen scratch, dar am de bug, ' because I have knowed de hen to scratch whar de warn't no bug." "I know dat's de way it reads in de English—'Whar de hen scratch, dar am de bug. But in de Greek it reads, 'Whar the hen scratch, dar am de bug, if de bug be dar. ' "

That is a fair illustration, friends, of certain individuals going after the Greek. Mistakes by those who don't know how to pronounce a Greek word when they see it, but add the genitive of the word to the original stem and seem to think it belongs to it. I would better not bother with the Greek; therefore, I deferred referring to this until last night. My respondent had made so much of what is called Acts 2:38, and made his analysis, that I thought I would deny the translation. He brought up the various translations here, and wants to know if I will set myself against them.

That leads me to think that I have more here which I ought to read, but I will not undertake it now inasmuch as my opponent has virtually admitted the translation "into," and then endeavored to show that it is in harmony with his position.

Now, with that much before, our minds, I will go back to these notes that I have here, and see what I can find with reference to them that may be worth replying to. I think indeed that I have already replied to near about everything

that he has referred to which has anything in it, that bears directly upon this subject, but I notice in one of my notes here that I say "Don't forget Philippians 1st chapter." So I turn to Philippians first chapter, in order to show where my opponent stands, and that he is not in harmony with the Apostle Paul.

Beginning with the 15th verse of Philippians 1st chapter, and we have this:

"Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife, and some also of good will:

"The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds;

"But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel.

"What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

Now, with that much before our minds, friends, you can see the difference between my opponent and the Apostle Paul. He rejoiced that the gospel was preached even to add affliction to his bond. It was made known to the people, and the gospel first consists of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and that is the great subject that should be brought before people before they are addressed with reference to the question of their obedience. And when they become fully convinced of the divinity of Christ and convinced of their sins, then the next question is to tell them what to do in order to be saved from their sins.

Now, with that much understood, you can see the difference between the Apostle Paul and my respondent in these respects.

I shall take a few minutes to look at the notes I have made with reference to him. My respondent seems to be able to pervert everything. I say, Don't forget his perverted remarks about meeting him alone. I made an analysis of this man and his constitutional make-up and I said if it wasn't for his religion I would not wish to cross his path, That is to say, go contrary to his will so as to stir his temper, and I think the audience generally under-

stood that, but he says I "would be afraid to meet him alone somewhere."

He says of me my criticism doesn't amount to anything because everyone is supposed to understand. Well, I might say his criticism doesn't amount to anything because everybody is supposed to understand this, that or the other with reference to what I say.

I made note of his five questions and then he handed them over to me. I have answered what he said about the only passage I referred to was Romans 6:17-18: Not true, not true, not true, and he knows it, because he was here when I made my affirmative speech on the subject.

F. L. Rowe or John F. Rowe—well, he quoted from Rowe's books and what Rowe said about Campbell. There is where John F. Rowe is to be spoken of again. He is a dead man. What is true with reference to it? Why, friends, he was a rhetorician, not a logician, not a close student, and as a result he scrapped the writings that he dealt with. * I have read the life of Campbell, and know that from the year 1812, after he was baptized, not wishing to remain in the Brush Run Church, he took his membership to the Redstone Church, in West Virginia, and remained there until by reason of the truth that he preached the sentiment was against him. He put out in the meantime a book, or seven volumes, called "Christian Baptist," and yet wasn't a member of the Baptist Church! Nonsense. And when he found the sentiment was against him in the Redstone Association, he moved his membership over to the Mahoning Association and remained there until the Mahoning Association went into the Brotherhood of Disciples.

I know what I am talking about on that question, John F. Rowe to the contrary notwithstanding, friend Rowe or whoever it is.

Sectarian and all the rights; accept baptism from the sectarians; they won't receive our baptism.

Well, there are individuals among them or denomina-

*NOTE: This remark about John F. Rowe was made while the speaker tonight thought that Rowe had been quoted instead of Campbell.

tions that won't receive each other's immersion, they are that sectarian as far as that is concerned, but we proceed and talk to them on the subject, and they hear the gospel as we preach it, and they say, After all, I was baptized to obey the Saviour; notwithstanding all their preachers may say unto them or the baptism being not for the remission of sins or they are saved before the baptism, I have never found one of them that was entirely satisfied with his acceptance with Christ until he was baptized.

A negro girl working in my home years ago was lamenting. Her father and brother had joined the Baptist Church, but had not been baptized, and died before they were baptized, when the flu or the grippe struck this community. My wife said, "What is the difference? Don't you Baptists believe you are saved before you are baptized?"

"Oh, but they hadn't been baptized."

The individuals, it doesn't make any difference what the preachers say, wish to be buried with Christ in baptism and delivered into the gospel in order for them to be satisfied that they are certainly accepted with Christ.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Now listen to my opponent with, the utmost care.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wanted those questions, but my opponent seemed so aggravated about having to answer them that he tore them up. That may be good ethics in debate, but I hadn't so learned debating. It is customary to hand the questions back after they are answered. I am not out of humor about it. I think I know why he tore them up, and will excuse it as all right.

MR. SOMMER: Not torn up; just torn in two.

MR. COWAN: He attributes to the majority of sectarian members that they all understood that they had to be baptized or they would be lost, and that is why the girl was lamenting her father and mother who had not been baptized.

Now, we have my opponent attributing to the majority of the membership of denominations the fact that their

baptism is right, but in the quotation I made from my opponent, he said the majority of them ought to be re-baptized.

Now, which time do you want us to believe you? One time he says the most of them don't need baptizing again; next time he says the majority of them do need baptizing again, and I don't know how to understand a man like that. That is my opponent versus my opponent.

He refers to the fact that Campbell published seven volumes of the "Christian Baptist" as proving that he belonged to the Baptist Church. I suppose he has forgotten that the word "Baptist" in history doesn't mean what the Baptist name does when applied to the denomination. Every one who believed in the immersion of believers were called Baptist in history, and that is what gave the book its title, not because he was a member of the Baptist Church, for he says himself twice that he was not a member.

In referring to Rowe's book from which I quoted, he proceeds to condemn and repudiate Rowe, but Rowe was only quoting Alexander Campbell, and he is the witness in this case, as his testimony appears in *The Harbinger*, a paper published by Mr. Campbell. So I would think that a man even though just a rhetorician and not a logician would at least have sense enough to know if he had joined a certain church or not, and he says he was not a member. That ought to settle that, it looks to me like.

He says were it not for my religion he would be afraid to meet me in some secret place or alone. I am glad to hear that correction, if it be a correction. I could have misunderstood him; that he attributes to me at least having that much religion, especially because I advocated it was wrong to kill, wrong to avenge ourselves, wrong to kill men in war because antagonistic to the principles of Christ which would exterminate war, and I am going to say this, I would not be afraid to meet my opponent anywhere even though he does show more of the fighting spirit than I do, and contends that it is right to fight. But enough for that.

Philippians 1:15, where Paul said Some preach Christ with envy and strife, but he rejoiced that Christ was

preached. He says Paul differs from me here. Not at all. I never object to any man preaching Christ. To preach Christ means to preach the doctrine of Christ. Baptism because of remission of sins is not the doctrine of Christ, and I do not rejoice when that doctrine is preached. With Paul I rejoice when Christ is preached, but my opponent rejoices because some other doctrine is preached and people sincerely believe it and obey it. He is the man that differs with Paul, not I.

After all the authorities from which he read on the definition of *eis*, the Greek word translated *for*, in Acts 2:38, I noted in several quotations he made, the following definition, "in order to, into, for, in order to, to the end that."

Now, I like those translations. It seemed to me that they are on my side of the proposition. If the word does have that meaning as the authority says, couldn't it have that meaning in Acts 2:38? Why was there none said it could not have that definition in Acts 2:38? Let's have one authority on the verse itself and Professor Thayer, the Greek-English lexicographer, is just as good and probably better than any from which he read. Most every debater and writer of every denomination today uses Thayer more than anybody else. In translating the Greek expression *eis aphesin hamartion*, he translates it, to obtain the forgiveness of sins, and cites Acts 2:38, the passage for us.

Then reading the verse with this scholarly translation, it would read, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ in order to obtain the remission of sins."

That should be enough to settle this question of scholarship.

He insinuated that I had driven him to the Greek. Well, that is the way a man usually goes when he can't defend his position by the English; he has to go to the Greek. I didn't go to the Greek first; you went to it first. You are man that quotes the Greek, "Whar de hen scratch, dar be de bug, if de bug be dar." You are the fellow on that side of the proposition, sir. You have run to the Greek to try to dodge the force of the expression, "for the

remission of sins," in English, and he scratched and scratched in all of those Greek authors that he read to you and dar wasn't any bug dar. He couldn't find any bug. If he did find a bug, it was this bug that every one of them defined to mean, "in order to," or words to that effect. They all gave that as one definition of the word *eis*, or words to that effect.

Again, he quotes from the Reynoldsburg debate, and tried to illustrate how easy it was for a man to scrap authors. I believe that, it is easy to do that, but I deny having scrapped authors in this discussion. I haven't scrapped his writings in the sense he may say I have scrapped them; I mean by scrap now to piece together, but I have scrapped his writings in the sense I have fought them, not only fought them, but have used them also to fight himself with or for him to fight himself with, and that is why it is so uncomfortable for him now.

He says he has seen enough of my debating, or words to that effect, to make him doubt me in every particular. After trying to fix up the statement about being afraid to meet me, he has gone ahead and made one worse. But I am not mad about it. This is one tactic of debaters. When they see their cause is lost, and the testimony is all against them, if they can make their opponent mad and get him to saying ugly things, it will break up the debate in a row, but you can't work that trick on me. I never was in a better humor in my life. I am all smiles over this debate, realizing we have the victory, and none of these slurs are going to cause me to lose it. I am going to say, "May the Lord have mercy upon my opponent."

In regard to baptism and the Lord's Supper he has said we have no right to judge a man before he eats the Lord's Supper. You remember an illustration he brought up on this formal reception and formal exclusion from the church? A certain man had acted so bad that they decided to exclude him and he threatened them with the law, and they had just to stay there, and eat with that fellow around the Lord's table, and him a vile character? If you had a form to receive him you would have judged him and not have let him eat, would you? Thou are the man who would judge one before he eats the Lord's Supper. In the lan-

guage of the Scripture, "with such an one not to eat." So that explodes that argument along this line.

Friends, it is easy when you know how. I am just taking my time and doing this deliberately, but positively.

He said if I had no more confidence in Baptists themselves than I have in their preachers I would say that the whole business should be re-baptized. Well, that is hitting the Baptist preachers a pretty hard lick, isn't it? Inasmuch as to say every Baptist preacher among the Baptist people needs to be re-baptized, because he was not sincere when he submitted to his baptism.

Now, don't think this is a misrepresentation because my opponent has said their baptism was valid, because they were sincere when they submitted to it, even though they did not understand what it was for. But when the Baptist preachers get their baptism, a long time, many of them, before they began to preach, then if they got their baptism in their boyhood days before they began the ministry, then was it not possible they were as sincere then as any other member of the Baptist Church? Then why bring this charge against the Baptist preacher? Won't that look fine in his book? Don't you suppose the Baptist preachers will give him a frown after they read the book and see that?

All right, we will go on to the next point. Now, as to the questions. He said he answers them all in this way: That he showed me six or seven reasons why that one should be baptized, and that I admitted that they were all purposes, objects or aims, but had you noted that in all of the six or seven that he gave, not one of them was because of remission of sins. Not one. All sectarian baptism, practically all, is performed because of remission, hence it can not be classed with these designs or these blessings that are stated to follow the one who is baptized.

I explained this once before, that the remission of sins was the initial design, and that these other things were included in that design in the form of blessings to be received by those who had submitted to baptism for this primary design. Just like a man marries a wife in order to obtain a wife, and all the blessings and pleasures she is

to him afterwards were included in that first initial design although not expressed there; yet that does not keep his marriage from being in order to obtain a wife.

So a man is baptized in order to obtain remission of sins, and then he naturally and rightly comes into possession of those blessings that grow out of that initial design or initial cause.

Now, it will not be necessary for me to go over that again as this is to appear in book form.

When I read these questions, Does one obey God who is baptized because of remission of sins? He didn't answer it, flatly refusal to answer that question. That is a pointed question; there is no' phraseology about it that is ambiguous, and that question demanded a respectful reply from my opponent. Why didn't he answer it? Because he knows that obedience presupposes a commandment and that you have no commandment to be baptized for that purpose; therefore, it can not be obedience, and the one who submits to baptism because of remission, may think they are obeying God, but they are not obeying God because there is no commandment given from God to that effect. From this conclusion escape is impossible.

The third question: Does one obey God who is baptized for the purpose of getting into a Baptist Church?

Now, he didn't answer that question. He tried to bungle things up and cover up the import of these questions by saying there are so many things in the Bible that a man is said to receive on account of being baptized, but that doesn't answer this question, a plain, simple question, Does one obey God who is baptized for the purpose of getting into a Baptist Church?

He could have said yes or no to that question. I know there are some questions you can not answer yes or no, but this one could be answered by a plain yes or no, and he refused to do it. Why? Because it was fatal to his position. That's it.

Can one be Scripturally baptized without the design to obey God? And he didn't answer it. The reason why I wanted these questions answered in this speech was because if he had waited until his next speech to answer

them, I could not have noticed his answers, but like It is now, I might as well have let him wait until his last speech, because he didn't answer them anyway.

Very well, I insist that if that design or purpose must be in one's heart, who is baptized, which is to obey God, then that Romans 6: 17-18, could be made to read, Obey from the heart that purpose of doctrine and that purpose being a desire to obey God.

Now, the truth about that passage is that the purpose is included in the statement, "Obey from the heart." The word "heart" here means understanding, the intelligence, and one obeys from the intelligence, the form of doctrine. In the intelligence is where the purpose is, and in the form is where the obedience is, so we use the intelligence, "That baptism is for the remission of sins." One submits to the form of burial and resurrection, and is thus made free from sins for which they were baptized to obtain their freedom, so the passage is mine.

I believe that covers the questions.

He refers to another thing that I thought was not necessary, and that is what he said about finished debaters, and about how they were regarded, how little confidence his friends had in those finished debaters. He means by that to apologize for himself, that he is not a finished debater. Cowan is a finished debater and that is why I can not meet Cowan on these arguments. Oh, if I was just a finished debater like he is, it would be as easy for me as it is for him. We accept your apologies and admit you are right about it, for the sake of the argument.

I tried to get him to say if or not, that he would take W. G. Roberts as authority, and he once said he did not repudiate him, yet he thought he was an extremist in that book. He is a little bit afraid to repudiate Roberts because he is one of his righthand bowers, yet in this debate, he can't afford to admit that Roberts told the truth in that tract, and yet my opponent didn't have the courage to show why he didn't tell the truth: just said, "he was an extremist, he is an extremist, and we are not debating W. G. Roberts."

Well, I may not be debating with W. G. Roberts, but

I am debating with my opponent and his moderator this evening, and I would like to debate with as many more as they could muster up.

I had a statement here in a tract that I wanted to read, to see if he would repudiate this authority; on page 11, of a tract called "Sectarianism," we will read the following language:

"Can the world be converted to Christ by means of sects or branch churches? No."

I will ask my opponent if that is good authority. This authority from which I am quoting is my opponent's, with whom I am debating.

The question is asked, "Can the world be converted to Christ by means of sects or branch churches?" "No." Yet if the sects or branch churches teach a man and baptize him for a wrong purpose, my opponent will receive him into his house and fellowship him, although this statement says he has not been converted to Jesus Christ.

Now, that makes things smoke but I can't help it.

Again on the same page we read: "What shall then be said of religious sectarianism? It is unscriptural and anti-scriptural. It defeats the end which the gospel contemplates."

Now, I remark, what end docs the gospel contemplate? The salvation of souls. Paul says, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is a power of God unto salvation. Then the end the gospel contemplates is salvation, and my opponent says these religious sectarian bodies defeat the end. In other words, they defeat the salvation of souls, and yet he is in this debate contending that they produce or effect the salvation of souls.

Now, I guess I have one witness he can't repudiate, unless he repudiates himself.

I want to read again on Page 10 of this same wonderful document, language like this: "What shall we say of those preachers who denounce all persons who happen to hold membership in sectarian denominations with a sentence of sweeping impeachment, as though they were all equally under the influence of sectism? We should say that they are probably more sectarian than some whom

they denounce. Their manner shows that they are un-Scripturally exclusive, and this is one of the elements of sectarianism.

"Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are identified with sectarian churches and wear sectarian names? No, not in the full and Scripture sense of the word Christian."

Then, my friends, you are bound to see if they are Christians at all they are just partly Christians, semi-Christians, maybe not over one-fourth or one-eighth Christians, and you have a terrible looking object of a person being born of God and made a quarter or eighth of a Christian by such an obedience, such a religious deformity. My friend takes him by the hand and shakes him into the church. (Page 10) One is baptized into the Church of Christ, not shook into it.

That completes his speech.

I don't see why I should ever say another word on this question. I have proved by the Bible that I am right in my proposition. I have proved by my opponent that I am right. I have proved by lexicons and historians I am right. What further evidence do I need? Seems like all that I need to do now is to sing the doxology and say, Amen.

Keep in mind, my friends, about twelve or fifteen arguments that I made in my first speech to which my opponent has not referred, and of course, if he refers to them in his last speech, I will have no chance to reply as we take up a new proposition tonight. Therefore, I say for the benefit of all who have heard this baptism question discussed that you do not take my word, do not take my opponent's word, but you take the word of the Lord, and if you can find such baptism as my proposition defines, which is because of remission of sins, anywhere in the New Testament, if you can find in the Bible where any one was ever baptized with any such design or for any such purpose, then you may safely confide in such baptism, but in the absence of such testimony, and I know the testimony is absent, you know it, my friend knows it, I ask you then for your own good in view of the judgment, in

view of eternity, please attend to that commandment and make your calling and election sure. Do not go through this life, my friend, my brother, my sister, relying upon a baptism that is at least doubtful and called in question, and one that you can not read about anywhere in the Word of God, when it is so little trouble to set the matter right, takes so little a part of your time, and so many opportunities that you have to do that right, that if I were you I would not go to judgment with that doubt in my mind, when you can have a baptism that my opponent and I both say is right baptism for the remission of sins. That takes no denial anywhere. That is Scriptural baptism, my friends, among all the disciples of Christ, or even those who claim to be the disciples of Christ. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER: (Closing rebuttal speech): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: My opponent thinks he has something to smile over and so have I, except from one viewpoint, something very saddening to me, to think that a man would pursue a course that suggests the odor of brimstone in order to make out his case. I say it is just the odor of brimstone. I have said he was a scrapper. I don't mean in, the sense of a fighter, but that might be applied to him; but a scrapper in regard to my writings. I haven't been careful on this subject because I knew very well that my writings would take care of themselves if read and for that reason I want it put into this debate that all those who wish to know what kind of a respondent I have had will need to secure a copy of the book or pamphlet called "Sectarianism—Analyzed, Defined and Exposed."

I will now state that in that tract or pamphlet they will find that my opponent is one of the intensest of sectarians according to the Scriptural definition of the word sect, but in regard to his scrapping of my writings I will just read to you one paragraph in which, or of which, he quoted a part.

"Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are identified with sectarian churches and wear sec-

tarian names? No, not in the full and Scripture sense of the word Christians." And he went on and made mention of part, third, fourth, fifth part, something like that, Christians, now you are going to receive them, and endeavored to make that as ridiculous as possible. Suppose he had read this:

"In mind and heart some of them are doubtless converted to Christ, but they can not keep the ordinances fully, nor be altogether in harmony with the gospel while they hold membership among sectarians and wear sectarian names. None of the denominations are wholly right, and none of them are wholly wrong. We should admit the truth and condemn the error in each, and should admit that many among the denominations are better than their sectarian creeds. Sectarianism is bad enough, and preachers of Christ should not strain their spirits with sin by misrepresenting what is found in sectarian systems."

This one paragraph shows that my respondent is a vile perverter of my language, and I use that in order to cover all that he has said in which he has tried to set Sommer against Sommer. It is by scrapping what I have said and putting a sentence here and a sentence there without any explanation against each other. That isn't all. My opponent read from John F. Rowe, these words: "They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches."

MR. COWAN: That is not Rowe's language; that is Campbell's.

MR. SOMMER: "Though not a member to preach for them. I often spoke to the Baptist congregation for sixty miles around. They all pressed us to join their Red Stone Association. We laid the matter before the church in the fall of 1813. We discussed the propriety of the measure. After much discussion and earnest desire to be directed by the wisdom which cometh from above, we finally concluded to make an overture to that effect and we wrote out a full view of our sentiments, wishes and determinations on that subject." Without reading all of the connection, I will just add this for it conies next: "We did so in some eight or ten pages of large dimensions, exhibiting our remonstrance against all human creeds and bonds of creed,

union among Christians, and expressing a willingness to co-operate with that Association provided always that we should be allowed to teach and preach whatever we learn from the Holy Scriptures regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom.

"A copy of this document, we regret to say, was not preserved and when solicited from the clerk of the Association was refused. The proposition was discussed at the Association and after much debate it was decided by a considerable majority in favor of being received. Thus a union was formed."

I have read the first part of it which said he had been solicited to go here and there and yonder, though he wasn't a member of the Association, and left the impression that he never joined it, but he said it was discussed and he did join them.

I again pronounce my respondent a vile perverter, not only of the word of God, but a vile perverter of documents which he has read here. Brother Harper borrowed that and called my attention to what was in the case.

Now, the inquiry arises, my friends, was I too severe when I said that my respondent seemed not to care (notice, I used the word *seemed*) for God, man nor the Devil, just so he made some kind of a showing against his opponent. I again say he has lost my confidence in every respect. I wouldn't trust him in any way, shape, form or fashion.

I again read from Thompson what I read a while ago in regard to the Baptist's, the debate held in 1873; on page 212 I find this from Thompson concerning baptism: "This ordinance is for the remission of sins, not to put away sins in a personal or real sense, but in form, in figure, in visible representation of that gracious truth, the remission of sins, through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus."

Now, friends, I will call your attention to Acts 10th chapter and Peter is preaching, at the House of Cornelius, beginning with the 42nd verse: "And he commanded us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead."

To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

Now, you have the Baptist ideas that they receive remission of sins when they believe whole-heartedly in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. You say you don't believe that; I don't believe that, but they believe that upon this testimony, and I don't believe, my friends, that they should be spoken of in the contemptuous and contemptible manner of the speech of my opponent about believing a lie, confessing a lie and then being baptized with a lie in their mouth.

"Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." They don't understand all that is embraced in the belief. We believe and hold it is the belief and obedience of belief; faith and the obedience of faith. That is where we stand, but they don't take all of the obedience we do and when they come to us, and as I said to you, and I find an individual who says he was baptized to get into the Baptist Church, I say I wouldn't trust that baptism any longer than that I could get to the water. You all remember that, but my respondent has endeavored to besmirch and bemean me all the way through on this question as accepting sect baptism. I demanded to know what sect baptism was and he hasn't found it. I on the contrary said that whoever says that single immersion in the name of the Godhead, pronounced by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, single immersion thus performed, that it is sect baptism when it originated with the New Testament Scriptures. I say whoever does that I regard as guilty of blasphemy or sacrilege or both of those combined. Follow that man if you wish, accept that doctrine, if you see fit, and friends, go on to the end and you can find out who will be right in the last Great Day. I don't believe that sectarianism as such will take people to heaven, and I don't believe that my opponent could find anywhere North, South, East or West more intensely a sectarian than he has proved himself to be by his speeches here. I don't believe that any sectarian has ever done worse on perverting the word of God on the one hand and the writ-

ings of his fellow mortals on the other than my respondent has done in this debate.

Talked about how many of his points I hadn't answered. I answered half a dozen of them in a single declaration.

He says remission of sins is the initial design. Who authorized him to say that any more than that somebody was authorized to say that you should get religion? He says I flatly refused to answer his questions. I did not refuse at all. I stated what was true with reference to all of those questions. They all belonged to the same group, and pointed out the Scriptures in which they had already been answered, and here he asked those and demanded an answer in what I said, and then stated that I flatly refused. There is no refusal in the case. I dealt with them, and I believe I dealt with them justly.

Says I didn't answer that question about being baptized to get into the Baptist Church. I did. I have answered it several times this very afternoon, that I wouldn't trust that kind of a baptism any longer than that I could get to the water.

"Just to be such a finished debater as Cowan is." Nothing of the kind, friends. I quoted the language of this brother who said that he had his doubts about these finished debaters. If I was going to shape *up* a special declaration on that subject, I would say, *professional debaters*, those who go from place to place and who are disposed to debate, debate, debate.

This reminds me that I happen to have here a copy of the paper with which my respondent is connected called "The Apostolic Way, Things learned, received, heard and seen in me do. Paul to Church of Christ."

The Apostolic Way is the gospel. Is that the Gospel? No, that is a presumptuous name; isn't the Gospel. But what is true here? I said before leaving home to my son who is here this afternoon, "Look over this and see how many times the word *debate* occurs?" One hundred and seventeen times the word *debate* or its equivalent is used. Besides these are *met*, *challenge*, *discuss* and *fight*, several times used in that one copy of that little paper,

Now, you see the disposition, friends. My opponent has shown it here. He has debated eighteen times the next question that we are to discuss, so he comes very nearly being a professional debater or at least he is the champion debater of the brotherhood with which he is connected. And I say to you that according to the tract which he has been quoting from and scrapping, according to that tract, if you will get it and read it, you will find he is one of the intensest sectarians that perhaps ever was in this state.

I wish to talk about ideas of Thayer. Was Thayer a member of the Church of Christ? Never heard of it. Never knew of it. What about all these lexicographers? Why, friends, if they were members of any church, they were members of the Roman Catholic Church, or some one of the Protestant sects, and he has brought sect scholarship here and introduced sect scholarship for the purpose of determining this question and here is our copy of the Bible, translated by whom? Sectarians.

Well, if for a sectarian to take an individual by the hand and receive some kind of a confession that has at least the confession of Christ in it, (for if a man says, I believe that God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins, he makes a confession of faith in God and Christ) but that isn't the confession upon which they are baptized. We find according to creeds, there is a confession more full than what we have asked. They are inquired of whether they believe in God and Christ and the Holy Spirit, and whether they believe in the resurrection from the dead and the forgiveness of sins and life everlasting, various doctrines. We find that in their creed, but they confess their faith in God and Christ and in Christ as the Son of God. They have other items connected therewith, that we teach them were not necessary and many of them have come into the Church of Christ and have become among the most outstanding members.

"Partly Christians, one-fourth, fifth." Yes, I have already dealt with the absurdity of what he said on that subject.

"Why it makes it so uncomfortable for him." Have

you seen any signs of discomfort in me, friends? That is all balderdash. As far as I feel, I feel as if I could continue this debate until the close of the year without the tremor of a muscle or of a nerve. I showed this brother my handwriting this morning. I think it was never more steady nor has been for the last twenty-five years. If anything, I am advancing as far as the question of enjoyment is concerned, and it is highly interesting to me. "Why so uncomfortable for him?" When he sees his cause lost, we can only make the debater mad. I don't think anything could make him mad. Why, no, the question is settled with him, as far as he is concerned.

Thou art the man that judgest a man about the Lord's Supper.

Let me see what was said about judging the man about the Lord's Supper.

Referred to the Scriptures, Put away from yourselves that wicked person. No, as far as that is concerned. Pie quoted the Scripture, Don't eat with that kind of a man. Just utterly perverted that. That referred to our social relationship to a man that has gone wrong. Rebuke him on the question of his wrongdoing by discarding him, and yet when you meet him, why endeavor to admonish him, but let him know that he isn't of the same standing. That is in the Apostle Paul's fifth chapter of his letter to the brethren at Corinth, and he had that man to be tried and to be excluded from the congregation by saying, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person," but that was the church, dear friends, which was set in order, no doubt, and there was an appeal to the congregation.

"Because it was not sincere; these Baptist preachers were not sincere." As far as that is concerned, friends, they may be sincere at one time and insincere at another, and for that reason we have said that we have more confidence in the people generally than we have in the preachers. The Baptist preacher will give him *the form*, He said, "Read Thompson again." I have done that.

Well, as far as I took notes, that is about all. That is about all I have here.

Now, let me see what I have in conclusion. I am not

at liberty to introduce any new evidence, simply rebuttal and I have done what was necessary in regard to this case in order to show that my opponent has misquoted me on the one hand, and misquoted Rowe on the other, scrapped my writings on the one hand, and scrapped Rowe on the other, and I say that is a fair sample of the scrapping which he has done all the way through, and in the very depths of my heart, I pity the man who is engaged in that kind of business.

Now, friends, the time has come for me to deliver a little exhortation. I earnestly entreat every one of you who has not had in your hand or possession that tract on Sectarianism, send to the Review Office, and get it and read it carefully from beginning to end, and when you will have read that with care, I think you will find that my opponent ranks with the rankest of sectarians. I wish you to do that, and then I wish you to secure also a copy of a tract there entitled, "An Exposure of An Unfortunate Man," and then you will have what might be called a pen picture of one of my opponent's friends who stands with him at least in most questions, and who is united with him in this particular paper called "The Apostolic Way," and you will be able to see that the man is not only not fair in dealing with the description of his fellow mortal, but that he is a scurrilous specimen of humanity, and my opponent has that kind of an associate, and seemingly endorses him even more than I endorse W. G. Roberts.

Now, with that much before your minds, I entreat you also to send to the Review Office and get that tract which is entitled, "Discussion of the Valid Baptism Question." It is between myself and the champion of re-baptism, no name to it, but it is one disciple and another disciple. That disciple called Another Disciple, wished to write for the Review some years ago, and I filled out some unexpired time on the paper that he had to give up and he was to write for the Review, and he said that if he was attacked on the question of baptism he would have to defend himself.

Said I, "Let's write a tract on the subject, and we can send that to anybody who would attack you on the sub-

ject," and he agreed to do so, and agreed that he would advocate his friends or call upon his friends to send for that tract, but would not do it. Fair sample of another man on that question.

And so, friends, I am afraid that these leaders, at least on these extreme notions, are without any scruples whatever on the question of advocating their particular notions. I told her that a certain lady said to me, who had been baptized by the Baptists, that she wished to unite with the Church of Christ, it was at Findlay, Illinois. I said, "What about your baptism?"

She said, "I am satisfied with it, but if you think I should go into the water again, I am ready."

I said, "You can't go into the water again on my say-so. Here is the gospel. Read the Book of Acts, especially what is found with reference to the cases of baptism there, and then if you are satisfied, I have nothing more to say."

How much reading she did I don't know, but when the time came for her to be received into fellowship into the church, she came with the others and I didn't ask any more questions.

Now, my friends, on this question of this extreme baptism, a great many have had faith in Christ and obeyed sincerely, but we have had some rebaptism extremist to address them and he has denounced sect baptism, sect baptism, sect baptism, never telling them what sect baptism is, why, they have become dissatisfied and have gone and been baptized again, and then afterwards have wondered whether their first baptism or their second baptism was acceptable to God, and being in doubt, why, they were liable to fall under the condemnation. He that doubteth is condemned, and "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

I have baptized a man the third time, not that I baptized him formerly, but he was first baptized by a Christian Church preacher, which was in the days of his early youth, and then by one of these extremists on the rebaptism question, and he said when he found out what kind of a man he had been induced to follow at that time, or had baptized him, he was not satisfied with it. He was in a

reading and before we had gone through the Gospel records, he said, "I wish to be baptized again," and I baptized him. Several years afterward he wrote to me and said, "I am satisfied now. My wife was likewise baptized again, and she is satisfied."

Now, I will make mention that over here at Red Key, in the state of Indiana, there was a man and his wife there that had been baptized by the Baptists, and had come into the Church of Christ, and were getting along well as upright and honorable as any people, and one of these re-baptism extremists came and told them their baptism was no good because they had been baptized by the Baptists. And then went back to history and found that Alexander Campbell was baptized by a Baptist, and that man broke down in the faith utterly, thought the New Testament Church was gone forever, and when I saw him the last time, he had the look of a man who is a condemned criminal because he regarded himself as doomed to eternal ruin just because he had lost all faith in the possibility of being a member of the Church of Christ.

Friends, I thank you kindly for your attention, and I say to you that the most saddening thought that I have had with reference to this matter is that my respondent has pursued the course he has, and has shown himself not to be scrupulous and if you will follow him, if you have confidence in him, the danger is that the divine condemnation will rest upon you all. Take the Word of God and don't be un-Scriptural on the one hand, or unreasonable on the other.

May God have mercy on us all.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative—Class Question): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I want to mention tonight before we take up the question for consideration, is some of the remarks of my opponent in his speeches this afternoon relative to me personally.

He said that I was a vile perverter of authorities. The word "vile" means "worthless, mean, ignoble, morally

base and impure." The word "ignoble," one of the definitions of "vile," means "of low birth, mean character."

I mention this not because it hurt my feelings, not because I think that it is worthy for me to reply, but for the purpose of apologizing to the people for Brother Sommer. I do not hold him responsible for the statement because in the condition of mind that he was in as manifested by his actions when he snatched a list of questions to pieces and threw them on the floor and then following that with the statement that I was vile, meaning morally debase, and of a low birth, of course, that was an expression of a fit of anger, and I ask you people not to hold him responsible for it, and I pray God to lay not this sin to his charge.

I am going to first read the proposition that I have formulated for discussion tonight: "Congregations of the' Church of Christ that oppose the class system and women teaching publicly are Scriptural in doctrine and practice."

If my opponent has objection to that proposition, I would be glad if he would so state.

I am going to read a passage from my opponent's book relative to teaching a public assembly: "Is it possible for a preacher of the Gospel to comply with more than one of these words in a single discourse? Yes, he may comply with them all and in view of the mixed audience which he is frequently required to address, he should in one discourse often try to arrest attention, lead people into willingness to become learners of Christ, then make known the Gospel as it is divinely intended for sinners, and finally he may teach the saints, or he may reverse this order, and first teach the saints and then turn his attention to sinners."

In other words, the preachers of Christ and all other public speakers in the church who are capable of so doing, should always adapt their discourses to their audiences, setting forth as far as possible, such truths as each listener should hear. Page 55 of the book entitled "Sectarianism."

On Page 56 we read: "Therefore, it may be safely said that a mixed audience calls for a mixed discourse on Lord's Day morning, and at all other times."

From these two statements, my friends, we can see that we certainly do agree on how a mixed audience of people should be taught, not only at one time, *but at all other times*. If my opponent will stand by what he has here said, I can not see room for any controversy, or debate upon this question. It will require that he repudiate this statement in order that he may deny the proposition that I am affirming tonight.

One other statement that I desire to read from his pen as a kind of preamble to this speech, will be found in his tract called the "Sunday School Question," Page 10: "But no one can justly claim to be a disciple of Christ and yet object to a church gathering all of every class to the meeting house or elsewhere, putting a Bible or a New Testament into the hands of each one who can read, and then reading and expounding the Word of God to them; then let this be done everywhere with diligence and to God's honor and glory."

This, my friends, is what I believe: Every congregation in the United States can safely unite and agree to go to work on this proposition laid down on Page 10 of Brother Sommer's tract. Inasmuch as the object of this discussion is not to widen the difference between us but to narrow it, I can not but think if we could both agree that this is a safe proposition to unite on, and it too being formulated by my opponent, why, couldn't we shake hands and say, The Churches of Christ shall all practice this in their public assemblies, and will be a oneness or one people, and division and strife over the teaching question will have come to an end.

Just before this statement on the same page, is where my opponent has said, "If one person in good standing objects to the division into classes, they should not be formed." However, he has repudiated that statement since this debate started, but yet that leaves a doubt that, that manner or method of teaching is not as safe as the one he mentions in the passage upon which I propose to unite with him and do away with our division.

I am going to make one other charge before I take up my regular line of argument. It is claimed that the purpose of the class system primarily is to save folks. Of

course, by teaching them the truth. I charge that there will be more people lost on account of it than will ever be saved by it.

Now, I realize that is a grave charge, and I am going to tell you why I make the charge. To illustrate, the Church of Christ in any given locality may be standing together, remaining united upon the principle that I have agreed to unite with my opponent, and hundreds of conversions may be brought about through their united effort, but if they divide because some are disposed to have the class system, and will have it anyhow, which brings about division, it causes the church in that given locality to lose its influence over outsiders, and hence there will be more people go to hell because they will not hear the Gospel from that church than can be saved by that church through the class system.

The nation-wide division that exists in the Church of Christ on this question has made us a stumbling block before the world and our influence has been greatly crippled and that too because designing men have advocated a system of teaching that has brought about discord and strife and division among the churches, thereby causing them to lose their prestige, and their influence over those that they should be converting.

With that much said, we shall now proceed with our line of argument for this evening.

I shall begin with this statement: Teaching the Word of God is the basis of all religious training. We are not opposed to teaching God's Word. We are highly in favor of it, and thus in this statement I make it the basis of all religious training. We have been accused as being opposed to teaching; been called such names as anti-Bible students, anti-teachers, but the titles are not appropriate. We spend as much time, we work as hard, at the business of teaching as anybody. The difference is not about teaching, but the difference is about the method or manner of doing that teaching and I believe now that is clearly defined.

Again I state that the position we occupy is not called in question; the manner or method that we employ in teaching an assembly the Word of God is practiced by my

opponent continually and repeatedly, so the method or manner that we employ is not causing trouble anywhere.

To illustrate: We teach these mixed audiences by preaching unto them a mixed sermon adaptable to both saint and sinner, as my opponent says should be done. My opponent does the same kind of preaching to those audiences; therefore, our method or manner of teaching that kind of an assembly is admitted to be Scriptural and right. All the doubt and all the debate and all the confusion in the minds of the people is about the method that he contends for in addition to the one upon which we agree. So I state, without fear of successful contradiction, that our position is not even under fire tonight, not in the controversy at all.

Some one may say, "Mr. Cowan, don't you all oppose the class system?" Yes, but our opposition is not our affirmative practice. That is our objection to the other fellow's practice. You can not make an objection a part of our practice. Take what we contend to be right, what we affirm that should be done with reference to teaching and nobody will deny it, and when a man produces another method not found in the Word of God, and we oppose that method, that does not make our opposition a part of out-practice. It is our opposition to the other man's practice.

We affirm that the home and the church are the only institutions ordained by God for religious training. Whatever teaching we do is done as a member of the home or church. We affirm that God established the relationship between a husband and wife that makes the birth of children legitimate. This established relationship we call home. It doesn't necessarily confine it to the residence. That is not what is meant by home, but it means to do things as a member of that home or relationship established by the God in Heaven between man and wife.

We affirm that God established the church, his family, through which the birth of spiritual children is legitimate. We affirm that when God established a home that made the birth of natural children legitimate, that he placed upon the parents the responsibility of morally and religiously training these children.

We affirm that when God established the church that made the birth of spiritual children legitimate, that he placed the responsibility of caring for these children upon the church or those who have the rule over the church.

Now, I don't contemplate that my opponent will disagree with these statements, but when we get farther on in the discussion, and learn that he is contending for some other organization besides church organization for doing this work, then there will be some debating about this question.

We affirm that when the home functions properly that the children will be proper subjects for Gospel address by the time they reach the age of accountability.

We affirm that it is the duty of parents to plant the principles of honesty, truth and right in the hearts of their children, which is the only soil in which the Word of God will bear fruit, and that the parents are the ones that can prepare this honest heart in their children.

We affirm that the truth will win any honest heart who hears it and retains it, and that the home that functions properly is entirely adequate to prepare this heart.

We affirm that it is right for parents to teach their children the word of God in their homes, and I will give the citations that prove that without reading them at the present time. Deuteronomy 6: 6-10—4: 9-10; Ephesians 6: 3; Colossians 3: 21; Proverbs 22: 6; First Timothy 5: 10-14; First Timothy 3: 4-5 and 12th verse.

These passages, my friends, teach conclusively and plainly that it is the duty of parents to teach their children the word of God in their homes. I don't suppose that my opponent will deny that and we know, too, it is right for the parents to teach the word of God to others in the congregation. Then you may say, "Where is the difference?" The difference will be developed when I show that the form, or to use what might be called a synonym to that word form, which means organizing classes, which is an organization more than church organization, then there will be some controversy between us upon these propositions.

Bear in mind I am laying down in my first speech some

general propositions that we expect to be the leading thought in our affirmation of the proposition.

Next we affirm that it is right to take the children to the assembly of worship. Deuteronomy 30: 11-13: I shall now read the passage in its entirety. "When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men and women and children, and the stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, that they may learn, and fear the Lord, your God, and observe to do all the words of this law and their children which have not known anything, may hear and learn to fear the Lord, your God, as long as you live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it."

Here is the passage, my friends, that teaches the duty of parents in the Old Dispensation to carry their children with them to the place where God's law was to be read, and it was read to every one of them in the same audience.

Joshua 8: 34-35 we read: "And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law.

"There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them."

How much plainer could language be than that? This teaches the duty of parents in the Old Dispensation to carry the children to the house of the Lord, but the question may be asked, Is it the duty in the New Dispensation? Certainly. We read now from other passages that teach the duty under the Christian Dispensation.

We affirm that the gospel of Christ is just as adaptable to all ages and abilities as was the law of Moses.

Now, I have held a debate with one man on this question that said the gospel was not adaptable to all ages of people and you had to fix the word of God up to suit them, the different ages and abilities. I hope my opponent will not take that position. To prove that this is true I read

some prophecies that bear reference to conditions in the Christian Dispensation, Deuteronomy 32: 1-2: "Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth."

"My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distill as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass."

Isaiah 55: 7-8: "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater;

"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: " From these two passages, which my opponent,

I am sure, will agree have reference to the going forth of the gospel of Jesus Christ; the word "doctrine" in the passage is the equivalent of teaching. When he says, "My doctrine shall drop as the rain," we may read, "My teaching shall drop as the rain."

I want to know, my friends, if the word of God comes like the rain, and the rain comes upon all ages of plants and vegetables just alike, and it matters not as to the size of the plant or the age of the plant, or the nature of the plant, that the rain is perfectly adaptable to all these different varied conditions of plants, and the word of God or teachings of God, being like the rain, don't you think that the word of God is just as adaptable to all ages of people regardless of their temperament or condition as is the rain to the plants?

I argue that it is true and any man who would try to fix the word of God or adjust the word of God so as to make it adaptable to different ages and abilities, had might as well get out when the next shower of rain comes, and try to fix that rain so it would be adaptable to all ages and sizes of plants.

If you can not fix the rain, and the word of God falls just like the rain, I would love to know how you can fix the Word of God. But my opponent says we don't fix the word of God. We just let it stay like it is. That being true, then there is no necessity of dividing into classes. If

you can't change the word of God, so as to be adaptable to different grades and ages, why there is no use to have the division into classes.

So I am persuaded, my friends, that this argument is so conclusive that it would be a waste of time upon my part to try to make that subject any plainer.

We affirm that in every instance where Christ or the apostles taught an assembly of mixed people that they taught the assembly as a whole, thus respecting this principle that the word of God was as adaptable to all classes as was the rain upon the herbs.

Therefore we go to the word of God under the Apostolic ministry and read you a few examples of how they did give this teaching to all men alike. Acts 2: 14, we read, "But *Peter* standing up with the eleven, lifted up *his* voice and said, "(this shows that he is the speaker upon that occasion; the rest of them are hearers). "Then *Peter* said unto them," and again, "With many other words did *he* testify and exhort," and again, "They that gladly received *his* word were baptized."

Here is the first case of teaching under the Great Commission and one man addressed the entire assembly when the time came for the gospel to begin to be taught or preached. Any happening on the Day of Pentecost before that time was before the gospel began to be preached and can not be brought into this discussion as being germane to the issue.

I read in Acts 6: 10: "And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake." That was Philip. "For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us."

"And all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel."

Then followed his sermon. You see, he had the attention of the entire audience. They were all giving him attention at this time. Well, says my opponent, we all believe that, and we do that way. Why don't you read something of where they divided their audiences into classes?

I just can't read it; that is why, and if my opponent can read it, we would be more than glad to have it read.

I want to turn to where our Lord taught in an assembly, Luke 4: 15: "And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all."

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

"And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written," and then he read that place and commented upon it, and then sat down.

I read this passage to show that the Lord Jesus, Christ had a *custom* of doing this; that that was the way he taught the various assemblies. He would come in and stand up before the congregation and read to the entire congregation, and commented upon what he read and that was his *custom*.

Well, was that the custom of his followers? I want to see if Paul didn't do something like the same thing. In Acts 17: 2, we read: "And Paul, a, ? *his manner was*, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures," Yes, he had a *custom* also.

Again in Acts 13: 14-16: "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.

"And after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if he have any word of exhortation for the people, say on.

"Then Paul stood up, and beckoning with his hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, *give audience*."

And in the 44th verse: "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together, to hear the word of God."

No dividing then into classes as his custom was. That was not the custom of Apostolic teaching in public assemblies; if then this was Scriptural custom, we shall be right in carrying it out, and this is in exact harmony with the

platform as laid down, and quoted from my opponent in the beginning of this speech. Then the question is not how to teach privately, it is not about any private teaching that man or woman may do, but is confined to the teaching of assemblies of folks who have come together into one place to be taught the word of God. For that reason I hope the discussion will be confined to the assembly and the teaching done therein and we will eliminate all this confusion about doing private teaching by either man or woman. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: You notice that my respondent closed up with a declaration against private teaching. All that he said pertained to men and women, especially to men; nothing said about women, public congregations, and he has implied that the preacher is the only one that has any right to do any preaching or teaching, give any instruction whatever.

Now all that he said, these different Scriptures that he read, bear in that direction, and thus the doctrine is a do-nothing doctrine for all the men and women connected with the church. Everything depends upon the preacher and the public assembly.

In trying to get away from the private teaching and that which is done by men and women, why he has gone to the Roman Catholic Church, altogether by the man, by the preacher Rome has it by priest. The Protestant denominations generally have the pastor. He is the one that does the reading, that does the praying, that does the announcing. He is the one that takes his text; he is the one that does the preaching, and the people are to sit like young birds to be fed by their mothers with bug or cherry, whatever it may be, and just accept it from the preacher.

He hasn't indicated that the Lord intended for a single individual, either man or woman, connected with the church to do anything whatever in that direction, for he has said right here in the conclusions, "All teaching is confined to the assembly, not private teaching."

Then, friends, in Philippians 4:3, he must have had

women doing the preaching because here we have the declaration, Philippians 4: 3: "And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women who labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the book of life."

Now, what under the shining sun did the Apostle Paul need to have women to be fellow-laborers with him, "who labored with me in the gospel?" How did Paul labor in the gospel? Why, he preached. He preached to public assemblies, and here were women engaged in that very business, but my opponent would have it that the apostles and evangelists only who could address public assemblies would be the one, or else those women addressed public assemblies.

Now, the more you look at that, the more clearly you will see it, but I will go back, friends, and see if I can't find something along the line of these notes that will be interesting for you and likewise for my opponent. Don't you recollect that in formerly dealing with this question my opponent in order to make the class system ridiculous, said that a man who had a dozen children would have to have a dozen classes unless there were twins there. I found that in my notes. If the children were divided even by one year in age, he would have to have a class for every one of those children unless there were twins. Do you recollect that? I don't think he will deny it. It will appear in the books. If he does deny it, it will be self-stultifying.

Now, there is the extreme of a man who is bound to beat down his opponent even if he must make himself ridiculous in so doing. You can't imagine anything more ridiculous than to contend that if a man has a dozen children, he needs to have a dozen classes unless he has twins.

Now, if you wish to have confidence in that kind of a man, I can't help it, but I warn you against him.

And then perhaps you will recollect that when he was talking about the class question on a former occasion and I made mention of elder women teaching the younger women, he boldly declared that I contradicted myself because I had said previously that the class system had

reason in its favor, had nature in its favor, and had expediency in its favor, and when he came to deal with that and I brought out the special class teaching another special class, and women at that, why, what did he do? He said he has contradicted himself, when the truth of the matter is, besides reason and nature and the worldly wisdom to which we could appeal because the Saviour said, "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," and I appealed to the school system and showed that any man would be rejected from public school who would try to put all the children in one class, and I brought up expediency, what did he do but said that I contradicted myself when I appealed to Paul's letter to Titus, second chapter, where mention is made of the older women teaching the younger women. What can you think of that kind of a man; what confidence can you have in a man who will reason after that manner?

Referred to some remarks made about him personally, and he became very good. My "condition of mind." Can you imagine anything worse than to reflect upon a man's condition of mind, whether he is responsible or not?

I have been charging him with perverseness. I think he is responsible, but he will apologize for me as if I wasn't responsible, and he would pray to the Lord to lay not the sin on his account.

Now, dear friends, you know how to estimate that; I need not characterize it.

His proposition is that the congregations of the Church of Christ that oppose the class system are Scriptural in name, doctrine, practice, worship and work. I just simply deny that any congregation that occupies the position that my respondent recommends, I deny that that congregation, friends, deserves to be called a Church of Christ; I deny that it has any right to the divinely appointed arrangement in regard to worship and work until it repents, and corrects itself by the word of God. That is my denial of his entire position.

And then we notice here, he copied more from my writings. I showed you this afternoon by pointing out in two instances that he is a perverter of documents, that he

reads, and I now state that what he has copied from my writing this evening, if examined, (I think it is from the Sunday School tract) I think you would find it a further perversion. I have my doubts whether, in view of the disposition that he has in the determining that he will break down his opponent, he can treat any doctrine or document fairly.

He says a mixed audience may be taught at all times. It is true; by whom? The preacher. I say, but is the preacher to do all the teaching? Is he the only man? Why, if there is anything clear, friends, in the New Testament, and especially the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, it is that one man was not to do all the teaching. We will come to that after a while. He has resorted to that quite frequently in the past and we will get there after while, and I propose to show that according to the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, to which he has appealed so much in regard to the apostolic order, doesn't allow him the privilege of occupying the pulpit throughout the whole time on any occasion, especially on Lord's Day.

While I have that before my mind, I will just call your attention to it, but I calculate to go back and take that, I might say that entire chapter, away from him a little later. He has depended on it so much. Twenty-sixth verse of the 14th chapter of First Corinthians: "How is it, then, brethren, when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying"

That would require one with the psalm, one with the doctrine, or item of teaching, one with a tongue, strange tongue, one with a revelation, and one with an interpretation. That would require at least five persons in the congregation, and he is ruled out according to that chapter, of ever occupying all the time on the first day of the week, especially before any congregation.

Now, he has resorted to that so much that he can't possibly get away from that chapter, but he is ruled out from that very chapter from occupying all the time. What then is he doing? Is he following that all the time? No,

he is following the course of Christ and the Apostles in addressing public congregations, and assemblies, and endeavors to follow them as though the preacher was the only man. That is Catholicism and the Protestant sects who have followed the Catholics. The New Testament Disciples have adopted a different course following what we have here in that chapter.

He quoted from my tract and then he said, "But this is all that shall be done; nothing else than just what is there mentioned." I couldn't write a tract, friends, to set forth all that should be done, and I declare that another perversion without stopping to look and see how grossly he perverted the passage by taking only a part of it as I showed this afternoon.

Same page: "If one person objects." I repudiated that, did it years ago because I found that the objectors were not humble Disciples, but dictators. You understand that. Have never found a case that was an exception, that the Disciple was not a dictator, that would destroy a whole congregation if necessary just to have his own way. Many of them have paralyzed congregations.

"The purpose of the class system is to save folks," he said. "I charge more people are lost on account of it than will ever be saved by it." Why, this opposition to the class system is a recent affair. Churches of Christ went on thirty, forty, fifty years without any objection. I think I am as well acquainted with the Brotherhood as any man connected with it. I have been under the necessity of reading the history many years, and I have re-read, and I have found no objection until a few years ago, until a man that started the Gospel Echo over in West Virginia, took this over into this state at a later date, and at a later date the Gospel Echo force was divided and became the Gospel Missionary and was taken by its editor down into Texas, I believe, and from Texas over there into Georgia, and if I mistake not, this paper called The Apostolic Way, is the residue or the old subscription list of that, and they have calculated to make themselves celebrities by going among the Churches of Christ and objecting to men and women teaching children in classes and others in classes,

and they are the ones, they are the ones, they are the ones, that are responsible for the division.

I think from what I have seen that my opponent and his followers would rather see every Church of Christ divided, not only so, but scattered to the four winds, rather than to give up their hobby on this question.

That is what I have seen. That is the impression they have made on my mind. I may be wrong. There may be some among them that would repent before they would see every church divided and destroyed, but paralyzed at least. They will divide every congregation they can and thus paralyze the cause of Christ.

He admits that when the division is introduced, their influence is gone. Who introduces the division? Those that object to what is generally established in the Brotherhood and they then become the innovators because of their preaching against the established order in the Churches of Christ that are keeping themselves free from innovations.

Speaking of the young people: Well, let me see. There was a gentleman that came here to me the other evening and said, "I was over to the Baptist Church in this town when there was a company of young people who came and presented themselves, and desired to be baptized by the Baptist preacher," and he found from whence they came, and it was from this congregation, and they wished to be baptized, and he said something about sending them back here to their own congregation, and they said, "We don't want to go there; they don't have anything for the young people to do."

"Designing men" Now, let me give you a little further history. There was a congregation over at Klondike, I believe it was, in Iowa, and that congregation (I think that was the name of the place) was going along in peace and harmony and making progress. A certain preacher, W. J. Campbell, went there and held a meeting, and what did he do? He didn't preach against the class system publicly, but simply sowed the seed privately. After he went away, within a year, there was a division. There is a division yet. We thought of holding this debate there, but it was found that it was not the place to have it, and conse-

quently, it was finally thrust upon the churches here in this community, not by my consent at first, though I had previously arranged that Shelburn would be a good place. But there was a delay in receiving word from Shelburn, and meantime my opponent said here at Sullivan was the logical place, and in view of the disturbance caused here, I agreed to that.

I wrote, or rather published, W. J. Campbell after this manner. I said: "If any church wishes to have trouble on hand, send for W. J. Campbell." He wrote back a letter, "Though I have convictions, I have never pressed them to the division of the church."

I said, "You don't need to press them to the division of the church. All you need to do is talk to two or three families in the congregation that may have a listening ear, and don't wish to do anything that will disturb them on Lord's Day morning, and all you need to do is talk to two or three families and just one family if you strike the right family, and the division will occur in a year. They will do the rest.

He never answered the letter. He knew it was true. Just like the organ controversy, friends. A preacher of that kind will go into a community; you let him preach for you. He will not say a word about the instruments in public, but talk privately, so after he is gone the church will be divided over the subject. That has been true in scores of instances, and that is going on now with such men as my respondent.

Who then causes the division? Who introduces the dissentious talk? I said designing men going around. I have told of the letter to W. J. Campbell.

Teaching the word of God, he says, is the basis of all religious training. They have been called anti-Bible study, but how many meetings, I say, have been held here since the division?

I have been told by those who have had an opportunity to see how often the lights are here at night, that there is a meeting here on Lord's Day morning, and then no more until the next Lord's Day morning, and then no more until the next Lord's Day morning.

Now, if I have been misinformed, I will be glad to be correctly informed on the spot, if that isn't true, one meeting a week, between protracted meetings, only one, and then when the preacher comes, he occupies all the time, contrary to the 14th chapter of First Corinthians and the 26th verse. How much harmony is there in the Bible, and how much is this doing for the advancement of the truth? The whole contemplation is that the preacher shall do all the work. Roman Catholicism!

He says, "The position we occupy is not called in question." It is seriously called in question because it means that the whole congregation will depend upon the preacher for its public teaching inasmuch as he is to occupy all the time, and is to do this in following out the example of the Apostles when they were going from place to place building up churches instead of teaching that men and women are to engage in the home instructions and in advancing the church in the knowledge of the truth.

He quoted what I said about teaching mixed audiences. I said all debate is from himself and his people. They introduced it.

He says, "Our objection is no part of our practice." wrote down, "But practice is to disturb all churches. That is the practice, go from place to place, disturb all the churches that you can, publicly and privately, shove the paper in it which has in here, about every number of it, more or less of this sort of teaching, so disturb every church that you possibly can, that is the practice, and when I called upon one of my respondent's friends or associates in this work to affirm his practice, he flared up tremendously and said he wasn't called upon to affirm his practice, but simply to affirm (was the way he expressed it) something to shut off his practice.

The practice of these people is to go from place to place, and disturb every Disciple publicly and privately that they possibly can on this question, just as they do with reference to the rebaptism question.

Then something is said here about the home and the church. The only legitimate place for the children to be taught. Now you see that he comes in there and shuts off

all teaching that may be done anywhere and everywhere. If you meet a man on the highway or meet some children in the road, and you have a chance to talk to them, mustn't do any teaching. If you will go to a school and the school teacher asks you to make a speech to the children, you mustn't make a speech about religion. The church and the home is the only place. The more you look at that, the more you see that the charge of anti-Bible teaching has a great deal of truth in it.

Duty of parents to plant the principles of truth in their children: Yes, friends, but this means the children of those who are already Christians. What about the children of the multitudes that are not Christians? Let them alone, let them alone, let them alone, don't try to teach them anything, let them alone. Don't try to draw the children in; don't try to draw the parents in unless you can do so by preaching rebaptism or something of that kind. Have something extra to set forth. They hear the other preaching other places. The duty of parents is to plant the seed in the children, but what about the children who haven't any parents to instruct them or the children whose parents are wicked persons? Can't we get hold of their children and teach them?

My opponent says, No. Let them live and go on and on in their wickedness, or all that the world and wickedness and Devil might invite them to go, and go to all the denominational meetings, and let the Sunday Schools gather them in and let them unite with the sectarian churches, and then call on my friend, Mr. Cowan here, to go and preach that sectarianism out of them.

In our classes he says we have an organization beyond a church organization. I deny that. No truth in it.

(Here comes in that demand for money again; we are on the class question.) His position is that if a father says to one of his children, "John, do so and so," and another one of his children, "James, do so and so," and the mother says, "Susan, do so and so," that man has formed an *extra organization in his own family!* Why, yes, because his position is that if the elders say to one individual, "You teach that class," and to another, "You teach that

class," why, there is an extra organization. Yes, the elders are the superintendents and these teachers are officers. Yes, extra organization!!!

I heard of a hunter once who said he could tree 'possums where there were no 'possums. I will tell you, friends, if this isn't a clear case, I don't know what to say to it.

No, it isn't an extra organization. Have they any secretary to keep books? No. How many were in this or that class? No. Any collection? No. Any treasurer? No. nothing of that sort, nothing whatever, and then no extra literature. That is what is recommended by the Churches of Christ which I represent, and if any depart from this, they are getting in the direction of what we call innovators. But, friends, the idea is that the extra class is formed in the imagination of my respondent, and he can denounce just as he sees fit.

This brother has seven children (meaning Mr. Harper) and he told me before leaving home he had the eldest of his daughters to take the other daughters in a room and go over the lesson with them, and the eldest of his sons to take his three younger brothers, and go over the lesson with them, and then he afterwards went over the lesson, I believe, with all of them more or less directly, and thus he formed an extra organization, didn't he, right there when he told one of his children to do this and another of his children to do that in searching the word of God.

Now, that is my opponent's position. That is what he has taken in order to prevent the legal tender to me of those forty dollars that I claim for the four points of difference that I have found between the Sunday School, the sectarian Sunday School, on the one hand, and the unorganized Bible classes on the other.

Right to take Deuteronomy 11: 13, All Israel came together. When I was reasoning on the subject of government and civil governments, talking about the question of war, and went back to the Old Testament there, why, that doesn't apply, that was under a former dispensation.

Why, friends, the God of Heaven ruled in the kingdoms of men then and he rules in the kingdom of men now,

and the gospel undoubtedly doesn't touch that question here; it is a question of teaching the word of God, and he said to go back there and find out how the people were brought together and they could all be taught in one class.

Duty in the New Dispensation: "God's gospel adaptable to all ages as the law was to the Old Testament." Now, friends, as far as that was concerned, he went and gave an illustration by quoting from Deuteronomy, and Isaiah, and now says, "Rain comes on all vegetables alike, and the word of God is adaptable to all ages, and I might as well try to go out and try to stop the rain." Did you hear that? hear that? Stop the rain. Gives that as an illustration. Stop the rain and dividing it and just as an illustration he gave that up. I ought to go and do that if I was going to divide into classes.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The reason why I went to Deuteronomy was to show that men, women and children of different ages and abilities were all taught in one congregation, and I also showed under the New Dispensation we had the same kind of an arrangement, so this does not compare with my objection to his war proposition because this has to do with men and women in the capacity of being taught and if different ages and abilities could be taught the law of Moses in one congregation, certainly people of different ages and abilities can be taught the law of Christ in one congregation.

He talked about some brother telling some of his children to teach or go over the lesson with others in the home. We are not debating about that. We are not talking about what a man may do in his private home. I believe in teaching the Word of God in the home, on the roadside or everywhere, although my opponent has said I did not, but we are debating about what shall be done v; lien an assembly of people comes together in a congregational capacity. There is where the issue is. My opponent keeps that covered up by talking about some private work that

we might do as individuals. All I have to do is just pull the cover off and let you see where the trouble is.

In regard to the money proposition, my opponent has claimed that for several times before this proposition was taken up again, and I waited until the proper time to reply. He has said over and over again that I owe him forty dollars, but he never has proved it. The fact that there might be a collection taken up or whether it is not taken up has nothing to do with organization. An organization may take up a collection or may not take up a collection. *So* there he loses one ten dollars.

The fact that they do have officers, or a superintendent and teachers proves that they are an organization. In fact, my opponent says classes may be formed and he is talking, too, about in assembly, when the people are assembled together, as his writings show, and formed means the same thing as organized in that sense. All through this debate, I have called his attention to the meaning of the word "organization." He ignores it, and then declares he hasn't any organization.

We shall now take up other things that he has said. First, he charges me with teaching that the preacher is the only one to do any teaching, that I do not believe in any private teaching at all.

Do you people remember my saying that the fathers and mothers should teach their children the Word of God in the home, and cited you about eight or ten passages to prove that in my first speech, and then my opponent gets up and says I denied teaching anywhere except in public. What is the matter with the man? I don't mean to reflect on his character and his standing when I say he is confused. A man can be confused and be a good man. I would not call him a vile perverter for anything, for that is in a mean word. I would not say I had lost all confidence in him in every respect like he did about me just because I see he is confused, but, my friends, you know and every intelligent person who heard my first speech, knows that that is a misrepresentation, that we do not confine the teaching to the preacher only in the public assembly. Then why did he say that? Why, he couldn't answer the

argument I made and had to pervert it before he could even reply to it. I take it as a compliment to the speech I made.

All right, let's notice another thing he said concerning making the preacher a pope and priest. Of course, that is all answered when I have refuted his misrepresentation.

Again, he says that I confined all teaching to the assembly, and after making that charge upon me, if he had just thought that I had said that teaching may be done by the parent to the children in the home, and I could add to that that one may call a preacher off to one side and teach him like Priscilla did Apollos and other examples I could give even where the woman was to teach her husband, and then say we confine all the teaching to the assembly? What is the matter with the man?

If he ever did need a substitute to take his place, I think he needs it now.

Then he goes to Philippians 4: 3, where Paul said certain women labored with him in the Gospel and he said, "What does it mean to labor in the Gospel?" To publicly proclaim the Gospel, and then argued for women preachers, women evangelists. Are you people who stand with my opponent ready for that conclusion? At first he wants to make the teaching by women private even in the congregation and class work. Seeing that he could not stay with that position any longer, he decided to open up the whole proposition and give the woman the same right to preach in the congregation as a man and away goes Paul's prohibition, Let your women keep silence in assembly.

Let's compare two authorities for a minute. Paul says, "Let your women keep silent in the assembly." My opponent says, "Let your women labor in the Gospel, or preach in the assembly." Now, here are two authorities. Paul and my opponent. Which one or them shall we believe? Which one of them shall we allow to be our guide? Something wrong somewhere, either with Paul or with my opponent and I am persuaded it is with my opponent.

I would love to hear him tell at what place and time that Paul meant for women to be silent. We know it isn't in the home. We know it isn't in a private way, and my

friend said it is not in the public assembly. Then where did he want her to keep silent? Do you reckon you could tell us?

All right, take up the next thought with reference to the man who had a dozen children, and what I said about there being twelve classes unless there were twins, I was reasoning then from his own writing in which he said that parents or guardians were to be the only teachers of the children, his objections to Sunday Schools were that the teachers did not have authority over the ones they were teaching, and hence the children were allowed to do about as they pleased.

Anybody can see from those statements—and they are not scrapped—that he is opposed to teachers teaching children when they have no authority over them. Then I conclude from that—and justly, too—that if a father and mother have twelve children, if they only divided them into six different classes, that would require six teachers, and as none but the parents were allowed to teach because they are the only ones that have authority over the pupils, then there would have to be six parents in the family in order to have six classes, and he sees the absurdity of his own reasoning and he gets mad at me for seeing the absurdities in his own writings.

He comes back and calls me hard names, but I thank the Lord. Sometimes those who are not accustomed to hearing debates can hardly stand to hear a man talk about his opponent like my opponent talks about me, but I can stand it and enjoy it, and I don't see what you want to break up all this rejoicing for. Both of us are having fun. Every one keep yourselves perfectly straight, especially your faces, and we will go on with the debate just as though he had never called me of low birth and debased morals.

Very well, we take tip the next passage: Old women teach the young women. Well, I am sure Paul didn't mean to contradict himself and permit women to do things that he forbade to do in another place.

About the schools—I have answered that. In public schools they have various classes. They have various

textbooks for those classes, but in the assembly of the Lord's people my opponent says you can not have any literature only the Bible, only one textbook, and the Bible is not like any other book. It is God's book and God made it for all classes of people, and it will fit all classes of people, and it will fit all classes of people and that is why we give it to them like it comes in the Book of God.

Me says, I deny that church has a right to be called the Church of Christ that follows the practice that I advocate.

All right, turning again to Brother Sommer's tract on this Sunday School question, Page 10, he says, "No one that claims to be a Christian can object to the church gathering all together on Lord's Day or any other time or any other place, putting a New Testament in each one of their hands who are able to read, and then read and publicly expound the Word of God to them."

That is our practice, and my opponent says no church can follow that and be Scriptural. Then it is another case of my opponent fighting himself and devouring himself. That is what makes him so wrathful at me, because I show these contradictions. Well, I will take up the next thought and pass right on.

He says if you people would examine his tracts that you would find perversions that I had made of his writings. Well, what has he got to do but take up these writings that I have quoted from and show you that they are perversions. I wonder if he thinks this is a scheme by which he can do a little advertising of his literature.

I want to tell you if he brings up some of my writings and perverts them, I am going to those writings and show they are perversions before this very people that I am talking to.

No one has ever claimed that the preacher should occupy all the time. That is another misrepresentation. We have been getting away from that practice and have been for years. We don't believe in the one pastor system. We will pass that up.

What he says about the class system not being of recent origin and other things of like character I will state that we have my opponent's authority for that, that's all. I will

state this, that the class system is of more recent origin than the New Testament, and my opponent has said that anything that is not as old as the New Testament can not be right. Therefore, I claim that your class system is too recent to be right.

Then he gave the Apostolic Way a little free advertising for which I thank him. Then he says that I would love to see every church destroyed and I would destroy every one of them in order to teach what I believe to be the truth on the class question. Well, I could just as easily show him. He might go into a community where there was a church and in that church they had instrumental music or they may be in favor of colleges, Christian colleges, so-called, and before my opponent would give up his contention against Christian colleges, he would divide every church in the land.

Now, that is feeding him out of the same spoon. Before he would give up his contention against musical instruments he would divide every church in the country. Then he is charging me of doing a thing that he is absolutely guilty of himself.

There is a man here, I will not call his name, that knows of a church divided twenty years ago because he went and introduced his class system. He speaks of the Klondike Church, over in Iowa, divided by W. J. Campbell. I don't know about that case, but I do know of one up in Montezuma, Iowa, I believe called the Liberty Chapel, right close to the church which is known as Sunnyside Church of Christ now, and I am going to use an expression of one of the brethren over there who talked to me about this, that my opponent, not only him, but a preacher by the name of Scott (I don't know his initials) had been over there and advocated this class system, and caused a division in the church over there, and they told the brethren that were opposed to the class system, that "when we get over to ourselves, we are going to do big things," and this brother who talked to me about it said they thought they were going to cut a big watermelon, and since they have gone to themselves into classes, they have disbanded and don't have any meeting there at all, and the

church opposed to classes like it always had been, is going right on and doing good, and building up and going good.

I wouldn't have referred to this, but I wanted to show you people there are two sides to every question, and I could fill my time just as he has filled his time in by telling experiences, but that doesn't show which side is right and which side is wrong, absolutely not.

How many meetings here since division came? Just one a week. Well, suppose, my friends, that that is true, they just have one meeting a week and they have it like the Lord said have it. That would be better than to have a meeting every day in the week and violate the Scripture every time you have it. That is enough on that.

What he said about the home and church that I would forbid a person teaching the Word of God anywhere except in the home, and he meant the residence, because he said you couldn't teach it out on the roadside, if the home was the only place, when I went to the particular pains of telling you I did not mean the residence, but I meant the relationship created between man and wife called home, and as a member of that family, or as a member of the church of God they were to do all their teaching and not as a member of another formation, that is my opponent's word "form"—they form these things instead of organizing them—then do this teaching in the home and church without going into this other formation to do it.

Now, this more than complements what my opponent has said. I wanted to refer to what he said about other children who did not have any father or mother who were Christians to teach them. In the first place, if they are unaccountable children, they are not lost. In the second place, if the church of Jesus Christ is doing its duty by teaching the Word of God to the parents of those children, they may reach them through their parents. In the third place, if the children have Christian parents, their influence in association with these neighbors' children will also help to win them over to the Church of Christ.

To illustrate, if your neighbor's child visits your home and in your home you have Bible reading and prayer, and the neighbor's child beholds the procedure and goes home

and tells his father and mother, don't you see the influence that would have? You reach them by social contact.

I am going to state this: That a great man has said that only about two per cent of the Sunday School scholars become members of the church and remain members, and this is a pretty high authority. For that reason, my friends, I am going to say that the Lord's plan is the best always to work on in conditions of this kind.

Seeing my former speech has not been answered, I am convinced that it can not be answered. I shall now proceed with my affirmative arguments for the remaining eight minutes, if I am not mistaken, of my time.

The first proposition that I shall mention is that in teaching assemblies the Word of God, note how I speak it, I am not talking about private teaching; I believe in private teaching. Keep that in mind. Don't let my opponent make you believe that we don't do private teaching, for we do. Now, I am talking about how you teach when you assemble together in a place of meeting, all you people have to do is to keep that in mind, and you will have no trouble to see the futile efforts of my opponent to break these arguments down.

Then I contend when assemblies of alien sinners were being taught, that the Apostles spoke one at a time as upon Pentecost, that when assemblies of Christians only were being taught, they spoke one at a time as Paul at Ephesus, Acts 20: 1-7. When assemblies of Christians and unbelievers were together, the same method was outlined as in the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, and if they did one speak at a time, that all may hear and learn and be comforted, that the unbelieving part of their audiences would be converted, and report that God is in you of a truth, and would fall down on their faces and worship God. Have you a better system, a better plan to reach the unbelieving folks than that plan; that is the Lord's plan; that is the plan the spirit has given. And there could not be any other kind of a congregation. Every congregation is composed of Christians, or sinners or sinners and Christians, and then why is not the plan for which I am contending and for which I can read in God's Book good enough for

anybody. And why can we not all unite upon that plan and be one? I believe we can. Then I shall go on with other passages along this line.

Paul went clown to Iconium, Acts 14: 1-4: "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the Greeks, believed.

"But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.

"Long time therefore abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.

"But the multitude of the city was divided: "

Now here, friends, here is one assembly divided, if my opponent can get any comfort out of this. How were they divided? "And part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles."

Were they divided physically? No, they were divided in sentiment, that's all, and even all of these parties were taught by the apostle at the same time. Well, says one,. we believe that. We all teach that way. Well, our position then is not called in question.

Says one, "Read the passage where they divided into classes to teach them the word of God when they were assembled."

I can't read it. I will shake hands with him and close this debate and go to work on that proposition if he will read it. If that isn't fair.

Listen again in Acts 14: 21: This passage describes Paul's return visit to congregations where he had been and preached the gospel and established them. And it would have been a good time to put the class system in operation, wouldn't it? Going back to newly organized congregations to see how they do and give them instructions as to how to live; and when they had preached the gospel to that city (Derbe) and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch,

"Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting

them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.

"And when they ordained them elders in every church, and divided them into classes to teach them and appointed some teachers over these classes—" No, it doesn't read that way. If Brother Sommer could just find one passage that read like that we would be practicing the class system today.

How does it read? "When they had ordained them elders in every church, and they had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed."

What a fine opportunity the old apostle had to establish a class system, and didn't do it, and yet he says he kept back nothing that was profitable, but he did keep back the class system.

Again I refer you to the eighth chapter of Acts where Philip went down to Samaria and preached Christ unto them and many of them believed, and were baptized, and Jerusalem, the mother church, heard about that great meeting, and they sent Peter and John down to that country, and they visited that meeting, and when they got down there, they never said a word about organizing those new converts into classes, but gave them instructions as to how to live the Christian life. I could multiply these illustrations over and over from the word of God, but I see that time will not allow me to do that.

Then, in conclusion, while my time lacks two minutes of being out. I want to say again for the benefit of the cause of Christ, because I love brethren and sisters who even may be divided, the one from the other, if you love union and harmony among the people of God more than you love the class system, you will lay the class system down. If you love the class system more than you love the brethren and peace and union among the people of God, you will maintain the system.

Now, here is a way to try or test your love. It is an evident fact, my friends, that the apostles and early Christians got along at peace and in harmony without the sys-

tern. We may do so today upon a plan that my opponent even says is safe and ought to be done all places to the honor and glory of God. Certainly, my friends, we can afford to do that. Let us then pray, let us work, let us labor, let us toil, to bring about that peace and that harmony and that union that can be based upon a thus-saith-the-Lord, and we can live at peace with one another and instead of my opponent and I being here debating this question, we would both be out preaching the gospel and saving souls, whereas, by having a division over the class system, souls are famished and perishing for the bread of life.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: This is the last time I will have the privilege of addressing you tonight, and I wish you to give me your very best attention. There was a brother here the other day who said, "Brother Sommer, you will need to be careful or else your opponent will continually talk about the class system as if you believed in dividing the public congregation between eleven and twelve into classes." A certain brother brought that before me.

Well, it just dawned upon me a few minutes ago as never before that this needs to be set forth. Everything that my opponent has said with reference to dividing the public congregation when they come together for the privilege of worship in the class system has been that much misplaced talk to say the least, and the mildest of it. He has simply been fighting a man of straw, an imaginary man of his own kind. I never have contended for anything of that sort, but I occasionally hear that where they haven't anyone who can stand up and instruct the congregation publicly they will in the absence of a preacher divide into two or three classes and have that sort of a performance, if I may call it thus, by having one to teach this class, another that, and another that, and when they can't do any better, who is going to say that they should have nothing rather than this?

That kind of an arrangement they should have wherever they can't do any better because they are teaching, but my opponent has simply wasted, I might say, hour after hour, talking about this question. He has certainly wasted a great part of his time in trying to make you believe that I contend for a division of the public congregation when it comes together for worship generally between eleven and twelve o'clock, that I am contending for it to be divided. Never contended for anything of the sort. Never contended for anything of the sort.

I wonder, can he understand that, and that he has wasted, wasted, wasted his time on this question?

Now, friends, I trust that you will be candid and honest enough with yourselves to reject the one who has endeavored to mislead you on this question. I thank the brother with all my heart for calling my attention to this because it was something that would possibly not have occurred to me that he was talking about this, and trying to make the people believe that I differed from him in regard to the period for worship. All wrong, all wrong, all wrong, and where did he get the idea? It was in his own heart or head, friends. Tried to bemean me, and break me down before this congregation as though I was contending for something that I never contended for any more than I would for a mourners' bench in the public congregation and I think if the mourners' bench was ever allowable it would be for such men as my respondent, to kneel down to and mourn over his remissness in reference to those who differ from him.

He says I called him hard names. I said he was a vile perverter. Perhaps I should have said a gross perverter, but he takes the word and has taken the meanest meaning he could and said I called him that. I have had that kind of something palmed off on me before, but it indicated the condition of the heart and mind of the individual.

Now, I am going to bring before you one instance though it was on the preceding question where my respondent was guilty of a gross perversion.

My tract called *Sectarianism, Analyzed, Defined, Ex-*

posed: I call it a tract for home reading for Apostolic Disciples. He read to the audience here this afternoon, I believe it was, my question: "Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are identified with sectarian churches, and wear sectarian names? I said no, not in the full and Scriptural sense of the word Christians." Pie stopped there.

Then I read what was my explanation: "In mind and heart some of them are doubtless converted to Christ, but they can not keep the ordinances fully, nor be altogether in harmony with the gospel while they hold membership among sectarians and wear sectarian names. None of the denominations are wholly right and none of them are wholly wrong. We should admit the truth and condemn the error in each, and should admit that many among the denominations are better than their sectarian creeds. Sectarianism is bad enough, and preachers of Christ should not stain their spirits with sin by misrepresenting what is found in sectarian systems."

Now, you see that he didn't read what he should have read in order to represent me fully.

Then my colleague here, Brother Harper, borrowed a book from him from which he had read that Alexander Campbell was not a member of the Baptist Church.

MR. COWAN: Be sure you read it all.

MR. SOMMER: Be sure I read it all. I think he would like for me to read it all so as to take my time altogether by reading and not have any time to reply to him.

He read that Alexander Campbell said, "They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches and though not a member to preach for them." I believe that is all he read with reference to the matter, and implied that he never was a member of the Baptist Church.

Before we get through with this paragraph we find that he made a proposal to be united with the Baptist Association in Pennsylvania, called the Red Stone Association, and then we find this in the next paragraph: "The proposition was discussed at the Association and after much debate it was decided by a considerable majority in favor of our being received. Thus a union was formed."

In direct opposition to his teaching that Alexander Campbell was never a member of the Baptist Church, he with all the congregation called the Brush Run congregation, that he had been chiefly instrumental in establishing, went into the Baptist Association, yet my opponent read here just what indicated that he was not for a time a member of the Baptist Church, and omitted that which declared he was a member. There was a faction that worked against him.

He further informs us, and at a later date, why he found it convenient, many years after, to go over to the Mahoning Association in Ohio, and there he remained till the Mahoning Association disbanded and the people generally went into the Disciple Brotherhood.

Now, I have given you a statement of the sense instead of reading all of it. This shows that my respondent can not be trusted, can not be trusted, can not be trusted, with any document outside of the Bible, and I have been showing that he can't be trusted with the Bible.

Now, I will give you an illustration.

MR. COWAN: A point of order. He skipped the passage that said they were Christian Churches that went into that Association, and not Baptists. He skipped over that.

MR. SOMMER: Who were Christian Churches?

MR. COWAN: The one that Campbell belonged to.

MR. SOMMER: He called the little congregation the Brush Run Church. He called that the Christian Church.

MR. COWAN: He called the Baptist, the Christian.

MR. COOK: I rise to a point of order. One speak at a time instead of talking back and forth.

MR. SOMMER: I am going to show how he mistreats the Scripture. He read the 14th verse, partly, in reading with reference to the Apostle Peter, Second Chapter of Acts: "But Peter lifted up his voice, said unto them," and he stopped. I wonder why he stopped and went to something else. I knew then after he had spoken a few words more why he stopped. Peter said, "Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and harken to my words: " **He** was talking to an audience of men; talking to an audience of men, cons?-

quently his address was strictly to them, and so with all of these other cases that were spoken of, audience of men, with perhaps a few exceptions, may have had a few women to hear him in the synagogues. The women then probably very seldom went into the synagogues when the men went for the purpose of teaching.

He read up to a certain juncture and stopped there without giving you the idea that Peter was addressing an audience of men.

With that much before you I come again and say I don't see any reason for complaint with reference to the manner in which I have spoken of my respondent.

His implications have been all the way through that the apostle said, Don't do anything else. Don't let anybody teach except just the preacher, and he must preach to an undivided congregation. All the way through that has been his implication. Now, I look at these other notes. When I came to Philippians 4: 3, I asked him what about those women. What did they do if they labored and he endeavored to make us belittled by saying, "Yes, they were preachers." My opponent would have them as preachers. I wanted to know what they did if they labored with Paul in the gospel. Didn't they have something to say to somebody else? I didn't say they were public proclaimers, but he endeavored to fasten that upon me.

All teaching is confined to the public assembly, not private teaching. That seems to be the idea according to what he read from these different Scriptures.

Now, talking about what a man may do at home. Now, when I told what this brother informed me he had done at home, and said that showed very clearly that he could have different members of his family engage in teaching and yet not form any extra organization, why he wishes to evade that whole matter, and yet that is the very something that he took hold of for the purpose of escaping that ten dollar offer that he made, the very something, the very procedure that when the elders of the church would say to this man, Do this, and this other man to do this other, why, he formed an extra organization,

Now, just consider that, friends, If that is true, and

he forms an extra organization, when the father tells one of his children to do this and another to do that, if he forms an extra organization, why, then, of course, he has escaped, but he doesn't form any extra organization, but the parents are in their own legitimate sphere directing their children with reference to their different departments of work just as the elders of a congregation when they say to this brother, "Do that," or that brother, "Do that," or that sister, "do that other." Undoubtedly it is the same congregation or same folks working but he would have it, You formed an extra organization, and extra organization, and he tells me that he has tried to call my attention to what the definition of an organization is.

Why he can't find any definition of an organization which would say that every time that a father tells one of his children to do one thing and another to do another, that he thereby forms an extra organization. He hasn't any dictionary to that effect; he can't find any dictionary to that effect.

The preacher the only one should do any preaching: That is what all of those illustrations amount to. That is what they refer to. Confined all teaching to the assembly. That was the bearing of his remark, and he asked, "What is the matter with you, man?" Well, I might ask, you know, "What is the matter with you, man?" That is cheap.

Now, where did Paul mean for the women to keep silent? I believe it would be a good time for me to tell you about the two divine organizations. There is the family. The husband is the head of the wife, and the wife is the helpmeet. He has the divine authority to rule and regulate his family. The wife is a helpmeet in this. She is not to be the boss. They should consult each other, but when the question finally comes, he is the responsible one. Let him have the last word on the subject.

How is it in the church? Why, here are the elders, the deacons, the elders especially to look after the spiritual affairs; the deacons after the temporal affairs, and these together to be the chief ones in the congregation.

Now, when Paul says, "I suffer not a woman to teach nor usurp authority over the man," what was he talking

about? The woman is to be in subjection to the man in the church just as the woman is to be in subjection to the man in the home. That is the divine arrangement, and when the Apostle Paul said, "Let your women keep silence in the church," he was referring to the wives of those inspired men, "for if they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home."

We haven't any such inspired men and any such wives now, wives of inspired men, so it doesn't apply. No more than the language about the special gift applies to one given to by the word of wisdom and to another word of knowledge and to another miracles. Does that apply to us? Not one of us. You all know that. We haven't the special gifts, and the language concerning the special gifts doesn't apply to us. So the language concerning these inspired men and concerning their wives, especially the wives, as we are now talking of them. We haven't any such men as they had, and consequently, any such women. That is all there is in this only when a man becomes technical and he palms off to the congregation, Let all women be silent, let all women be silent, let all women be silent, he doesn't say so, but that is by implication; that is his doctrine.

No sister is at liberty to open her mouth in the congregation except to sing. Why is she allowed to sing? Why are the women allowed to sing? Paul said, "Teaching and admonishing, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Why is she allowed to sing? Why isn't there difficulty and division on that subject? Where is the Scripture which says women were intended to sing? Not one. Not one. Not one.

Now, the inquiry arises, Why is there not a difficulty over this? Just because my opponent and his friends don't see fit to object. Says we don't object to women singing. I have seen that in their literature. We don't object; we don't object; we don't object. They haven't any more right to object to women teaching in a congregation than to women singing, because when she sings, she teaches. "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs; singing and making melody in

your hearts to the Lord." It is because he objects. If he objects, then the women will have to keep quiet.

There was a man who preached on that subject, that the women be silent. After the meeting was over, and he went down and shook hands with different sisters, they just shut their mouths. "What is the matter?"

"Well, we are in the assembly, and we are not allowed to speak." They didn't say that much, I think, until they got outdoors, but just shut their mouths, giving him an overdose of his own doctrine, by letting know about this.

Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. There is no objection, because we don't object. If we would object, she would have to keep quiet, and couldn't sing, and yet there is just as much Bible, friends, just as much Bible for the classes, yes and more, because in Titus we have a special class of women teaching a special class of women. Titus, 2d chapter. But they will let the women sing without one word on the subject in favor of it.

Now, what are you going to do with such men? Or I might say in response, What is the matter with him? What is the matter with him? What is the trouble with him? I can tell you. He is just simply a hobbyist. You know what that means. Why, he has gotten on this particular idea that he can make a celebrity of himself by emphasizing these questions and he can damage and destroy churches and build up something by dividing different congregations on these questions where the people haven't had an opportunity to study them, and the individuals who adopt this idea, as I have pointed out, become dictators. They seem to think that they have attained to something whereby they can show themselves and they can defy the elders and defy - everybody because, Let your women keep silent in the churches. That is plain. Yes, let them keep silence and that means all women.

All, the more you look at it, friends, the more you see that it is outrageous. It ought to be beneath the dignity of any man who pretends to be a man. to advocate any such idea. Now, with that much before your minds,

I don't think that I need to pay much more attention to what we call notes.

My respondent has read considerable from my writings. If he had treated me justly, I would have been very glad, because I have furnished him with considerable material. What under the shining sun would he have done if he hadn't had some of my tracts? Why, my tracts have furnished him on quite a number of these questions with the greatest amount of information that he has offered to the congregation, and if he had only presented a sentence in its connection at this, that or the other time, and read the whole paragraph so as to have given an idea of what I really said, just idea, I mean, and not tried to read just what he could set in opposition to some other passage. Why I can take the Bible and treat it after that manner.

The Apostle Paul said, "Without faith, it is impossible to please God." The Apostle James said that is the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also, and then in Romans, 4th chapter, the Apostle Paul said that a man was justified by faith without works, put them in opposition to each other, and the Saviour said "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of the Father, but he that doeth the will of the Father which is in Heaven; " and the Apostle Peter on the Day of Pentecost said, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." The Saviour said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord" (and that is calling upon the Lord), and the Apostle Peter said, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

That is the kind of treatment that my writings have received at the hands of my respondent, and what shall we say to that? I say to you that my conviction is that he has scrapped every one of the passages that he has read from me and hasn't given a just idea because he hasn't given the connection. He hasn't even stated the connection in words so that the people might have gained the idea that I had said something to modify what I had stated in the exact language that he quoted.

Now, in the remainder of my time tonight I will say to you that it is exceedingly unpleasant to me because it

has passed from the discussion of the subjects strictly to the discussion of the man who presented the subject because of the manner in which he treated the Word of God, and the manner in which he treated the documents that he quoted on the outside of the Word of God, and such being the case, it is exceedingly unfortunate that I have been called upon to reprove him after the manner that I have with reference to these matters. He hasn't been fair. I saw a little report of his debate with a certain brother named Taylor down in the South, and he said that Brother Taylor couldn't excel him in trying to be a gentleman, and I thought, "Well, I will have a gentleman with whom I can debate," and that was a pleasant thought to me and not a single personal reflection ought to have been made in this entire discussion, and wouldn't have been made if he had confined himself to the subject and had not turned over after the manner that he did.

You recollect that my colleague here (meaning Mr. Harper) couldn't even hand me a note the other night without a personal reflection, "That's all right, Brother Harper. Help him all you can; he needs it," and I learned that his moderator afterwards said that he exceedingly regretted that, that over there, handing over had also been done. As soon as Brother Harper handed me a note, he said, "All right, Brother Harper, help him all you can."

That is personal and never should have been introduced.

I suppose my time has about expired. I wish to thank the audience for your splendid attention. We are now near the conclusion of this discussion. I trust that my opponent may live in good health and the same may be true of myself and our stenographer here, who has been so faithfully taking down what we have endeavored to set forth.

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: After having enjoyed some more of the good things of this life we are assembled to hold the

last session of this debate, and I most cheerfully enter into the work that is before me.

We regret that those who have come to this session of the debate have not been here heretofore and have heard what has been previously said. You would have been much better qualified to appreciate what shall be said upon this occasion.

I shall first speak with reference to the general status of this debate. My opponent has complained continually about my style, method and manner of debate. He has charged me with reflecting upon his mind and otherwise, and I have studied the matter over very carefully and if I have said anything worse than that I thought he was confused in his mind, I can not call it to my mind now.

However, he has referred to me as being a vile perverter, one in whom he has not any confidence about anything. I have taken all of this with that good nature I think any Christian man should, and have a few times apologized to the audience for Brother Sommer, and have asked the Lord in my prayers to lay not this sin to his charge. This matter shall all appear in a book. I have spoken during this debate with that in view, hence have refrained from using any language that I thought would be unbecoming in a book of this kind, especially a religious book. I do not know what the reader will think about those vile epithets that have been applied to me by my opponent. I am going to compliment those who believe as does my opponent with the fact that they have secured a representative man, one that is qualified to defend his position if any man can. Knowing the rules of honorable debate, and knowing what it takes to defend a proposition, he certainly would use the best arguments that could be made in favor of that position, and judging from what he has presented, to turn his whole batteries loose on his opponent and bemean him and talk about his character is the very best argument that could be made in favor of the class system.

He wonders how I would have conducted this debate had it not been for the writings that he has given us in the form of tracts, etc. I am quite sure that he has become

worried by me reading from his own pen. Think of the fellow who was carried into a room for a night's lodging, and on the morning when he awoke, there being a mirror in every corner of the room, he looked into one of them and spoke; looked over and spoke again, and every way he looked, he saw the same fellow, and finally he saw that he was speaking to himself, or meeting himself. And he became aggravated because somebody placed those mirrors in that position.

So I have held up my friend's writings and let him see himself from every direction, and when he found out that he was meeting himself in this debate, he became aggravated and laid all the blame on me for placing the mirrors where he could get one good view of himself.

I will have no more to say now with reference to the status of the debate.

Now, review the speech that my opponent made in closing the discussion last night. He said he was told by some of his brethren that he would have to watch Cowan, that he would try to make the public congregation the same as the one before the public congregation. To be plain, when people congregate from ten until eleven, that is one congregation, and from eleven to twelve, is another congregation, and my opponent denominates the last one public. I wonder if the first one is private. Wonderful reasoning, isn't it? By what law of reason or logic can you make one assembly a public assembly, and the other a private one, when it is the same people assembled in the same house only at a different hour?

Again we notice his reply to my argument on Acts 2: 14, and following verses, and said I read a part of that and stopped. I did that; I didn't read it all. I was reading these passages to show how that meeting was being conducted, and did not deem it necessary to read it all. Hence I read about where Peter spake and when they heard his voice and things that he testified, using the parts of the passage that had the pronoun in the singular number to show that only one was doing the talking at the same time in that audience. Instead of meeting my argument he raised a little fuss about me not reading it all

when there is nothing to it. I proved by those Scriptures that there is only one speaker addressing an entire assembly and just so with all the passages that *I* used from the Acts of the Apostles, showing they did respect the principles of God's word, falls upon the people just like the rain did upon the herbs, and that no man can adjust the rain and neither can he adjust the word of God.

The prophet said, "My doctrine, or my teaching shall drop as the rain." If you can adjust the rain you might undertake to adjust the word of God.

He charges again that we don't believe in letting anyone teach but the preacher. I have refuted that.

On Philippians 4: 3, in his first speech, he argued that inasmuch as Paul labored in the gospel and some women had labored with Paul in the gospel, and that Paul labored in the gospel by preaching to the public congregation, that the women did this very work, and in his last speech, after I had charged him with contending for women preachers, he came back and said he didn't say it.

I looked, or had the stenographer to look at the notes, and he did say it and it appears in the notes of this debate. Now, he can do one of two things, he can either contend for women public preachers preaching to the public congregation, or else he can retract the statement as it appears in the stenographer's notes.

Now, coming down to First Corinthians 14th chapter, with reference to women being forbidden to speak in the assembly, we have my opponent's dissertation on this passage. He says that means that the woman should not be boss, that she should allow the husband to be the boss, and he also told us that he should be boss both at home and in the congregation. That being true, then I would like to know how she could speak any more at home than she could at church. If he is to be boss at both places, why should she wait until she got home to ask her husband? Your reasoning and your philosophy here is rather cheap, ray opponent,

And it doesn't get you anywhere, but it is like all other efforts to deny that passage of Scripture,

Paul says, For it is a shame for a woman (used it in

the indefinite sense) to speak in the church. "A woman" is from the Greek word "*gunakas*," and it is defined universally a woman of any age, married, single or a widow. Thayer is my authority, the standard lexicographer of the world.

Then I am going to argue, if Thayer's definition of the word is right, and it is a shame for a woman to speak in the congregation, or in the assembly, that an assembly of people at ten o'clock and an assembly of people at eleven o'clock could not change the propriety of the woman's conduct in public. Please tell us, my opponent, why would it be a shame for a woman to speak before the same congregation at one hour and it would not be a shame at the next hour.

Rules of propriety, decency and order are under the Apostles' instructions here, and I can not for the life of me see why it would be impolite for her to speak to the congregation at one hour and perfectly polite at another hour.

He says they were the wives of inspired men; we haven't got any wives like that today. I suppose he understands those men to be inspired as were the apostles. I might as well take that idea out of his mind now. If they were inspired as were the apostles, then we have the Holy Spirit in one apostle teaching the Holy Spirit, and other inspired men how to do, the Holy Spirit teaching itself how to perform. And again, in the same passage, the Spirit here that inspired those prophets was their *own spirit*.

How do I know that? Because he says *the spirit of the prophets* is subject to the prophets. I wonder if the Holy Ghost is subject to the prophets. Now, you see the fallacy of his reasoning upon that passage.

Why would it be impolite for the wife of an uninspired man to speak and not impolite for the wife of an inspired man to speak? Would there be a difference in the propriety of the thing? Why, there could not be.

Now, he comes down to the celebrated argument called the song argument from Colossians 3: 16. He said if the woman can not teach the public assembly, then she can **not**

sing in the public assembly, because we teach in singing. That is his argument, as clearly stated as he stated it. I would have you note this: that he denied the women the right to teach in the public congregation, said we would teach no such stuff as that, but gives her the right to teach in the private congregation. Inasmuch then as sing means teach, therefore, your women are forbidden to sing in the public congregation.

Are you ready for that conclusion? Now, this is another case of my friend meeting himself coming back.

I would say in answer to this argument, the word teach or speak in First Corinthians 14: 35 is from the Greek word *lalein*, and the word sing is from the Greek word *hodo*. They are different words in the Greek, mean different things, and also different words in plain English and mean different things. So Paul could easily have forbidden the speaking and yet permitted the singing, seeing the words do not mean the same thing.

Lastly, he says that he is sorry that he has been compelled on account of my conduct to discuss me rather than to discuss the proposition. I am sorry also that he thought that. I have held something like one hundred debates in my life, public religious debates, and this is the first time I have ever had that admission from an opponent, frankly admitting that his efforts had been to debate what kind of a man I was instead of replying to the speeches I made, and answering my arguments. I knew that was what he was doing, but I did not think he would admit it, yet he boldly admitted it in his last speech last night.

I wonder if he thinks the audience that is composed of intelligent men and women, thinking people, are going to take his word that Cowan is such a terrible, impolite, vile perverter, that you people will believe what he says about it, and that just because Daniel Sommer says so, it is bound to be that way?

Now, if he thinks that is argument, and these people are going to take that for argument I think he will find out he is sadly mistaken. With that much in reply to his speech, I shall now advance with some other affirmative arguments on the proposition.

If the class system is the most effective way of teaching, and this way must not prevail when the church meets in public congregation, then, what does prevail an hour before the church meets, and is more effective at that hour, proves that men have contrived a plan, or method of teaching that is more excellent than the plan that Paul, the Apostle, laid down to be observed in the public congregation.

The plan Paul laid down to govern and control the church when it comes together in one place was for one to speak at a time, and the women to keep silent, but my friend has found another plan that will more effectively do that teaching in the congregation; than he has discovered something better than the spirit of Almighty God was able to devise, and hence he magnifies himself above the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Says one, Brother Cowan, isn't that talking mighty plain? Yes, I must talk plainly to be understood, but I am not out of humor when I say that. I must make my point. I have the Word of God for it.

Again, it is the duty of parents to bring their children up in the admonition and nurture of the Lord. Ephesians 6. The class system supplants this duty, as much so, as the Sunday School system that my opponent contends for, supplants the same thing. My opponent contends that he objects to Sunday Schools as such because they are robbing the children of teaching, and causing parents to become negligent concerning their children, thinking they get that training in the Sunday School, that they should class system, whether you call it Bible study, Sunday-School or what not, can do the same thing, that parents can neglect to teach their children at home, thinking that the Bible classes will give them all the information that they need.

I have made this objection a number of times, and my opponent doesn't notice it only in this way; he says I scrapped what he says. Well, let him show I have scrapped this proposition, and then his objection will have some weight to it.

The class system makes a public work out of a private

one. I get this idea from First Timothy 5, concerning widows who are widows indeed. Paul says in the tenth verse, "Let not a widow be taken into the number under three score years of age, having been the wife of one man if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saint's feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, and has been diligent in every good work."

Now, there are several works in a category of like nature, all private works. In the number there is feet washing. My opponent will say feet washing is a private work, and not a public work of any congregation, but classed with it is the bringing up of children, another private work. If he says we may make the bringing up of children a public work in the assembly, then I am going to argue we can make feet washing a public work in the same assembly, and don't you ever knock on feet washing in a public assembly until you clear yourself of this charge.

The Holy Spirit was to guide the apostles into all truths, and at the time the Holy Spirit came to guide them, the world needed teaching as bad as it could, and the Holy Spirit no doubt was wise enough to direct the Apostles in the best possible manner or method of teaching.

Then if we go to where these examples are recorded in the Book of Acts, and see how they did this teaching, and then we imitate their methods and manner of teaching, in our teaching work, we are certainly upon the safe side of this proposition. To illustrate: The Holy Spirit was to guide them to baptize folks. I go down to the eighth chapter of Acts, and I see just how it was performed, "and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him, and then they both came up out of the water."

Then I argue, that is the way we ought to do baptizing. Well, our Methodist friends say, "That is all right, but sprinkling or pouring will do, too."

All right, let's apply that. The Holy Spirit guided the apostles in the method or manner of their teaching. I go and see that they always taught assemblies by one method and that is by one speaking to the assembly at a time.

There is absolutely no exception to this rule, laid down in the Acts of the Apostles.

Then I contend that is the only way we should teach an assembly. My friend comes along and says, "that is one way to teach them, but another way will do." A way not mentioned will do; just so our Methodist friend argues immersion is one way to baptize, but another way to baptize will do. Now, if we are contending for immersion only, because that is the only way they have that baptizing is done, why not be confined to one speaking to an audience at a time being the one way we should conduct the teaching of assemblies of people? I believe everyone gets that argument, and the Holy Spirit that guided the apostles into all truth was also to bring to their remembrance everything the Lord had said. Of course, the Lord had said nothing about the class system. The Holy Spirit did not bring that to their memories. It was to show them things to come, no prophecies in their teaching ever prophesied of the Sunday School or class system.

All Scripture inspired of God is profitable for truth, correction, etc., that the man of God should be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto every good work, but the word of God does not furnish us with a class system, therefore, we charge it is not a good work. Paul say, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you." Acts 20: 29. He did keep back the class system; never said a word about it; therefore, it was not profitable.

I wish to call attention again that God's divine power has given unto us all things that pertain to godliness. That divine power is the gospel. We do not find the class method pertaining to it, but the reverse is death and ungodliness. Again, it is not an act of faith, not being found in the Word of God.

Faith comes by hearing God's word, and you can not have faith without hearing God's word, and God's word doesn't say a thing in the world about the class system. Then how can you have faith in it?

It is an evil tree because of its fruits. Everywhere where it has been introduced, it has caused division and strife among brethren. If we are to judge a tree by its

fruits, and our Saviour said do that, I judge the system my opponent contends for is an evil tree because of the evil fruit it bears. We are told to mark them which cause division among us, contrary to the doctrine which ye have received of us. That is Paul. We received no such doctrine from Paul as my friend is contending for as a method or manner of teaching, but he contends for that which he says is based upon human reason and worldly wisdom, and even to the extent of dividing churches and congregations.

Then Paul says for us to mark those that do that, contrary to the doctrine we have received, and in another place he says, "Not after the tradition ye have received of us."

Now, the class system is a tradition all right, but it did not come from the apostles. And it being a tradition of men, Jesus Christ says they set at naught the law of God by their tradition, and that is exactly what I am charging upon my opponent in this debate. Don't get the idea that I am reflecting upon my opponent. I am making Scriptural arguments and demand a Scriptural answer to these arguments.

I wish to call attention then to another thought in this connection, and my closing part of the speech that the audience that assembles from ten to eleven o'clock is composed of the same people that are assembled from 11 to 12. Now, I want to know why it would not be proper and polite and right to divide that assembly from 11 to 12 to do the teaching part of that work. I want my opponent to tell you why it would be *wrong* to divide that assembly while they are being taught in that assembly, and be *right* to divide them an hour before that time.

I just confess to this audience and to my opponent that I can not see why that from ten to eleven it is right to divide that audience, and from eleven to twelve it is wrong to divide it. I mean in the teaching part of that eleven to twelve audience. Maybe he knows why. I am going to insist that the same different ages and abilities exist in the audience from eleven to twelve that existed in the same audience from ten to eleven. If different ages and abil-

ities is the cause that requires the division into classes, then the same audience from eleven to twelve would require the same division and for the identical same reasons.

I wish to state furthermore that if we can not have what we want from eleven to twelve, in what my friend calls the public congregation, in other words, more than one can not talk at a time now, women must keep silence as far as teaching is concerned from eleven to twelve, we know the Lord objects to that, but we have got some men who want to talk more than one at a time, and we have some women who desire to teach publicly, therefore, we will meet an hour earlier, and make a meeting of our own, and what the Lord won't let us have in his place of business, we will make a meeting of our own and have it anyhow.

Now, there is the attitude that my opponent stands in before this intelligent audience, claiming that the Lord will not permit him to classify and have women teachers in his meeting, but why can't I make a meeting of my own and have in it what the Lord will not let me have in his meeting?

Now, I see I have not time for another argument, in this speech, and I shall present a summary of my work in my next speech so we shall ask you, ladies and gentlemen, just to notice these arguments I have made and mark each one of them that my opponent answers during his next speech. See how many he takes up in the manner I have stated them, and replies to them as they have been stated, and I shall be satisfied.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I suppose that you all feel that I have a tremendous task before me, in view of the speech that you have heard, and my respondent rather challenges me to mention all of the items that he has brought forth. I don't have to do it. For they are grouped under one or two headings. One of them is: He has spent considerable of his time talking about one at a time, one at a time, speaking to an audience, yes one at a time speak-

ing to an audience. That is the Lord's arrangement, one at a time speaking to an audience, and my opponent wants more than one talking to an audience at one time.

That is all a misrepresentation as far as I am concerned. Every class is a separate audience, every class is a separate audience, and all that my respondent has said about my wishing to have people or teachers to talk to the audience more than one at a time is just that much balderdash. He has wasted his time. He has simply tried to confuse his audience. A man who has had a hundred debates —why, yes, he engages in tricks of that kind, but, friends, I have called his attention to this several times in one form or another, and several of these blundering mistakes were made, just blundering arrangements, and now I call your attention to this one:

I never contended for more than one individual speaking to an audience at a time. Set that forth I suppose very nearly as many times in this debate as I have fingers on my two hands, but he thinks that he can get somebody to believe it, that I am after having more than one speak to an audience at a time. Now, I suppose that ought to be sufficient, as far as that is concerned, and it answers near or about one-half of his last speech.

Said I raised a little fuss. Only one speaker addressed an entire assembly. And then talked about adjusting the rain, using that as an illustration of trying to adjust God's word to the people. What did Paul mean when he said, "Rightly dividing the word of truth. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." What did he mean by that? What could he have meant?

I gave an analysis of the entire Bible, history, law and prophecy, showed that the history is the plainest part, the law more difficult than the history, and the prophecy most difficult. He wanted to know if I could separate the milk from the meat, and those of you who were present well recollect that he tried to have some fun in talking about the different kinds of milk, and wound up with clabber, and then about the different kinds of meat. And here is a man who has a dozen children and would have to

have a dozen different kinds of meat for them. I called that balderdash; I still call it balderdash. It is the style of the demagogue who is working for temporary effect, that's all.

A dozen different kinds of meat for a dozen different children, unless the man had twins, and if the children were only a year apart, the man would have to have a dozen classes. He tried to make me ridiculous and in so doing made himself ridiculous. It has been a boomerang, has rebounded against my friend, and in this case, as I told the audience before, it is the smoke of the priest that ascends rather than the smoke of the intended victim. He intended me as the victim, but was guilty of such outlandish talk that he was the victim himself, and the people could see it as soon as it was mentioned.

Made mention of Philippians 4: 3. What I did there, I asked what the woman had done or those women had done in laboring with Paul. I wanted him to answer that, what they had done, and if I said that they had preached, it was just in between and the context will explain the matter when it comes forth. I am not uneasy about that. I don't think I have said anything here except what I intended to say, and the connection will show, friends, that I have not been contradicting myself, but my respondent in reading from my writings, endeavored time and again to show that Sommer had crossed Sommer's path. When I came to follow him up on one or two occasions, we found he had been a document scrapper, hadn't been fair, either to me or to Alexander Campbell's writings, tried to make you believe that Alexander Campbell was never a member of the Baptist Church, reading one sentence out of two paragraphs there, and when the matter was summed up, it was shown there was a time when he wasn't a member, but there was a proposition made that they receive them. After that last night certain of you recollect that we had a talk that those were Christian churches. Well, friends, that was before the Disciples Brotherhood was established and Campbell wrote even at a later date of the different churches made up of the different denominations as Christian churches. I don't think he ever quit that.
Beginning

with the old New Light assemblies, they called them the Christian Church, and the other religious denominations were called Christian churches. That is what we had a little talk on between him and his moderator. I wanted to know what they did, and he hasn't told us.

Did they simply wash the preachers' clothing and darn their socks, cook his victuals? Is that all they did? "Help those women that labored with me in the Gospel." What did they do? If they were bound up and down and in and under after the manner that he mentions?

I couldn't avoid being amused when he talked about that Greek word *gunikos*. Still takes in the genitive singular, as the stem of the word or unites it to the stem of the word. That is the reason I told the story last night about the negro and the Greek.

It was a shame for a woman to speak in the congregation. He would have it *all* women. Let your women keep silent. Wives of these inspired men, and if they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. Now, he would have it *all* women, all women, all women. We exposed that before, but he still goes back to it. It is a shame for women to speak in the 11 o'clock meeting; then why at 10 or 11? In the meeting that Paul referred to it was when the women were interrupting the men, the women were interrupting the men, the women were interrupting the men. If they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home.

I turn here to First Corinthians, 14th chapter, again, and call attention to this, beginning with the 22nd verse: After saying, Let all things be done unto edifying, "If any many speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret.

"But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence," enjoined upon the man as on the woman, on the man as on the woman, on the man as on the woman. I wonder can he understand that by my repeating it three times, or stating it and then repeating it twice.

And then he says in the 29th verse and onward: "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.

"And if anything be revealed to another that sitteth

by, let the first hold his peace." Let him be silent. Let the men be silent. The men's silence is here mentioned twice, and the woman's twice perhaps. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law."

That is what the Bible referred to. He referred to "Boss." Tried to make it as ridiculous as possible. The woman "boss" in the home and the woman in the meeting house.

Well, here we have two references to the men keeping silent, and two references to the women keeping silent. Why? To avoid confusion. Two persons to speak to the same audience at the same time would produce confusion, and thus to the women he said, "Let them ask their husbands at home."

He says these were not inspired men and tried to ridicule the idea of the Holy Spirit instructing the Holy Spirit. Paul was regulating the use of the gifts, and he said to them, that the spirit of the prophets are subject to the prophets, in other words, they were not inspired to such an extent that they couldn't possibly keep still like some of the fanatical people in this day and age who say they couldn't possibly keep still.

A certain man was charged with causing confusion in his meeting. He said one day that he was going to throw the meeting over to the Holy Spirit. He threw himself on his back and kicked like a bad boy would do sometimes when he wished to annoy his mother in a fit of anger, and he kicked, and afterwards he got up and said that after he turned the meeting over to the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit had made more noise and had more confusion than they had ever had. Charged all upon the Holy Spirit.

Now, the more you look at that, friends, (that was over at Magnetic Springs, Ohio,) the more you see the absurdity of this kind of talk.

Let the men keep silent, and then because it says, Let the women keep silent, why, the women keep silent in the church. All down through the ages a woman has to keep silent in the church. Upon that principle what was the

reason for keeping silent? Was it not to avoid interrupting somebody? Examine it for yourselves and you see that this man has simply been offering to you a series of subterfuges, misleading very much like the political demagogue.

Now, don't forget that prophesying was for the public congregation. Paul declared in the 22nd verse of First Corinthians, 14th chapter, "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them that believe," for the edification of the church and then just listen while I read in the 11th chapter a passage that my opponent has seemingly kept clear of, in the 11th chapter of First Corinthians, and 5th verse. Paul says, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven."

Women were to have coverings on their heads and for that reason they shouldn't cut their hair off, have the hair for a covering, used like a veil in those days. Now, here we find that the woman prophesied. And prophecy, we learn elsewhere, or in the 14th chapter, was for the edification of the church. And this word for woman here is not the word for the widow or the virgin, but it is just simply the word *gunikos*, as he calls it.

The word *guna*, referring to a woman, generally a married woman. The context shows that, for there is another word for the widow and there is another word for what is called the virgin, and Philip had four daughters who did prophesy and prophesying was for the edification of the church. How could they edify the church if they didn't speak to the church? Speak to somebody else and let somebody else tell the church? Where is the instance of that kind'?

I see that my time is half up.

He spoke of my discussing him rather than the proposition. Well, friends, who commenced this thing, as Abraham Lincoln said to the bull who chased him to a haystack and when Lincoln chased him around and took him by the tail and began kicking him, and when the bull saw he was

beaten he darted out in the field and started to paw and bellow, and Abe said, "I would like to know who started this anyhow?"

He was the one who began discussing the person instead of the proposition, and I rebuked him for it and told him it was impolite and he went on and on and the last speech was very largely made up of discussing me, even though he said he was not going to do it. Oh, no, he is too much of a gentleman to discuss me, but you heard as much about me, didn't you, as you did about the proposition.

He said he had had over one hundred debates. I wrote down, "My opponent has been discussing me most of the time."

Then he said, "If the teaching can be done more effectively at the ten o'clock meeting than at the eleven o'clock meeting, then man has devised a means better than God's, and he magnifies himself above the Word of God."

What a tremendous charge, magnifies himself above the word of God.

Now, according to my respondent, there isn't any teaching to be done anywhere under the shining sun except in one audience in the public congregation, or it is to be done at home. It isn't authorized even to talk about the subject if he meets somebody on the sidewalk or meets somebody in the social circle. The parents are to teach the children and nobody else is to teach them, and it is all bound up after that manner, only two places, and according to this, except what the parents do toward the children, they are not authorized to teach anybody else and that is to be done at home. And what a preacher can do in the public congregation. That is the do-nothing disposition that we are complaining of, and it is the class of do-nothing disciples who prefer this particular something, but this is what they will do, come together on Lord's Day morning and there will be perhaps three or four sitting there and two or three sitting here and several others sitting back yonder, and coming together in groups and talking, (it may be for ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty minutes before the eleven o'clock time comes, in case they do

gather that much earlier) about anything, politics or crops or the weather or anything; spend their time after that manner, only don't talk about the Bible, because you are in classes. Don't talk about the Bible.

Now, friends, the individual who talks after that manner or says what implies this, ought to blush and drip with shame. He ought to be ashamed to live and afraid to die. We are called upon to study the word of God. The Apostle Peter says, "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth," and in view of all else that claims our time and our attention, do you think that two hours on the Lord's Day is too much for us to devote to the word of God when we come together? One hour for the regular service, in harmony with what we have here, and then another hour previous to that for those who can come to teach not only their own children, but others, and in so teaching, to have one teacher for each class?

Well, but where is your authority for any class? I have read over here in Titus, I don't know how many times since this meeting commenced. I say I have read in Titus, or Paul's letter to Titus, and the second chapter, that he said, in so many words, addressing that preacher, beginning with the first verse: "But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine."

Now, listen to the sound doctrine:

"That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience." Not a word said about them speaking or teaching. Listen to this now:

"The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; " Women are to be teachers of good things; not a word said about the old men being teachers of good things. Why not? Either presuming that much is understood or that the old men were not in the faith. He can take either alternative he sees fit.

"That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,

"To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient, to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."

Now, there we have divine authority for a special class teaching a special class, and that is an index, friends, to this special class business, whether at home or some other place.

The Saviour said over and over again in the course of his personal ministry, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." That is a universal charge; the Apostle John wrote that the Saviour said, Revelation second and third chapters, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the spirit saith to the churches." But my respondent would have it all summed up in an audience coming together and listening to the preacher, listening to the preacher, listening to the preacher; doesn't seem to have much use for that idea of four different speakers on one occasion, because if he had dwelt upon them as found in the 26th verse of the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, he would undoubtedly have shut himself off from preaching on Lord's Day morning when the whole assembly comes together. And this reminds me that I happened to mention on a former occasion, "Where is your authority for your extra meeting on the Lord's Day night?" And what did he do but slipped over to Acts 20th chapter where we find that Paul met with the disciples on the first day of the week and continued his speech until midnight. I was talking about the extra meeting, and he endeavored to mislead the audience by saying Paul continued his speech until midnight. He continued the same service as far as the book informs us. They met in the after part of the day and perhaps after sunset in the evening upon the basis of which some say we shouldn't commune except at night. He set that forth and Paul continued his speech until midnight.

And he endeavored to mislead the people with the idea that I have called for a night meeting. I wanted to know what authority he had for that extra meeting at night, and I have called for authority for the protracted meeting. And here I am reminded that when I called for the Scripture for the invitation and the invitational hymn when we come to the conclusion of a meeting, he went over there to the last chapter of Revelation and said that "the Spirit

and the bride say, Come, and let him that heareth say, Come."

I was talking about that which is actually the case in -near about every one of our meetings. It is presumed that we can have the invitation and that we can have the invitational hymn; yes, of our own accord, our own arrangement. When and where did any apostle ever say, "Brother, what is the invitation hymn?" and then have him announce it, and to begin the singing and call upon people to come forward and make the public confession? That is all in addition to what we find in the New Testament to which he would wish to confine himself so closely.

I have five minutes more, and whether I get all of his balderdash answered or not, friends, I will make mention of this: If one instance of Scripture for the contribution is authority for us to have the contribution all down through till the close of the gospel age, why isn't one instance of the special class authority for us in regard to having a special class whenever and wherever the occasion may demand it, for the same reason that is given there in the Book.

And furthermore, if the one instance of meeting upon the first day of the week to break bread, as found in Acts 20: 7, is authority for my opponent as it is for me and you, to meet upon the first day of the week, and we cling to that, why is not that one instance of the special class authority for us to have a special class, just as often as the occasion may require, and for the same purpose—to give instruction that could not be given by anybody else than the special teachers that are there mentioned?

Talk about answering arguments. I would like to know why this can not be done. Why is it true that the one instance in the one case is authority for a continued practice and the one instance in the other case is something that you can snap your fingers at and disregard? The more you look at that, friends, the more you see that my respondent is not treating the word of God fairly, and he isn't treating me fairly when he casts reflections upon the basis of his own imagination with reference to what he has accomplished in that which he has said.

If the one instance of rebaptism, friends, in Acts 19th chapter, gives my opponent authority as he thinks, for rebaptizing everybody that didn't understand fully what he was doing when he was baptized the first time, and had some error connected with it, why if that one instance gives authority for all of this rebaptism that he is contending for, why is it that the one instance of a special class taught by special teachers is not authority for just as many special classes as my respondent could have special individuals to baptize again that have been previously baptized?

Now, when you come to consider that, you will see that he is engaged in a kind of reasoning that is suicidal to himself and is misleading to the audience, just as soon as it is brought to the attention of intelligent people. The man is engaged in a kind of reasoning, friends, that causes me to think of the disposition of a hungry dog with reference to his dinner. Now, don't suppose I am calling him a dog. But the dog has his mind upon his dinner and whoever undertakes to draw his attention off is liable to have his hand snapped, and when I endeavor to call my opponent's attention to some other Scripture, he is ready to snap and snap and snap or ridicule and burlesque and say, as he said several times, "I am feeding him out of his own spoon, feeding him out of his own spoon." I don't know how often he has said, "feeding him out of his own spoon," but he wouldn't say anything ugly. He is, in his own estimation, I think, a perfect gentleman, but you can judge for yourself with reference to this matter.

The time is too far spent to say anything or begin anything more, and I just leave this speech with you, friends, and the Lord willing, I shall have one more in which to deal with his case. (Time expired.)

MR. J. N. COWAN (Affirmative): Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: After having listened to the speech made by my opponent, I shall now address you for the last thirty minutes that I shall speak in this debate. I shall first review some things that my opponent has said,

and then shall give you a brief summary of the work done upon this question.

He said something about the special class business, referring to Titus 2: 1-4, and says, Here we have a special teacher and a special class, although Paul was talking about what older women should teach younger women in regard to how to keep house, and how to raise their children, and domestic things of that kind which were not appropriate topics to be taught in a public assembly. Here is where he goes to get his public teaching of things that ought to be taught in private to younger women by mothers or older women who know how younger women should start out to housekeeping.

There goes your special class proposition.

But listen: Suppose this line of argument is so; then I find the same Apostle writing again to Timothy saying, "Charge them that are rich, that they be not high-minded nor put their trust in uncertain riches."

Now here is a special teacher and another special class, the rich class. Now, on Lord's Day morning, when the older women get the younger women in one class, then where are you going to put the rich, those that are rich? You have another special, that of rich folks. First you have to determine who are rich in order to get the rich folks separated from the poor folks. This is the same instance.

Again I find in First Timothy 5: 3, Paul instructing a younger preacher, again says, "Let the younger widows be refused for when they began to wax wanton against Christ they will marry."

Now, here is special instructions to a special class, and it is the wax wanton class. Now, when you meet next Lord's Day, you get your young women in one class, and rich folks in another, then pick out the young widows who are waxing wanton, and put them in another class, I suppose. Now, there is the kind of argument that he is trying to divide an assembly into classes upon your minds with.

I could prolong that, but that is enough to give you a fair sample of his method or manner of reasoning. Then he undertakes to describe what we do. He says that they

come together and set a group here and there and yonder and talk about anything and everything but the Bible. He wants to know why we can not put that time in studying the Bible. We could, put it in studying the Bible, and we take up as much time on Lord's Day studying the Bible as my friend does, every bit as much, but listen, when they come together before they start their Bible study, what do they do? They talk around about various things before they start their Bible study. Why didn't you start your Bible study before that? According to his position as soon as you get into the church house, you must start studying the Bible. You can't say, "How do you do? How are your folks?" Well, if you can, away goes your argument.

He said something yesterday about what I said being cheap. What about that for cheap?

No teaching anywhere except in the church and in the home. I explained to him last night what I meant by home. I did not mean the residence, the dwelling house, but all the teaching we do was to be done as a member of the church or as a member of the home without this other forming or organizing classes.

Again, he wants to know who began this thing about discussing one's opponent. He is the man who began it. He thinks I began it for this reason. I referred to what he said and I answered what he said, and that is not discussing my opponent, although I used his name very often, but he says that he 'is discussing me as to my character, as to my being morally debased, a vile perverter of Scripture or a vile perverter of authority.

Now, there is a difference in calling a man hard names, and using a man's argument to turn against him. I claim I am within the limits of my rights, as a debater, when I refer to what he said, and show that thing to be absurd and that is not a reflection upon my opponent's character in any sense of the word.

But he has transcended his limit by referring to me as not being worthy to be trusted in any respect, he said, and the stenographer's notes will show that he said that.

Very well, he talks about prophesying, women prophe-

syng, First Corinthians 11: 5, and had something to say about bobbed hair and stuff and another which does not pertain to the discussion of this question.

He says that silence was enjoined on man as well as upon woman. Why, certainly. What kind of silence was enjoined upon man? Now, listen right fast while I talk fast. If a man was in the audience and wanted to teach and had a foreign language that the congregation could not understand, why, let that man keep quiet and not undertake to teach that congregation. To keep quiet means not to teach the congregation, so if that is the meaning of the word, when you say, "Let your women keep silent," he means for them not to play the role of public teacher, either, so I have the argument.

He said the women were interrupting the men there at Corinth, that is why they gave that instruction. Wonderful information! I never read it. Now, that is some of his manufactured testimony. Who told you they were interrupting the men while they were talking? Now, let's read two authors. The reason why women were forbidden to speak in the church was because they were interrupting the men. —one authority. Next: Let your women keep silence in the church for they are not permitted to speak, but to be in subjection, *for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church*. That is the other authority. Now, which one are you going to believe?

Now, concerning the definition of the word *gunakas*, he still persists that I used the wrong word. I have Thayer, who *is* the author of this Greek lexicon of the New Testament. I would be glad if any one desires to come and look at this word in its different forms.

First we have the word *guno*, *gunakas*, *gunake*. There are three forms of the word, and this definition follows all three of the forms: Universally, a woman of any age, whether a virgin, married or a widow. There is the authority; the words used, and the word I used are both defined by the identical words. That is enough for that.

What he said about Campbell joining the Baptist Church: He still persists that I misrepresented Campbell. This doesn't belong to this discussion any more than it

shows how one may treat an author. That is the only reason I suppose that it is introduced now. I have the book here, and I want to read just a little from that as this is my last speech, and I will have no chance to refer to this any more.

Mr. Campbell says, "I had no idea of uniting with the Baptists more than the Moravian nor the mere independents." I read that on page 169 of Rowe's history. Turning to page 171, I read: "They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches, and though not a member, to preach for them."

Does that sound like he is a member of the Baptist Church, and he says, "though not a member."

"I often spoke to Baptist congregations for sixty miles around. They all pressed us to join their Red Stone Association." Notice now the word "association," not "church."

"We laid the matter before the church in the fall of 1813. We discussed the propriety of the measure. After much discussion and earnest desire to be directed by the wisdom which cometh from above, we finally concluded to make an overture to that effect, and to write out a full view of our sentiments, wishes and determinations on that subject. We did so in some eight or ten pages of large dimensions, exhibiting our remonstrance against all human creeds as bonds of communion or union, among Christian churches, and expressing a willingness upon certain conditions to cooperate or unite with that *association*, provided always that we should be allowed to teach and preach whatever we learned from the Holy Scriptures, regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom."

Now, this tells what church he belonged to and tells the creed of the church, and my opponent knows that this creed laid down here is not a Baptist creed and no Baptist church ever adopted such a creed. Then I am right in this contention and he is wrong about it.

What they did do in a number of those churches, they went into that association, not that he joined the Baptist Church, but did unite in that association of churches, and

he still says he is not a member of the Baptist church and I am right.

MR. HARPER: Would you be fair and read the rest of it?

MR. COWAN: I will read it on his time.

MR. SOMMER: I will read it.

MR. COWAN: He talks now about Philippians 4: 3, and says if he said they may preach to a public congregation he said in between somewhere, and I never did understand just what was between. He didn't make himself clear there; the fact of the business is he said Paul preached to public congregations and women did the very same work, and the stenographer's notes show that, because I had them looked up before I left the meeting last night. So he might as well prepare to repudiate that, like he has repudiated a lot of other things he said during this debate.

All right, now I shall not refer to but one thing in his speech and that is about all there is to refer to, and that is concerning the family of twelve children. Now, I am going to tell you how that came up. My opponent wrote a tract upon the Sunday School question, and I have the tract of that description that I read from. On Page 8, he says:

"I believe that we may do so with great advantage, forming a separate class of each grade of learners, and in a certain sense privately explaining the lesson just considered in public."

On page 24 of the same tract we read: "Parents or other guardians are to be the teachers."

On page 6: "Others have not authority over these learners," and on the same page he says, he objects to the Sunday School because the teachers in their classes have no authority over the learners, yet he would form a class and put a teacher over it and wouldn't call it Sunday School, yet the teacher has no authority over these learners more than they had in the Sunday School class.

I argued, then, if the parents only had authority to teach their children because they only had authority over them, then suppose a family of ten children, no two would

be in the same class unless they were twins. Therefore, if they are separated into grades, there would be ten grades in this family to be taught in as many groups or grades and only the parents to teach the ten classes. Why? Because he says the other teachers have no authority over these children.

Now, this is a place where my opponent meets himself coming back, or saw himself reflected in the mirror and got mad at me, because he saw what he had said himself.

Listen while I give more matter from the same tract, page 24: "If parents or other guardians wish to begin to do this, private teaching, expounding in a meeting house by calling their children into little groups or companies in different parts of the house, they are only carrying out what has been begun by the one doing the public reading or expounding."

Here we would conclude that parents could teach their children only and not the children of others, because they have no authority over other children. Where is the congregation which maintains such a practice? If there be no such congregation, then how can the church that my opponent is identified with be Scriptural in doctrine, work and worship?

Now, the introducing of this testimony from my opponent's pen is what has caused all of this fuss about scrapping authors, etc.

I want to read again on page 10 of the same tract: "The forming of classes is left to the decision of each congregation, and every assembly where one or more persons in good standing will object to the forming of classes, they should not be formed. The same is true in regard to women becoming teachers of classes in a meeting house, but where there is objection to any women teaching a class, then let the objection prevail if it be urged by one in good standing."

Now, since he has written that tract he says, "I repudiate that statement." Here is one of the things he said that he had to take back. Well, now, then, after repudiating **that** statement, we **follow** *with* the **next statement in the same book**, page ten: "But **no one can** justly *claim to*

be a Disciple of Christ, and yet object to a church gathering all of every class to the meeting house or elsewhere, putting a Bible or New Testament into the hand of each one who can read, and then reading and expounding the Word of God to them. Then let this be clone everywhere with diligence and to God's honor and glory."

With this I headed my first affirmative speech on this question in this debate, and I am still staying with that proposition. If my friend would only agree with me that all Disciples of Christ can be united upon that, that he says that no Christian can object to, and we don't object to it; then peace and harmony will prevail among the Disciples of Christ.

Now, reading these passages from his writings is why he censors me with being unfair. I just ask the audience to think now how could I have misquoted or misread those passages and left the wrong impression because I read enough to give a clear statement of his proposition before I quit reading.

Now, he can accuse me of anything, for as I say, I rejoice when men say all manner of evil against me. He is getting joy out of calling me those names, so nobody break up the joy we are having.

I desire to call attention to the fact that in my opening speech I showed that in the Old Testament age, God had all the people gathered together in one audience, and the law of Moses was read to the entire audience, naming" the men, women, and children. You will find this in the 31st chapter of Deuteronomy and in the 8th chapter of Joshua. I argued that if the law of Moses was so perfectly adaptable to all ages of people, then the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ could be, and would be as adaptable to all ages and grades of people now. Then I quoted from Deuteronomy, 32d chapter, and Isaiah 55th chapter, that the Word of God, the teachings of God, dropped just as rain dropped from Heaven, and that if the rain in its nature was perfectly adaptable to all ages of plants, and we all know that rain water is the best water for plants that can be had because it is distilled in God's distillery and is pure.

That being true, then, the rain just as it comes from the aerial heavens is adaptable to every plant from lettuce with two leaves on it to the giant oak tree. If the Word of God drops in the same manner—and the Book says it does—then the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is just as adaptable to the little child as it is to the man who is hoary with age.

I state furthermore, my friends, that when the apostles carried out the great commission that they respected that very principle and hence always taught their audiences exactly alike. For that reason, I claim to have apostolic example, apostolic command, and apostolic precedent for the method and manner of teaching that we employ.

Could my opponent read one case, like he does, in the New Testament, I would give it up. I know many people today have been traditionized in the class system. You will think strange of a man who would oppose it, but let me ask you, my friends, have you read the Bible on this question? Do you know what the Lord says about it?

Now, it is possible that you, my friends, have held to something all your lives that was a mistake, so please do not allow any prejudice, or any teaching before now, disqualify you for an impartial juror in the decision of this case.

I must claim, my friends, that the arguments I made concerning the carrying out of the great commission, that if the example that the Apostles gave us were a safe example for baptizing, it would also be a safe example for teaching. If the way they did the baptizing was the only way it should be done, then the way they did the teaching was the only way it should be done, and I have made this argument several times, and my opponent treats it with contempt and silence. Not only this, but the number of arguments that I made in my last speech concerning the work being of a private work instead of a public one, concerning the Holy Spirit bringing to their remembrance all things that the Apostle Paul said concerning the showing of the things to come, in fact, about a dozen or more arguments that I made in my first speech this evening, he never referred to one time*

Yet he calls that debating. I will tell you how he regards the best way to answer an argument, if I can say that word—"*balderdash*." That answers the whole thing, doesn't it—"*balderdash*." If that is what it takes to make a debater, if that is the way to reply to an opponent's argument, I would not be surprised if a little ten-year-old boy would soon learn to say *balderdash*. I don't know what that word means, and he hasn't defined it yet, but he keeps using it.

I want to state further, my friends, that in this debate I have offered the argument that the congregations that assembled from 11 to 12 are composed of the same ages, grades and abilities that the audiences are who are assembled at 10 o'clock; if it be right to assemble at 10 o'clock and divide those grades into the proper places, which means to organize them, why would it not be right at 11 o'clock to divide the same people into their different grades for the same purpose?

Did he tell you why? No, he didn't tell you; only he said "*balderdash*."

Again, when I showed that he recognized the fact that from eleven to twelve o'clock in that meeting they must not divide into classes because God forbids it; they must not have the women teach them because God forbids it, but if the Lord won't let us do what we want to from eleven to twelve, we will get here before the Lord has any say-so in it, and we will do what we please, and do the things that the Lord won't allow us to do in his place of business. What did he say about that? Do you remember his answer? Echo answers where? Now, if you call that debating, saying "*balderdash*" and that answers it, why, I have been brought up in the wrong school of polemical ethics. I certainly have.

I further showed, my friends, that if the class system, as advocated by my friend, was the best system of teaching, but God would not allow it at his meeting from eleven until twelve, that then man has organized a better system from ten until eleven, than God Almighty would allow in his meeting from eleven to twelve.

I know that intelligent people can not afford to believe

that. I state further in this connection that the class system is not essential. It can be dispensed with, that the teaching can be done as my opponent says in his tract called "Sectarianism," that preachers should preach mixed sermons to mixed audiences, and if they do not know their audience, they should ask elders of the church who should know how to deal out the Word of God in that audience. It can be done in that way, and that way can not be dispensed with. And we can all agree to that. I say to you, my brother and sister, if you love peace and union and harmony better than you love the class system, you will forsake that, and take what we all say is right, but if you love the class system more than you love God's system, and more than you love the cause of Christ, and more than you love the reputation of the church in this community, of course, you will stay with the class system and maintain the division. Your love is put to the test. Which do you love the most, the class system or the peace and harmony of God's system?

Now, if my opponent says without the class system he will say we may go to hell, will he say we can dispense with the regular teaching to the regular congregation as a whole? No we can't dispense with that. Then both believe that is right and can not be dispensed with, but the other can be dispensed with for peace and union. If eating meat will make my brother to offend, I will eat no more meat while the world stands. Why don't you have that spirit about your class system, and that will eliminate the trouble, restore peace, union and harmony, among the people of God?

In my remaining seconds, I want to thank these people for the patient manner in which they have listened, and I want to ask you not to stay with my proposition just because I am on that side. Let Cowan sink beneath the wave of oblivion, but let the truth rise and be exonerated. Don't stay with my opponent on his account; don't join with Brother Sommer on his account, but take the proposition as it stands upon its merit, and if you can find in the passages of Scripture where the apostles divided the audience into classes in order to teach them, then go ahead and do

that. If you can't find it, you had better let it alone for the Word of God furnishes unto all God's works and all we want to ask you to do is to take the Bible and be satisfied with what you find there. If I am wrong, I would like to know it. I think we should all be of that mind. Be open to conviction and be ready to be instructed, but it takes more than "*balderdash*" to convince me, it takes a thus-saith-the-Lord to convince me that a proposition is right, and that is what we have been calling for, and urgently calling for, from the beginning of this debate, and have not received, so I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, from the depths of my heart.

MR. DANIEL SOMMER (Negative): Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The wisest monarch of Israel wrote near the conclusion of the book of Ecclesiastes, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."

"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

And now hear the conclusion of this whole matter that has been going on here for five days and a half, or fully five days.

I suppose that many of you have been in court or you have read law enough to know the old legal aphorism, False in one, false in all. If a witness is convicted of a falsehood while he is on the stand, then that witness is set aside, and a witness may be arraigned for perjury. That is the legal phase of it.

Well, now that is one reason why I haven't tried to take the pains to answer everything that my respondent has offered, nor has he tried to offer any response to all that I have offered, that is to a great part of it.

Some of you recollect that I made three or four arguments in my last speech. One on the idea that if one mention of the first day of the week justifies our meeting upon the first day of the week, why not one mention of a special class justify us in having a special class? If one

mention of the Lord's Day contribution is sufficient to justify us in having a Lord's Day contribution, why not one mention of the special class justify us in having the special class, and the special classifying, and then if one mention of rebaptism justifies my opponent in rebaptizing everybody that he can dissatisfy with their first immersion, and justify his friends in so doing, why not this one mention of the special class be sufficient to justify us in forming special classes? And he never touched one of them except that he referred to Titus and he said the older women were to teach the younger women something that wasn't fit to be taught in the public assembly.

Now, listen while I read to see that I am not unjust to my opponent when I say that he is a reckless asserter, that he is a vile perverter, not only of humanly arranged documents, but even of the Word of God.

Paul says of the older women that they may teach the younger women to be "sober," in other words, sober-minded, not sober in regard to strong drink. The word there I have found means sober-minded. Isn't that right to teach in the public congregation? "To love their husbands." Isn't that right to teach in the public congregation? "To be discreet?" Isn't that right to be taught in the public congregation? "Chaste." Isn't that right to be taught in the public congregation? "Keepers at home," minding their own business. Isn't that right to be taught in the public congregation? "Good." Isn't that right to be taught in the public congregation? "Obedient to their own husbands." Isn't that right to be taught in the public congregation? That the Word of God be not blasphemed.

Now, he stands convinced of a false statement concerning that special classing or classifying there mentioned in Titus, and I just simply show him to be a vile perverter of the Word of God; just convicted of that, by saying, "Teach things not fit to be taught in the public congregation."

I again say the man ought to be ashamed to live and afraid to die. He should blush and drip with shame.

Now, false in one, false in all. I bring this before you. He has read much from my writings but I say he has

scrapped every passage. I convicted him on a former occasion of reading from the tenth page of my tract on Sectarianism, reading a single declaration and question, and its answer, and then stopping there. I will read that again. It will look well in the book.

"Should we acknowledge any of those to be Christians who are identified with sectarian churches and wear sectarian names? No, not in the full and Scripture sense of the word Christians."

Now, he stopped there and made capital of what I had said and presented it with something else. I took that up and read the following:

"In mind and heart some of them are doubtless converted to Christ, but they can not keep the ordinances fully, nor be altogether in harmony with the Gospel while they hold membership among sectarians and wear sectarian names. None of the denominations are wholly right and none of them are wholly wrong. We should admit the truth and condemn the error in each, and should admit that many among the denominations are better than their sectarian creeds. Sectarianism is bad enough, and preachers of Christ should not stain their spirits with sin by misrepresenting what is found in sectarian systems."

Now, there was my explanation. He didn't read it. He scrapped my writings. He is not only a Scripture scrapper, but he is a humanly arranged document scrapper; in other words, a scrapper and a perverter of humanly arranged documents.

He wants to know, and I wrote it here, Will the people go to hell without the class system? That he would not say so. They are allowing a great many people to go and join sectarian churches and I have already brought before you that there was a witness here that says there was a company of young people who had been attending here, who went to the Baptist Church and asked to be immersed, and wanted to stay there because they had nothing to do here.

MR. COWAN: That is new matter.

MR. HARPER: That was presented before.

MR. SOMMER: That was presented before.

Now, he said about the meat, if eating meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world stands, because it might encourage others, and Paul said that is true. That was right. It affected Paul only for him to quit eating meat. So it is not setting an example that would damage another individual, and cause an individual to eat meat that had been offered to idols, and thus eat with a conscience that was in doubt. That affected Paul only, but I am talking about something that affects not only the whole congregation (it may be a large congregation) but affects the brotherhood generally. It is a question of taking care of the young people, the young people are going astray just as rapidly as they can, and our young people, if we don't give them special attention, are destined to go off in many instances at least, and associate with others, and go to sectarian Sunday Schools, and perhaps unite with sectarian churches, notwithstanding all that we may try to do for them at home. That is the way it has been in other places, and so it isn't a question of eating meat; it does not come under that heading.

Now, here is the part that my respondent hasn't been disposed to read from this book concerning Campbell. On page 171, second paragraph: "The proposition was discussed by the Association, and after much debate was decided by a considerable majority in favor of our being received. Thus a union was formed, but the party opposed, though small, began early to work and continued with a perseverance worthy of a better cause." Then he goes on and mentions the special individuals here that took the lead in this.

Now, you see the union was formed. The Brush Run Church that Campbell had been chiefly instrumental in establishing as a church, went into the Baptist Association, and thus became identified with the Baptist denomination, and that church remained there. But Alexander Campbell, when he found his teaching was going to cause him to be put on trial before the Association, why, he left and went over into eastern Ohio, northern Ohio, where the Mahoning Association was, and put his membership there. That is the history of it. I know that by having read Robert

Richardson's Memoirs of Alexander Campbell and statements of Campbell with reference to that matter by his own pen in other places.

Now, I see, friends, that I haven't very much time to conclude this whole matter, and so I will begin to read my final arraignment.

I now make my final arraignment of my opponent and his cause, and offer to my hearers many serious charges. Every cause may be (now, notice) justly judged by its own merits, and then by the conduct of its advocates. A man may have a good cause, but may damage it by bad behavior in advocating and defending it. Then a man may have a bad cause, and yet may defend it to favorable consideration by his good behavior in defending it. But in this instance, my opponent has had a bad cause, and he has disgraced even that cause by his bad behavior as the following charges will abundantly prove.

First, I charge that early in this discussion my opponent began to show what one of my brethren called "a nasty disposition" by making } personal reflections and flings against me, which were like an eel in the mud that would require a low stoop and a muddy step to get hold of the slimy thing.

In my debate with a German Baptist, nearly forty years ago, nothing of that kind occurred as the published report of that debate will show.

Second, I charge that my respondent has misrepresented me in near or about every one of his speeches, and in several of them he has misrepresented in near or about a dozen different particulars.

Third, I charge that my opponent has misrepresented near or about every document that he has read from in this debate, as I have indicated by the instances in which I have taken such documents in hand and have exposed him as a perverter of what he read.

Fourth, I charge also that, worst of all, my opponent has misrepresented nearly every Scripture that he has used in this debate by unduly restricting or unduly extending or by mis-applying what he read,

Fifth, I charge likewise that my opponent has falsely

spoken of himself as persecuted for the sake of his righteousness when his unrighteousness only was exposed and he was reprov'd for it.

Sixth, I charge that my opponent has been guilty of taking the worst meanings of all that I have said against him and then has so conducted himself that *I* could not justly deny that such meanings were applicable to him. I suppose we all remember what he said about feeding me out of my own spoon.

Seventh, I charge also that my opponent has been guilty in this debate by adopting the word *only* in various instances and thus guilty of misrepresenting me as when he said that I had contended for classes on the basis of reason, nature and expediency and worldly wisdom only, and then charged me with contradicting myself when I referred to Titus second chapter, as an evidence in favor of special classes, as though the additional thought was a contradiction of what I had previously presented.

Eighth, I further arraign my opponent on the charges that he endeavored to ridicule me for justly going back to the Old Testament for evidence concerning civil governments, yet he unjustly went back to the Old Testament for evidence in favor of his own class idea at all times. The government, that continues, but so far as the method of teaching is concerned, that didn't necessarily continue, because we have a different order in certain respects in the New Testament. I say unjustly because in the New Testament we find mention made of at least one special class with special teachers.

Ninth, I arraign my opponent also on the charge that he takes the incidental case of rebaptism referred to in Acts 19th chapter, and 'uses that as authority for the special doctrine of rebaptizing all that he can cause to become dissatisfied with their previous immersion. —

MR. COWAN: That doesn't belong to this question. We are not debating the baptism question.

MR. SOMMER: I gave that as an illustration, I beg your pardon.

Yet denies to me and my brethren the right to take the command concerning a special class of learners in

Titus 2d chapter as authority for any number of special classes.

Tenth, I arraign my opponent further on the charge that he justly regards the one mention on the first day of the week as recorded in Acts 20th chapter as evidence that Christians should now meet for worship on the first day of the week, yet he denies that the single mention of a special class with special teachers is authority for such classes and teachers in the church in this generation.

Eleventh, I charge also that my opponent takes the single mention of the contribution on the first day of the week as authority for such contribution in the churches now, yet he denies that the single command for a special class to be formed with special teachers as mentioned in Titus second chapter is authority for any special class now with special teachers.

Twelfth, Furthermore, I arraign my opponent on the charge that he accepts the command concerning the contribution for a special purpose. I say he accepts such command and extends it as authority for all other Lord's Day contributions, and for all other purposes connected with the worship and work of the church, yet he denies that the command in Titus second chapter furnishes authority for any special class or classes with special teachers in our meeting houses in this generation. And what more shall I say? For the time would fail me to tell of all the other inconsistencies of my opponent in his efforts to uphold his divine doctrine about the classes for the purpose of instructing people in the Bible; also his divisive doctrine concerning the authority of civil governments and his authority concerning rebaptism and woman's silence. My opponent and his friends, I fear, all fall under the condemnation of every Scripture that condemns unscriptural divisions, but we can not compel them to be fair and honorable in their use of Scripture, They seem to delight in denouncing everything that pertains to the doctrine of the unity of the Churches of Christ. They seldom establish a new congregation, but try to divide every assembly of Disciples that they can possibly divide.

The doctrine of forbearing one another in love they

seem to hate, and the doctrine of disturbing and dividing congregations of Disciples they seem to love. I fear they are under the divine condemnation of those that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and who by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple, of those that are not informed against the false reasoning adopted by them.

Finally I mention that I regret exceedingly the unfair course that my opponent has adopted in this debate. In the Southland from which he comes are many honorable . gentlemen, as well as ladies, and all such he has disgraced by the course he has pursued, even if his doctrines had not been abominable.

The tree is known by its fruits, said the Saviour, and in this instance, we may judge that the tree with which he is connected undoubtedly is known by its divisive fruit.

Now, friends, something else to bring before you. You heard the statement here, or several of you did, most of you, I suppose, that the Cloverdale congregation has literature.

MR. COWAN: Has the collection.

MR. COOK: The collection. I am the man that made the statement, and I say it is collection.

MR. SOMMER: We were talking about literature.

MR. HARPER: Brother Cowan made the statement from the platform.

MR. COOK: But made it over my evidence. We got the witness.

MR. COWAN: I was quoting Brother Cook.

MR. HARPER: He made the statement; I don't know what you said. It is a question of what the respondent said. My recollection is that he said literature.

MR. SOMMER: I made mention of the literature afterwards and it wasn't discussed at all.

MR. COOK: It was the money question that Brother Cowan brought before the congregation and that is what I informed him of. If you want a statement of what I know about it, I am ready to give it.

MR. HARPER: It isn't necessary. It is what the respondent said.

MR. COWAN: Let me state a point. If they understood me to say literature, I am sorry. If I said it, I made a mistake. So the notes or report of the debate will show if I said literature or collection. If I said literature, I didn't mean to say it, but I was using the collection as one of the points that he had charged I didn't have. That is all I have to say on that.

MR. SOMMER: Literature was the question before my mind, and I was going to read a telegram that was sent to T. J. Nixon over there: "Cloverdale Church of Christ: Do you use lesson leaves in Lord's Day Bible classes? Wire at once."

"Greencastle, Indiana, November 14, 1926. A. R. Sommer, Davis Hotel, Sullivan, Indiana. No. T. J. Nixon."

Well, that little misunderstanding prevents what I intended to use with reference to that, but I have eight minutes yet, my moderator informs me.

I wish, friends, in conclusion to state that I have been closely connected with the congregation meeting in Sullivan from its beginning, or rather, I should say, I was connected with it, helping to establish it in the old court house when it was driven out, or certain disciples were driven out, from the Christian Church. They went into the court house and I gathered together about twenty-five of them, the congregation was established there, and set in order, as I recollect.

At a later date this house was for sale, and those brethren bought this house, and I was called on and helped in one protracted meeting here.

A little later there was a certain man that came in here who had notions against the classifying, and he found some others who had come in had similar notions. They united, the preacher and these persons, and they stirred up a racket here which resulted in physical force being used, and a lawsuit being used. The leading man here then was Brother W. G. Engle, and the lawsuit he brought did not by any means affect him unfavorably, and after the lawsuit was over, the question was, Who should

have this house, and there was a question about whether it should be taken to the courts or not.

One Lord's Day in Indianapolis I was at home, and a strange gentleman came into the meeting, and after the meeting was over he said, "I am an attorney from Sullivan, and I have been sent over here by Wm. G. Engle (and I don't know how many others he mentioned) and your friends over there to inquire what you think about settling this question."

I said, "Settle it out of court, if possible."

"Upon what terms."

I said, "Give all those who claim to be differing from you, all the money they can show they put in this house."

He said, "We have offered them that."

I said, "Offer them that again; not one cent more, not one cent of interest on the money because they have had a sitting in that house, and have given you much trouble."

He went back and the next thing I heard it was settled out of court, and I believe I can safely say upon that principle. And, friends, that is the manner in which true disciples treat those which differ from them, when a division must take place. They say, "How much have you put in that house?" They will pay them, as I have known them to do in I don't know how many instances, as near every dollar as they have put into the property.

But, friends, the Christian Church element, when it has taken possession of a house, has with the rarest exception ever offered us one single dollar, but has robbed us clean and clear of everything we have put into the house even though it had been the principal part of the house, in building or in purchasing it. And we find out that these who are divisive characters as contrary to the New Testament, when they gain the ascendancy or will stir up a racket with those who wish apostolic principle and purity, and when they leave, they don't give them what they have put into the house or property. Those who left at this place, some of you know, left over three hundred dollars in the treasury, and I don't know that any proposal has been made.

There is the question of the tree being known by its

fruits, friends. Here is the final indication beyond all question with reference to the honesty of these congregations.

MR. COOK: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that it is irrelevant to the question, and if he is going to continue, let Brother Cowan reply.

MR. HARPER: His respondent introduced the subject of a tree being known by its fruits.

MR. COOK: There wasn't anything said about this congregation. He was answering his argument in regard to this Bible class movement, and not this congregation, and this is a new question that is being injected, and I say that Brother Cowan or the elders of this congregation have a right to answer this question, if he proceeds any further with his tirade against the congregation.

MR. HARPER: He is showing the fruit of the class system, perfectly within the rules of honorable debate.

MR. SOMMER: I don't need to say anything more, friends. We conclude with the doctrine that the tree is known by its fruit. Then watch these two congregations and watch the procedure all the way through and consider what you have heard in this debate, friends, and read with care the published debate when it will be offered, which I trust will be before many months, and if possible, before many weeks.

Friends, you know what I think of this debate. I can tell you. Read in your histories the record of the Battle of Gettysburg. The southern forces made a splendid showing, or at least a good showing, in the first part of the battle, but when they undertook to break the union center, they found a steadiness against them that they were not looking for, and that magnificent general, Robert E. Lee, and his magnificent helpers, General Longstreet and General Pickett, retreated and went back to the Southland chagrined, defeated, if not what may be spoken of as broken-hearted. And you read the history of the Battle of Gettysburg and see if it isn't in harmony with what we have had here on this occasion.

I thank you for your attention.