

# Broking-Maxey Debate

## Broking's First Negative

### Introduction

Maxey wants the readers of this debate to believe that I just signed on to the proposition that I affirmed a few weeks ago. Maxey knows that is not true, but like the false teacher that he is he needs to keep pressing character issues because he can't deal with the doctrine. In the Broking-Maxey Discussion (2000) about Maxey's false teaching concerning marriage, divorce, and remarriage I wrote, "I am pleased to follow the New Testament pattern on this subject" (#2). I also wrote:

The inspired apostle taught the pattern concept of the New Testament. Notice another godbreathed statement: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 1:13). The word "form" in 2 Timothy 1:13 translates a word meaning "a pattern" (see ASV), and "a model." By following the "pattern" of sound words men stand in unity, the mind of Christ and thereby appropriate his grace. Paul wrote the following to Timothy: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine" (1 Tim. 1:3); because, without following the godbreathed pattern of faith, unity and practice, men cannot enjoy God's wonderful grace (#8).

My teaching about the New Testament pattern is nothing new to Al Maxey. The fact of the matter is that he does not have any teaching of substance to offer. Readers of this debate on the fringes have come to understand just how deeply Maxey is stooped into the outer darkness of his false teaching. Additionally, Maxey the wolf is not chasing fluffy little bunnies; he is too busy seeking to devour the sheep of God's flock.

I wonder if Maxey even read my 4<sup>th</sup> affirmative in this debate. I wonder because had Maxey read the material I wrote about how to use the pattern, then why did he write such foolish questions about ship movements and Jason's house? Maxey, I did not affirm that every word of the New Testament has to be obeyed, I affirmed that every word of the New Testament is the pattern for salvation and fellowship. That pattern has to be properly used. Maxey has been fighting patternism for years, but it is clear that he does not understand what patternists believe and teach about the pattern.

After reading Maxey's claim that David Brown and I are liars, I was minded to deal with his unfounded allegations in this negative. Rather than deal with this in my negative post itself, I have supplied as an appendix an email exchange that resulted from Maxey's claim. It is there for those interested. When I finally release the e-book of this debate, I will release the original pre-debate emails in the appendices.

### Maxey's Questions Answered

1. In Acts 18:7 we are informed by the inspired writer that the house of Titius Justus "was next to the synagogue." This statement provides a "pattern" of attitude and/or action

for disciples of Christ Jesus today that directly pertains to one's fellowship with other Christians and one's eternal salvation. True or False? **False**—it is part of the New Testament pattern. Remember Al that I did not affirm a proposition similar to yours.

2. In Acts 21:1-3 we read the following historical narrative: "We ran a straight course to Cos and the next day to Rhodes and from there to Patara; and having found a ship that was crossing over to Phoenicia, we went aboard and set sail. And when we had come within sight of Cyprus, leaving it on the left, we kept sailing to Syria and landed at Tyre; for there the ship was to unload its cargo." These words are binding upon us today as a "pattern" of attitude and/or action that directly pertains to one's fellowship with other Christians and one's eternal salvation. True or False? **False**—it is part of the New Testament pattern. Remember Al that I did not affirm a proposition similar to yours.

3. If a penitent believer is plunged beneath the waters of the baptistery, but dies instantly of a massive brain aneurysm *before* his nose breaks the surface of the water (thus failing to fully complete the act symbolizing the death, burial and *resurrection* of Christ), he dies in a *lost* condition. True or False? **True**—is a child born who dies in the birth canal? Maxey, I am limited to what the Scriptures reveal.

4. Jennifer is a quadriplegic who has developed a severe illness and has been hospitalized. While there she is visited by the hospital chaplain on a regular basis. She looks forward to his visits each day, and this chaplain takes the time to share the good news with her. After many hours and days of study, she asks to be baptized. He checks with her physician, but he says the act of immersing her could prove fatal and refuses to give his permission while she is still under his care at the hospital. The hospital administration concurs. Jennifer is willing to sign a waiver absolving the physician and hospital of any culpability in the event of her demise. The hospital's legal representative is out of town, but will prepare that document the next morning upon his return. Jennifer dies that night. She is lost. True or False? **True**—is a child born who dies in the birth canal? Maxey, I am limited to what the Scriptures reveal. Funny that you should attempt to poison the well with this one. Back in the 1980s I was called to discuss the Scriptures with a man who was in the process of dying. When I told him about the steps into Christ he began to cry. He told me that that was the first time in his life that someone had told him what he needed to do to get into Christ. He asked me to baptize him. His nurses and doctors said no—it might kill him. His family said no—it might kill him. He said, "let's do it now." So I, with the help of a willing assistant, took him that minute and baptized him. We ignored legal threats because this man's soul was hanging in the balance. Al, in your first affirmative you charge me with being a liar about what I teach and believe. Maxey you don't know my heart at all! I am willing to die for what I believe and always stand willing to give up my life to help others be saved. Would it do any good to quote Matthew 7:1 to you? Does that **narrative** even interest you?

5. Jason Smith is a devoted missionary, newly arrived on a remote island in the South Pacific. He has traveled two days inland, up a river by canoe, to reach the isolated Magurai tribe. He is welcomed by these primitive people, who seem eager to learn of this Jesus of whom he speaks so lovingly. In time, a few come to believe, and a small congregation of disciples is established. Jason faces a problem, however, with regard to the observance of the Lord's Supper. There's no wheat or grain grown by these people; they prepare a "bread" product from the root of a local shrub. Grapes also are unknown, but they eat a melon-like fruit, with red pulp, that grows on a vine. Jason has chosen to

use this "bread" and this red melon juice as the elements of the Lord's Supper. Jason and these natives are committing SIN by not using the exact same elements utilized by Jesus at the Passover where He instituted this memorial meal. True or False? **True.** Speaking as an experienced missionary, lets suppose that Jason went to start a church in a place where the emblems were not readily available and he did not have the foresight to bring them with him, then the worshippers are not obligated to observe the Lord's Supper any more than one who has no money is obligated to give. They will need to order supplies and take care of the problem, but substituting the emblems is not an optional matter.

6. Christians may *sing* Psalm 149 and Psalm 150 within a "worship service," but it would be a SIN for them to ever *do* what these two psalms declare. True or False? Al, this compound question should really be two questions. If you were to write them as separate questions, I would answer the first as **False** and the second as **True**. It is sin to dance and use the timbrel and harp in our worship services. It is sin to promote error in our worship music. Also, it might be a problem getting our beds into the meetinghouse. Interesting that you would even try to use this narrative when we are actually discussing what the New Testament authorizes.

#### Questions For Maxey.

1. The Scriptures can be correctly interpreted. True or False.
2. Following interpretative rules can assist those who study the Bible to make correct rational determinations about a passage. True or False.
3. Failing to follow interpretive rules can prove disastrous with respect to perceiving the true meaning of a passage or statement. True or False.
4. Correct interpretations of a passage are authoritative. True or False.
5. The interpretations of inspired writers of the Bible about other passages are authoritative. True or False.
6. Peter's interpretation of the antitype-type teaching of the flood and baptism, that baptism now saves us, is authoritative (1 Pet. 3:21). True or False.

#### Maxey's First Affirmative Examined

Maxey sought to restore sanity to this discussion about the Father's will for the salvation of humanity by ridiculing the idea that every word of the New Testament is essential. Maxey just does not get it! God placed His Word above His name (Psa. 138:2). The Scriptures were written within parentheses, if you will, warning men of the dangers of adding to or subtracting from God's Word (Deut. 4:2; Rev. 22:18-19). Maxey, I will disown that which I affirm, when you can prove from the Scriptures that one can take away from the New Testament writings without having his name expunged from the *Book of Life*. Please provide the readers of this debate with that list, however small or large it may be. Your list must contain at least a Word from God stating that your list of Scriptures can be taken away from the Scriptures. Is it a mark of sanity to suggest that God gave men useless filler material in the Scriptures? According to the Bible, adding to or taking away from the Scriptures is a salvation issue. Maxey where is the sanity in suggesting that any part of God's Word is not important?

Is it the case that those who diligently study every Word of the New Testament to please God do so because they are duped by the devil? In Second Timothy 3:16 the Greek word *graphe* is translated with the word Scripture. This Greek term means writings. When it is used in regard to the inspired writings of God's Word it is translated with the word Scripture. Hence, the term *Scriptures* refers to the Words breathed out by God, which were written by inspired men (2 Tim. 3:16). When Jesus said, "The Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35), He was speaking of the inspired written Word of God. God gave men the Scriptures in propositional form, i.e., logical, written sentences. God's declaration in Scripture is that it and it alone, is this final authority in all matters of faith and morals. The Scriptures are, in and of themselves, completely sufficient to thoroughly equip men for every good word and work (2 Tim. 3:16-17). All Scriptures were given to make man perfect before God. Understanding this truth is essential to listening to and obeying God. Maxey, maybe one of the best tools Satan could use against mankind would be to suggest that men should rally around the man and to agree to disagree about any plan, however small it may be.

The proposition that I affirmed is Biblical. It is important to note that Second Timothy 3 begins with a warning about perilous times in which the church will be plagued with false teachers. False teachers who creep into houses and lead people captive, people who learn false teaching but never come to a knowledge of the truth. How was Timothy to deal with the problem of false teachers and their influence? He was to continue in the Scriptures. All Scriptures are God breathed, i.e., God is the **only** source of their origination. Don't be fooled by Maxey's suggestion that he and I are close on inspiration. The Bible teaches that God actually breathed the Scriptures and Maxey views the end product of a collective process as inspiration. The differences in what we believe and teach on this subject are as different as night and day. Maxey's pragmatic approach to the composition of the Scriptures is part of the reason that he is in such a mess. His theory, by its very nature, has to deemphasize the value and significance of God's Word in order to help its adherents stay in the ever learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth mode. If Maxey actually believed that God breathed all Scripture, then he might be able to begin to appreciate *sola Scriptura* as the only rule of faith for the followers of Christ.

Notice that Paul said that Second Timothy 3:16-17 says that "**all** Scripture ... is profitable... that the man of God may be perfect ... ." Maxey is not in disagreement with me, he is in disagreement with God. There are readers of this debate who acknowledge that Maxey's theory muzzles God at times and at other times it blends the voice of man in with the voice of God, all of which is totally unacceptable. Maxey ridicules the idea that each and every Word of the New Testament constitutes the pattern for fellowship and salvation, but God said that **all Scripture** is profitable and that is what I have affirmed and Maxey has denied in this debate. God's people are not "thoroughly furnished unto all good works" and "perfect" without utilizing all Scripture, i.e., the Holy Writings. The Old Testament is for our learning (Rom. 15:4) and the New is our pattern. Remember that Paul was getting ready to die. He knew that the days of inspiration in men were quickly fading; therefore, he directed the minds of men to the source of all religious direction—the Scriptures. Observe that Peter did likewise in his writings (2 Pet. 1:13, 15, 19-21). He prepared his readers to deal with religious matters by recording his teaching so that after his death we would be able to have what is needed for our perfection in Christ. Paul,

Peter and others were not giving new truth, or a changed truth (they were not postmodernists) in their Writings; their Writings are equal to that which they orally taught via the Holy Spirit. Now Maxey, you have a moral obligation to tell us which of the Holy Writings are non-essential to thoroughly furnishing men unto all good works and perfection. Maxey give us the list and supply the voice of God to prove your case or repent so that you can avoid going to a very literal and eternal devil's hell.

Maxey used John 5:28-29 as a proof-text to allege that Jesus is salvific, not His Word. Maxey uses John 5:28-29 as a proof-text to suggest that Scripture is revelatory not regulatory. I had assumed that Maxey was too smart to defeat himself in this debate, but he did! Read Maxey's words again, "they search Scripture for law, and in the process they fail to perceive the Lord; they look for regulation, and miss the Redeemer." Now notice his proposition: "The New Covenant writings CONTAIN specific requirements and expectations of our God, few in quantity, that are essential for both fellowship and salvation." Requirements and expectations; notice that Maxey teaches that at least parts of the New Testament are regulatory. Al Maxey, you need to repent for your deception and your false teaching! Will you repent and turn to God with your whole heart? Because I study the Scriptures to learn how to approach and please God, Maxey says that I am in the camp of those legalistic Pharisees. Does Maxey's doctrine make him a "little, legalistic, Pharisee"?

#### Maxey's Short List of Salvific Regulations

1. Love.
2. Faith.
3. Repentance.

If Maxey had more in mind here he needs to do a better job of spelling it out. He discusses baptism as a demonstration of faith but not an essential. Maxey's doctrine on baptism is straight out of a Baptist manual. Maxey suggested that the gift of the Holy Spirit was given to Cornelius in some kind of demonstration that Cornelius was, at that moment, a son of God. However, one becomes a son of God on this side of the cross by being baptized into God's family (John 3:3, 5). Cornelius went on to be baptized, according to Maxey, to demonstrate his faith as a visible act of obedience, but not because he had to be baptized to be saved. Here are a few things Maxey is willingly ignorant of in regard to Acts 10 and 11. 1) Peter and the Jews who traveled with him did not believe that salvation was for the Gentiles. Something needed to happen to show the Jews that the gospel is also for Gentiles. 2) Tongues are a sign to non-believers (1 Cor. 14:22). 3) Speaking in tongues was the demonstrative act that proved to the Jews, who did not believe that salvation was for the Gentiles, that God intended the gospel system of salvation to be extended to all people (Acts 10:47; 11:15-18). 4) Peter had some regulatory matters to discuss with Cornelius (10:6, 22, 33, 48; 11:14). 5) Cornelius was to hear *words* whereby he and his house were *to be saved* (11:14). These words would reveal to Cornelius and his house what they **must do** (10:6). These words were **revelatory** of the **regulatory** expectations for Cornelius and his house. The Greek term used here, *dei*, means it is absolutely necessary. Someone forgot to tell Peter that Jesus + \_\_\_\_\_ is demonic teaching. 6) Cornelius was not commanded to believe

because he already believed. He and his house were commanded to be baptized! Maxey, if you want to provide the readers of this debate a revelatory proof-text to regulate your Jesus + nothing theory, or your Jesus + love, faith, and repentance, theory (Wait, we can't say that can we? Jesus + \_\_\_\_\_ is demonic.), then you are going to have to keep on searching. But why search those Scriptures Al because it is apart from them ye think that ye have eternal life.

Maxey also discussed eating the Lord's Supper, but he did not list the Lord's Supper as an essential. In fact, it is confusing to even try to understand what Maxey actually believes about the Lord's Supper. On one occasion he wrote:

What did Jesus initially intend? What exactly was His expectation? I believe He simply gave us something to *remember* Him by. It's as if He said, "*Whenever* you come together for a meal, *whenever* you sit down as family at the table, *whenever* you gather together in love and sweet fellowship *let Me be there with you*. As you eat together, pause and take some of the bread and *remember* that I am the Bread of Life come down out of heaven for you. As you drink some of the wine, *remember* My blood that was poured out on your behalf. In so doing, you will be celebrating the very One who has brought you together as *One Family*, and you will experience the joy of the *unity* of the Spirit for which I am laying down My life" (Maxey, # 351).

Paul in First Corinthians 11 condemns turning the Lord's Supper into a common meal. But why worry about that, after all the Scriptures are just a love letter, a revelatory narrative!

#### Maxey vs. Maxey

Maxey alleges that "Jesus + \_\_\_\_\_ doctrine" is demonic doctrine that will cost men their eternal salvation. Maxey alleges that Jesus + love, faith, and repentance, Maxey's short list, is essential. Maxey declares that Maxey's doctrine is demonic. Thank you Al, but this we already knew.

Maxey alleges: "Paul agreed when he wrote that those who had been saved by grace through faith (**not through any effort of their own**) would then engage in good works in their daily walk with the Lord [Eph. 2:10]. These would not be performed *to be* saved, but as evidence of their love and gratitude for *being* saved." Maxey affirms that the The New Covenant writings **CONTAIN specific requirements** and expectations of our God, few in quantity, **that are essential for both fellowship and salvation.** What is it Maxey, are there regulations to follow, or are men saved *without any effort of their own*?

#### A Challenge For Al Maxey

Al, if the short list of three essentials noted above is not representative of the specific requirements of Scripture essential for salvation and fellowship, then you are hereby called on to provide a detailed, exhaustive list of exactly what brethren *must* agree

upon in order to have true Christian unity? Must Christians agree about love, faith, and repentance to be saved and have fellowship with Christ? Al, is it the case that faith/belief in God and Jesus, and demonstrated love, are essential to our very salvation? If the answer to this question is yes, then is faith/belief in God and Jesus and demonstrated love human effort that is necessary to the salvific process?

#### Sources Cited

Broking, Darrell. Broking #2. *Maxey-Broking Discussion*. 24 April 2000.  
<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/mb3.htm>.

- - -. Darrell Broking's Broking #8. *Maxey-Broking Discussion*. July 13, 2008.  
<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/mb15.htm>.

Maxey, Al. Examining Eucharistic Expectation What Did Jesus Christ *Really* Have in Mind When He Instituted the Lord's Supper?. *Reflections*, 351, June 13, 2008.  
<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx351.htm>

#### APPENDIX

After reading Al Maxey's statement in his first affirmation Tom Shiflett wrote the following in an email to David Brown, Daniel Denham, John West, Darrell Broking, and Al Maxey on September 6<sup>th</sup>. The last few emails in this exchange included one or more elders from the Spring church of Christ and Michael Hatcher from the Bellview church of Christ:

\*\*\*

Dear Brothers in Christ,

Please tell me what Al wrote below is wrong and that you are "men of your word". Any debate coach or debate judge anywhere in the world will tell you that this is wrong. If what Al said is true, then when are you going to moon people like a debate coach did? His boss fired him, now what do you think that God will do to you? If you have the truth and Al does not have the truth, then you have nothing to worry about. If someone in your group is starting to change their mind on things, then work with them one on one to show them the truth. Just answer the questions that they have. Your integrity is saying a lot to these people. After this, it would not surprise me if Darrell quit this debate.

It sounds like to me that you are getting very desperate. If that is the case, then go get some help. I know of some people that think like you do that you can go to. Dave Miller at AP in Montgomery, Alabama, Wayne Jackson, John Waddey, Brother Music who wrote the "Behold the pattern" book if he is still alive, all of the Bible teachers at Freed Hardiman in TN, Phil Sanders and the other writers of the Spiritual Sword and Old Paths magazine, the teachers of the preaching school that you went to and your friends.

I emailed you saying that it was great for people on your side to debate Al Maxey but after reading what Al said, I am not as happy as before. You are starting to let me down. Thank God I put my faith in Jesus, the pattern and not men.

All of us will have to answer to God in the last days.

Have a great day,  
Tom Shiflett

\*\*\*

Tom, thank you from not believing Al and getting disappointed in us **before** you actually saw that to which we all agreed before this debate began. I will release the actual email exchange in my next post and we will expect Al to keep his word and place it on his web site. Tom, I tried to expedite the posts that Al and I wrote by sending them to the list. That violated a rule we established before the debate. I had actually forgotten that point, but that did not excuse what I did. In my 4th post I confessed my fault. I am not above making mistakes and when I learn of them I am not too big to correct them. You have seen my fruit but still, without actually asking for the evidence, you *inferred* or rather *surmised* that we are liars. Qualifying what you wrote with the word "if" does not excuse the fact that you made a judgment in this regard without verifying the facts first.

Brotherly,  
Darrell Broking

PS I am not disappointed. I know how Al works and expected his spin on the facts.

\*\*\*

Brother Shiflet,

There is a reason that false teachers teach a doctrine that they know is false. They are what they are because of their character. Their wilful mind set and conduct is described Rom. 16:17, 18; 2 Thess. 2:10-12; 1 Tim. 4:1, 2; 2 Peter 2:1ff; and Jude. They are what they are because they chose to be. Men who are of this caliber do not have any scruples when it comes to misrepresenting the facts and judging motives.

Brother Shiflet you rebuke us on the basis of such a character's report about us without checking with us. Obviously, one can see why some people are led astray by those who appear as angels of light (1 Cor. 11:14). To use your own illustration, it seems that Al has "moonied" you and you were dazzled by the sight. Having read Al's "moonie" comments yesterday we responded to him with the following email.

For the One Faith,  
David P. Brown

\*\*\*

Al,



In view of the following quotation that I have placed after the following list, please consider the following list of facts.--David P. Brown

Fact One: You knew and agreed before the debate began that we would not advertise any of your web sites, except the one you created specifically for the debate between you and Darrell.

Fact Two: You deliberately put links into your debate posts, rather than foot or end notes, that sent people to your web sites, which web sites you knew we would not advertise and to which you agreed prior to the said debate you would not do.

Fact Three: However, you deliberately with fore thought put said links into your debate posts, but never informed us about them.

Fact Four: When we realized that you had gone against our agreement made prior to the beginning of said debate, we removed said links that sent people to your unauthorized web sites.

Fact Five: The removal of the links from your posts was in keeping with our agreement made in good faith between us prior to the beginning of said debate.

Fact Six: I too "was always taught that "the measure of a man is the worth of his word." "

Fact Seven: Since the Spring Church of Christ placed their web site on line David Brown has, does not have and never has had access to the part of the web site that allows for changing matters on said website; neither does he know how to put the debate on the web site churchesofChrist.com if he had access to it.

Fact Eight: The Spring Church of Christ elder who built the church web site is the person who puts material on the site.

Fact Nine: Said elder gets to work on the Spring Church of Christ web site as his job allows him the time to do it, which is not everyday--sometimes it is not even once a week.

Fact Ten: At least regarding your debate with Darrel, you report matters to others regarding said debate and matters pertaining thereto, contrary to the facts bearing on this case.

Fact Eleven: The Lord willing, said debate with Darrell is going to circulate far more than you ever thought it would.

Fact Twelve: Without adequate evidence or credible witnesses you have judged our motives to be evil.

Fact Thirteen: You do not care how you misrepresent the facts as long as they make you look good in your friends eyes--at least this is the case in the matters pertaining to said debate.

Fact Fourteen: You will misrepresent the facts we have written in this email to others also as it serves your needs.

Fact Fifteen: Al in part wrote: "Before this debate began I had some concerns that my posts might be tampered with by the "powers that be" prior to their being posted to the group. Therefore, on June 13 I wrote to David Brown, the owner of that Internet list (and the editor/publisher of Contending for the Faith magazine) and said, "Will my posts be placed on the list UNedited and UNtouched by the moderators, or will they be free to 'edit' my posts as they see fit? I would NOT be interested in participating in any such debate where I was never sure if what I wrote would be what would actually appear." He wrote me back five hours later, saying, "I will say that regarding the posting of the discussions that absolutely nothing will be altered, changed or edited about them. The posts will appear on ContendingFTF just as they left each disputant's email to us." I took him at his word and agreed to the debate. But, my fears were soon realized. When I sent my third rebuttal to the moderators so that it could be posted to the group, Darrell Broking, prior to the posting of my third rebuttal, deactivated every one of my links to articles I referenced in the body of my rebuttal, thus preventing the readers from being able to click on them and access the referenced material. I appealed to David Brown, reminding him of his prior assurance to me. However, he refused to honor his word and informed me that all future links to anything I had written would also be removed from my posts. Therefore, they have begun "cleansing" my posts of unwanted material before they are posted to their group. I was always taught that "the measure of a man is the worth of his word." I believe we now have evidence of the measure of these men and the nature of their character [indeed, David Brown DID deactivate all my links in my fourth rebuttal before he would allow the readers on ContendingFTF to see it; one has to wonder what they're so afraid of. I also find it quite interesting that David Brown has failed to place another word of this debate on his congregation's web site!! He made a big deal of placing our debate on that site, but after the release of my 2nd rebuttal on July 25, not another word has appeared. As I predicted some time back, these little lords will soon begin to remove all trace of this material so their followers can't read it --- indeed, they are already censoring it]. "

\*\*\*

Good Morning Tom,

Once again, David Brown and Darrell Broking have displayed their true character. I have discussed this confusion of two issues with them previously, but obviously they just "don't get it." David Brown and I discussed TWO SEPARATE MATTERS prior to the beginning of this debate. (1) The first was with respect to whether he would advertise this debate in his magazine "Contending for the Faith" and what would appear on the page I created to advertise this debate (2) The other was what would be done with my

posts when they were sent to the moderators prior to their release to the "ContendingFTF" Internet site.

David made it very clear with regard to what would or would not be allowed IN HIS MAGAZINE that he didn't want to advertise my web site or my Reflections in his magazine. That didn't bother me at all. I only wanted him to inform his readers of the debate. Therefore, I created a web site that was SOLELY for our debate, and which would NOT give any links to my Reflections. It is:

<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/pattern.htm>

This is the link he put in his magazine, and as I agreed there is no reference to my Reflections on that page, no link to them, no link to the Al Maxey web page, in fact. The page is totally devoted to the Maxey-Broking Debate. The ONLY additional navigational tool on that page is simply a button at the bottom that takes the debate readers back to the debate archive where these debates are listed (including my other debate with Darrell Broking). I have several times offered to remove even THAT button if David would prefer it not be on there. He has never responded to any of my offers to remove it. If he does, however, I will immediately remove. My intent is to honor our agreement regarding this FIRST ISSUE.

The OTHER issue, however, which is ENTIRELY SEPARATE, deals with what will happen to my four rebuttal posts and my four affirmative posts when they are sent to David and the moderators for posting on the "ContendingFTF" web site where this debate is being posted. I have no fears of what happens to my own posts on MY OWN web site. But I was indeed concerned that my posts NOT be edited or altered before they appeared on HIS web site. Again, please remember that this is NOT the same issue as #1 above (which was limited to what would be advertised in his magazine and what would appear on the web page I created for advertising this debate). This is ANOTHER MATTER ENTIRELY.

I wrote David on June 13, "Will my posts be placed on the list UNedited and UNtouched by the moderators, or will they be free to 'edit' my posts as they see fit? I would NOT be interested in participating in any such debate where I was never sure if what I wrote would be what would actually appear." David wrote me back a few hours later (and again, please remember that we are not talking about issue #1 here -- those terms were agreed to, and I abided by them -- we are talking about what would be done with my posts), and David assured me with these words: "I will say that REGARDING THE POSTING OF THE DISCUSSIONS (did you notice this, Tom? This is about the posts, not about issue #1) that absolutely nothing will be altered, changed or edited about them. THE POSTS will appear on *ContendingFTF* (again, Tom, this is about David's web site postings, NOT about the magazine or MY web site) just as they left each disputant's email to us."

It is THIS, Tom, that was not honored. The conditions of what would be advertised in his magazine, and what would appear on my Maxey-Broking web site (which is the ONLY

link he was willing to put IN HIS MAGAZINE) has been honored. The ONLY thing I can see that David *might* object to with regard to THAT negotiation is my navigation button at the bottom of the page, but I have offered several times to remove it if David objects to it. He has never responded to those several offers. His statement to me on June 13th is the issue here. And that statement, as the text of it declares, refers to the POSTS to the debate that are sent to the moderators and what would or would not be done with them prior to their being placed on HIS web site (again, NOTHING to do with the magazine or MY debate site, and our agreement with regard to THOSE).

What has now happened is that David and Darrell are trying to bring the restriction from #1 over into #2. That was NEVER made a condition in our prior discussions. This was NEVER the understanding. The written understanding with regard to my posts was that NOTHING would be "altered, changed or edited about them." They would appear on the "ContendingFTF" web site "JUST AS they left each disputant's email to us." I don't know how that could be any clearer. Each disputant would have the freedom to express themselves and make their points as they saw fit, and there would be no interference from the moderators. NOW, however, they ARE altering, changing and editing. I guess the way they have chosen to justify this in their own minds is that they think if they didn't want my Reflections links in the magazine and on my debate page, then they just assumed it was understood that these links would not be allowed ANYWHERE. That was never stated, however, and the language of his email to me of June 13 certainly never suggested such a concern. In a debate, the participants are generally allowed to offer all kinds of support material. Darrell has quoted from a number of sources, and even Darrell himself provided the URL's for some of my Reflections articles in his own source material at the end of his own posts. Even HE has referenced these Reflections. I simply activated those links so that the readers would have ease of access to the materials referenced in the course of the debate. That is all I did. But, Darrell and David have DEactivated them, thus making it more difficult for their readers to actually access the material referenced in both our posts. I believe this violated the written assurance David made to me on June 13 (which pertained ONLY to these posts).

They are now "spinning" this to make it look like Al Maxey has not lived up to the conditions of this debate (even though Darrell also has referenced my Reflections in virtually every one of his posts thus far; one would think if it was "understood" that Al Maxey would not mention them, that Darrell would be equally forbidden. That, of course, was never the understanding. This just an effort to try and justify their current actions of altering my posts). Darrell will undoubtedly try to place this spin in his next post (makes you wonder when he might quit unleashing these rabbits to chase and actually get down to defending his position). If he does, then I will simply inform the readers in greater depth as to what actually happened, and it will just reveal to even greater degree the lack of character and integrity being evidenced by these people. I have kept all the correspondence and can easily demonstrate the point. I would think they would want to avoid this negative exposure of their dealings, but if not ... then I will oblige them, although this is only hurting them in the eyes of 99% of the readers who see them trying everything to avoid actually dealing with the two propositions at hand. The more they do these things, the more people are turning away from them in disgust.

Tom, I have accepted the fact that they will continue to alter and change and edit my posts. I can't stop them from doing it. That's just the reality I face here; it comes with dealing with such people. Thus, I shall continue the debate to its conclusion, knowing that 99.9% of the people in the world reading these posts read them as I have originally penned them. I hope this explanation helps clarify the confusion, Tom. Have a great day, brother. It was great to hear from you again, and I appreciate all your support over the years for my Reflections.

Al Maxey

\*\*\*

The question is, Is God pleased with Al for using a later stipulation to circumvent what David clearly said was not to happen? He will tell us all about His ruling one day. Who can believe that David would have said, "Al you can violate our agreement as long as you do it directly within your posts." Al, nothing of your content was changed, only hot links to your *Reflections* archive. God knows this Al and so do you. Sometimes you appear to be the exact *paradigm* of that which you seemingly despise in others. Remember that all of us will stand before Him one day, and Al, hell actually exists. It really does. Al I love your soul, and as I told you yesterday I am weeping for you and those you influence. May God bless us when we do His will. Good day.

Darrell Broking

\*\*\*

Darrell, you still don't seem to "get it" with respect to the fact that TWO SEPARATE ISSUES were discussed prior to the beginning of this debate. Indeed, there were MANY separate issues discussed, including font size, number of pages, margins, etc. There were a number of different negotiations, none of which overlapped. ONE issue was what would appear in the magazine "Contending for the Faith." Also, what would appear on the patternism debate page to which David Brown agreed to provide a link in his magazine. What you have done, Darrell, is lifted some quotes from the exchange David and I had REGARDING THIS ISSUE, and you have tried to make it apply to a SEPARATE negotiation regarding our individual posts and what the moderators would or wouldn't do with them prior to their appearance on the "ContendingFTF" Internet discussion group. The two issue are not even remotely related, and entirely separate email exchanges occurred regarding both issues. For you to try and lift a quote from one of those exchanges and make it apply to the other exchange is unacceptable, and people will see through that easily (even if you can't).

Darrell, I did not violate my agreement with David Brown regarding the debate page to which he then linked in his magazine. I have no reference whatsoever to my Reflections (or even to my family web site) on there. I admit that I can see how my navigation button at the bottom might be upsetting to David, and I have offered repeatedly to remove it if it bothers him. He has never responded to any of these offers. My offer still stands. IF this bothers David, it will be gone immediately. My intention was to HONOR our agreement with respect to the debate page itself, to which he linked in his magazine. That was ALL those exchanges dealt with.

What you and I place within our individual posts to one another, and source materials we may individually make reference to or provide quotations from, should NEVER be limited or edited. Such would completely violate all the rules of debate. We are each allowed to make our case as best we can, providing materials (either from our own previous studies or from the studies of others) that help substantiate our individual cases. No right thinking person would ever assume that such freedom would ever be limited. Indeed, nothing was ever said about any such limitation of our individual posts. It was NEVER stated that my Reflections could never be mentioned in my posts, or that reference to them could NEVER be made. THAT is a SEPARATE issue from what would appear in David's magazine and what would appear on the page to which he linked. Trying to regulate our posts is a separate matter. Indeed, in our other negotiations regarding font size, number of words and/or pages, margins, etc. I made it clear in my exchanges with him that such would be too restrictive and limiting, and that I would NOT engage in any debate in which my posts (or yours, for that matter) were restricted in any way. We must each be completely free to make our case WITHOUT such limitations. He agreed and lifted those various limitations. Nothing was said about a limitation on quotes from or references to source materials. That was NEVER mentioned.

Nevertheless, I was still not convinced that some tampering with my posts might not still occur. THAT is what prompted me to write my email of June 13, to which he replied with his assurance that my POSTS would not be tampered with in any way, shape or form. They would appear JUST AS they left my computer. Those were his words.

Darrell, you seem to suggest that I was aware all along that NO links to my Reflections would ever be allowed in my posts to this debate. You wrote: "Who can believe that David would have said, 'Al, you can violate our agreement as long as you do it directly within your posts.'" First, as I've already pointed out, there were TWO SEPARATE agreements. One dealing with my created main debate page, and what would or wouldn't appear in his magazine. That agreement has been kept. It had nothing to do with posts. The second agreement had to do with posts, and had nothing to do with the debate page and his magazine. Your suggestion, Darrell, is that URLs to my Reflections were forbidden from the beginning, and that I should have known this.

Well, Darrell, apparently YOU didn't know it either. In your second affirmative we find this:

Maxey, Al. "Otherwise Than Prescribed": Did Jesus Violate the Passover Pattern? *Reflections*, 184, August 4, 2004. <http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx138.htm> (accessed March 28, 2008).

In your third affirmative we find this:

Maxey, Al. "Grace And The Caveman: Pondering the Parameters of Divine Acceptance of Human Response to Available Light." **Reflections #158**. November 15, 2004. (accessed July 30, 2008).

Yes, you had not sent an active link, but had merely written out the entire address, as you did in the second affirmative. I simply tried to make access easier for my readers. However, the point is: you had provided the entire address to this Reflections for the readers of your post. They could easily just type it in and go to it.

In your fourth affirmative (which came out AFTER you had deactivated my links in my third rebuttal) we find this:

Maxey, Al. The Consuming Fire: Examining the Final Fate of the Wicked in Light of Biblical Language. *Reflections*, 46, June 6 2003  
<<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx46.htm>>  
---. The One Cup Fellowship: Reflection on a Conviction. *Reflections*, 330, January 3, 2008. <<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx330.htm>>  
---. The Lord's Supper Focusing on Frequency, *Reflections*, 30, April 15, 2003.  
<<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx30.htm>>  
---. Reflecting on *Hades*: Truth or Tradition. *Reflections*, 44. 30 May 2003.  
<<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx44.htm>>  
---. A Study of Revelation 14:9-11 Torture or Termination? *Reflections*, 45. 1 June 2003.  
<<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx45.htm>>  
---. The Bondage of Silence: Human Hermeneutic Gone Astray. *Reflections*, 361. 25 August 2008. < <http://www.zianet.com/maxey/reflx361.htm>>

The reality here, Darrell, is that YOU have provided the links to my Reflections almost as much as I have!!! The only difference is that yours were not activated, mine were. And yet you have suggested it is the providing of these links themselves that constitutes a violation. Obviously, you did not perceive that to be the case, or YOU would not have been providing them.

Darrell, this is all about the fact that in my third rebuttal I had mentioned the violation of a few rules of engagement (to make a separate point pertaining to the debate), and in response to that you "got back" at me by then deactivating my links IN THAT POST prior to putting it on. It was an "I'll show YOU, Al Maxey" moment. When I objected to this, you then had to find a way to justify your actions. It is going to backfire on you greatly, Darrell, if you insist on pursuing it, because people can see through this in a second!! There was NEVER a ban on either of us providing source material in our posts. There was never a ban on me mentioning pertinent issues of my Reflections (and I never mentioned my Reflections ARCHIVES, as you stated in your email). I only reference specific articles that dealt directly with a point being pursued in my post .... JUST AS YOU DID. We have BOTH provided links to my articles, Darrell ... and you know it. It was never against the rules.

However, David IS the owner of the "ContendingFTF" list, and he can and will do as he pleases. If he chooses to deactivate my links, then that is his choice. I can't stop him. However, I DO believe it is a violation of the assurance he offered in his email to me of June 13. But, as you say, Darrell, he can take that up with God one day. I will continue

with this debate to the end, and trust you will do the same. I will try to stay focused on the propositions, and hope you will do the same. But, if you want to air all of this before the readers in your next post, then I shall inform them all in great detail what has actually occurred. Your choice. And we'll let THEM decide the issue of character.

Al Maxey

\*\*\*

David,

Here is the deceit of Al exposed. He said in his email:

Therefore, I created a web site that was SOLELY for our debate, and which would NOT give any links to my Reflections. It is:

<http://www.zianet.com/maxey/pattern.htm>

The term website is inclusive of ALL the web pages contained therein, not just the landing page. It is true that the landing "page" does not have a link to his Reflections. However, every one of the pages at the website where Al posts his rebuttals thus far do have links to his Reflections. Therefore, the "website" he created solely for the debate does indeed have links to his Reflections.

Jack

\*\*\*

For those interested, in the email in question this is David's first sentence: "**I am not going to put a general advertisement of your web site in or on anything anywhere.**"

The person who is placing the debate on Spring's website obviously understood David's intent because he removed the hyperlinks before posting it and Al sent out an email complaining about it. I knew David's intention too and allowed the first two posts to go through anyway. David and I discussed this before the debate began and said that he did not want Al to use the list to promote his web site. I removed the hyperlinks on the third post only after Al complained about violating the rules, which apparently only apply to what is sent out over the ContendingFTF list. Al, as I typed these words your latest post came into my in box. I have not read all of it but enough to know you suggest that I did what you did. My friend, you know that is not true and you know that I have evidence of that in an email exchange with you. Anything else I have to say about this matter will be said in public! I do not intend on exchanging any more private emails with you until you repent.

Darrell

\*\*\*

Darrell,

Al does not believe in playing by any rules. He is a law unto himself, which is the problem of discussing anything with him and why he gets repeatedly kicked off website



after website regarding discussion lists. Like the Clintons in politics, it is all about Al. It has nothing to do with truth or any desire to let the truth will out on things. It is all about Al promoting Al, which is one of the reasons he will never agree to a public debate, because that type of tomfoolery is much easier to expose in person than through email exchange. He will bend and break every rule he thinks he can get by with, whereas in public debate a continual stream of points of order would expose his duplicity. Daniel Denham

\*\*\*

As you wish, Darrell. We shall let the readers decide.

AL

\*\*\*

Al,

It has been only a little while ago that my wife and I returned from Spring's "door knocking" work, an effort to reach the lost, the unfaithful and new comers residing in Spring. Thus, I am only now able to respond to your (Al's) email to brother Tom Shiflet regarding my email sent earlier today to brother Shiflet, Al and certain other interested brethren, which said email exposed Al's misrepresentations of our (Al's, Darrel Broking's and David Brown's) agreement made prior to said debate.

I certainly realize that you (Al) would like said matters to be treated as two separate issues. However, when you put ways and means into your debate posts that allow the readers of it to navigate to web sites we agreed that I would not advertise, for anyone who can see through a ladder, the two "separate matters" become entwined with one another and are no longer two separate and distinct matters.

Since you reject implication when it suits you, then I can see how you would continue to say that said two matters are separate from each other. After all, you have to believe and follow that crooked view, or you must admit you violated the rules. So I expect you will continue down the same crooked and broad path of error to which you have become accustomed.

Originally when ways and means to reach your web sites where your quotations were located--ways and means deliberately inserted by you into your debate posts--were pointed out to me, I defended your efforts. After all, this is a debate (an adversarial discussion) and thus, I thought you were only directing people to the places where the quotes you had inserted in your debate posts were located. I gave you the benefit of a doubt--that you would not try to make an "end run" around our said agreement--made prior to said debate. Again you know that said agreement between us allowed only such navigation away from the actual debate site to the special web site you created for said debate. But then one of our elders, Jack Stephens, and also Darrell Broking, pointed out to me that when one goes to the sites from which you selected your quotations that you inserted in your debate posts, there are found on said sites ways and means for the reader to navigate to your other web sites--*the very web sites that we agreed prior to the debate not advertise in said debate. Thus, you violated our agreement. Why did you not*

*put said quotations from your other web sites that you inserted in your debate posts into end notes in said debate posts?*

You very well knew and know in our negotiations prior to the debate that we originally stipulated page limits to each one of the debate posts. But, you protested any page limits for said debate posts. You wanted no page limits as to the length of each debate post--***to which we agreed.*** So, you could have as easily "cut and pasted" said quotations into the body of your debate posts, or you could have placed them as end notes to said posts. This is the way that scholarly documentation is done and you know it. After all, you have had no problem with "cutting and pasting" from your previous writings and placing such into other of your writings. But, by design, you did not do so. Knowing there were no page limitations to the length of the debate posts, you, never the less, chose to place ways and means in said posts that would allow people access to your web sites--***the very sites that we agreed not to put into the debate.*** Why did you do that Al? **Facts are stubborn things and they will not go away.**

Not that it will make any difference to you, but quoted below is something from the Spring elders sent to me this morning. It concerns their policy about referencing any false teacher or false teaching on the Spring web site. And, I wholly support it. Al, I knew the Spring elders' position all along and it has always been my position before I knew anything about the Spring congregation, the Spring elders, or you. I had been preaching 28 years before moving to Spring, Texas. Further, this is the same policy long held by faithful brethren everywhere, whether you or anyone else likes it or not. It is because of said policy that I took the position I did prior to said debate, which position is my opposition to any ways and means appearing in said debate posts whereby the readers of said debate would be directed in any form or fashion to your regular web sites. Now, note below the email sent to me this morning.

David,

While we are listing facts, here are a few more.

- 1) The Spring church of Christ elders do not KNOWINGLY post links to our website that will direct visitors to other sites that teach false doctrine.
- 2) Based on the teachings of the Bible coupled with the words and actions of Al Maxey, the Spring church of Christ elders KNOW that Al Maxey is a false teacher.
- 3) Therefore, the Spring church of Christ elders will not KNOWINGLY post links to any of Al Maxey's websites.
- 4) However, we are honoring the commitment to post EVERY WORD written by Al Maxey in this debate -- "UNedited and UNtouched" -- which does nothing but prove #2 above for reasonable people who love the truth.

On the matter of when the material gets posted on the Spring church of Christ website, I try my best to post the material when I have time. I am currently working on Darrell's 4th affirmative which contains several images and charts that are causing a bit of delay -- it is certainly not out of fear of posting Al's own words which condemn him.

Jack Stephens  
Elder, Spring church of Christ

The following facts I emailed earlier to you and brother Shiflet continue to stand (that is the nature of factual evidence), and all of your (AI's) quibbling will not change them. Please give special and careful consideration to the obvious importance of fact number fourteen of said list concerning your (AI's) normal mode of operation in these matters-- "You will misrepresent the facts we have written in this email to others as it serves your needs."

We expect you (AI as well as all other double minded men) to continue to act the way you do in such matters. This is the case because as a man thinks in his heart, so is he. Do not even you find it strange how heretics can always find a way to love and justify about anybody and their beliefs, no matter how far out in outer space those beliefs are from reality, but they are so ready to find fault and impugn motives of their own brethren. So much for the heretical mind set.

Here is that same list of facts again. **They are still there and they will not go away.**

"Fact One: You knew and agreed before the debate began that we would not advertise any of your web sites, except the one you created specifically for the debate between you and Darrell.

Fact Two: You deliberately put links into your debate posts, rather than foot or end notes, that sent people to your web sites, which web sites you knew we would not advertise and to which you agreed prior to the said debate you would not do.

Fact Three: However, you deliberately with fore thought put said links into your debate posts, but never informed us about them.

Fact Four: When we realized that you had gone against our agreement made prior to the beginning of said debate, we removed said links that sent people to your unauthorized web sites.

Fact Five: The removal of the links from your posts was in keeping with our agreement made in good faith between us prior to the beginning of said debate.

Fact Six: I too "was always taught that "the measure of a man is the worth of his word." "

Fact Seven: Since the Spring Church of Christ placed their web site on line David Brown has, does not have and never has had access to the part of the web site that allows for changing matters on said website; neither does he know how to put the debate on the web site churchesofChrist.com if he had access to it.

Fact Eight: The Spring Church of Christ elder who built the church web site is the person who puts material on the site.

Fact Nine: Said elder gets to work on the Spring Church of Christ web site as his job allows him the time to do it, which is not everyday--sometimes it is not even once a week.

Fact Ten: At least regarding your debate with Darrel, you report matters to others regarding said debate and matters pertaining thereto, contrary to the facts bearing on this case.

Fact Eleven: The Lord willing, said debate with Darrell is going to circulate far more than you ever thought it would.

Fact Twelve: Without adequate evidence or credible witnesses you have judged our motives to be evil.

Fact Thirteen: You do not care how you misrepresent the facts as long as they make you look good in your friends eyes--at least this is the case in the matters pertaining to said debate.

Fact Fourteen: You will misrepresent the facts we have written in this email to others also as it serves your needs.

For the One Faith,  
David P. Brown

\*\*\*

Speaking as a ContendinFTF moderator, to the other moderators and list owner (as stipultaed in the pre-debate discussion), I believe that this needs to be posted to the ContendingFTF list asap. The truth about what AI wrote to his advantage needs to start spreading out now. Maybe the **one** or **two** readers that we have following the debate might benefit from this. The other 99.99% of interested persons will have to wait about 2 weeks before I release my next post. (It would be interesting to actually see AI Maxey's documented emperical evidence on this but ... well you already know, don't you.)

Darrell Broking

\*\*\*

Good grief!! I leave you guys in the hands of God!!

Again, I shall continue the debate to its conclusion (as it is doing much good), and shall continue to offer 99.9% of the readers of this debate the world over the unedited, uncensored version. You can chop my posts up any way that makes you feel good. I can't stop you, and you'll do as you please anyway. Rest assured, however, that the readers are not as blind as you seem to think. They will see through your deception in an instant. The only ones who will be fooled are the small handful of legalists who are as blinded to Truth as you yourselves. God have mercy!!!

Al  
\*\*\*

Al,

There was only a "small handful" on Noah's Ark, and they were legally on that ark. There were no illegals on it. Those eight souls on the ark loved God before He ever told them of the flood that He was going to send to destroy all the illegals--whose minds were only on evil continually (Gen. 6:5). Only 8 souls out of all those then living on the earth found grace in God's sight (Gen. 6:8). They found grace in God's sight and were saved by it only because their love for and faith in God, which love and faith led them to obey His instructions regarding building the ark, how God authorized it to be built and concerning all things connected thereto. "Thus, did Noah, according to all that God commanded him, so did he" (Gen. 6:22). Faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17). And, the Hebrews writer declared of Noah, "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" ( Heb. 11:7).

Noah faithfully preached the same system of salvation that he and his family believed and obeyed to all the people year in and year out, but everyone else thought as you do Al. Thus, all those people, "the great majority", perished in the flood (1 Peter.3:19, 20). Only that "small handful" (Noah and his family) loved God, had such faith in Him and his system of salvation from the flood, that they fully obeyed him and were, therefore, saved by God's grace through an obedient faith. Paul said such Old Testament accounts were written for our learning (Rom. 15:4). But, Al and the great majority of those who think as he does have not learned this simple but powerful message of salvation in Christ. Instead Al mocks the faithful few who walk in the steps of faithful Noah and all the rest of the Old Testament worthies listed in Hebrews chapter eleven. Deceived, Al is. And, perish he shall. That is unless he can find repentance from his rebellion to the love, grace and authority of God in Christ. How sad, so very sad. And, all Al can exclaim in his frustrated blindness to the facts in evidence in this particular case are the words of a cartoon character, Charlie Brown, --- "Good Grief!!!"

Al, we are in the hands of God because we are saved by God's grace through the gospel system of faith (the perfect law of liberty--James 1:25) by our obedience to said system (Rom. 6:17, 18; Heb. 5:9). As Noah did, so we today do and, therefore, we are the "heir(s) of the righteousness which is by faith". How sad that men reject and rebel against the simplicity of salvation in Christ.

**For now, I close with the following comment. Al, remember "Fact Fourteen: You will misrepresent the facts we have written in this email to others also as it serves your needs." You have not deviated from it to date. Too bad. Too bad.**

For the One Faith,

David P. Brown

\*\*\*

David,

Al is pleading that God have mercy on us. Yet Al does not really believe in Hell. Go, figure the self-contradictory ravings of a fevered liberal mind! Daniel Denham

\*\*\*

Daniel,

Al, like all of his stripe, is a walking contradiction and is an example of fermented absurdity.

David

\*\*\*

David,

Notice Al's goofy self-contradiction. In the first part of the debate he contended that there is no pattern (period). Now he contends that there is a patten -- albeit a small one -- hidden somewhere in the New Testament. As Darrell's noted, Al doesn't mind being absurd. After all Al's a postmodernist even if he doesn't realize it!

Daniel Denham

\*\*\*

David,

The effect of Al's affirmative is that he implicitly admits some of the major aspects of Darrell's affirmative proposition in order for Al to try to make his case for his own affirmative proposition, which is one reason I suspect Al does not define his proposition. He really can't afford to, because its terms IMPLY a pattern, regardless of however small he may want to have it to be.

Daniel Denham

\*\*\*