

# COLLEY-KETCHERSIDE DEBATE

HELD IN  
BECKLEY THEATRE  
DALLAS, TEXAS, December 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1953

BETWEEN

FLAVIL L. COLLEY  
Evangelist, Church of Christ, Dallas, Texas

and

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE, St. Louis, Missouri  
Evangelist and Editor of The Mission Messenger

•

Tape Recorded

•

First Edition

•

Published by

**Flavil L. Colley**

6872 Shady Brook Lane

DALLAS 31, TEXAS

1954

**Copyright, 1953**

**By**

**Flavil L. Colley**

**All Rights Reserved**

**Printed in the United States of America**

**Printed and Bound by The Manney Co., 1041 Isbell Road, Fort Worth 14, Tex.**

## PROPOSITION I

The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the Churches of Christ in Dallas, is Scriptural.

Affirmed by:

FLAVIL L. COLLEY

Denied by:

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

## PROPOSITION II

The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the Churches of Christ in Dallas, is contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures.

Affirmed by:

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

Denied by:

FLAVIL L. COLLEY



## COLLEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen:

I am grateful for the opportunity and privilege that is mine to appear before you to affirm the proposition that was read in your hearing. I have had several debates with those who were not members of the church. It has also fallen my lot to debate with some of the members of the church of the Lord. I told brother Ketcherside and those who were with him when we signed these propositions, that I had much rather be signing propositions to debate with those who were not members of the church. I have debated with those who use mechanical instruments in the worship. I have debated with the premillennialists. I have debated with the anti-class brethren. When there is that which stands in opposition to, and opposed to God's eternal truth, I have never felt that I should stand aside and let error have its way or sway in the hearts of my brethren.

I will read the proposition again: "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas is Scriptural." I want to define these terms as clearly as I can. Frequently a definition of terms will pertain to the arguments that follow. By "securing" I mean to obtain, or to acquire. "Preacher," a man that preaches the word of the Lord, such as 2 Timothy 4:1-2. "As a minister," a servant with other servants in the church. His work, preaching the word, making full proof of his ministry. 2 Timothy 4:5. His work will be defined further as I continue with my affirmative. By "congregation having elders," churches that have had elders or bishops appointed, and said elders or bishops are ministering in the work to which they have been appointed. "Generally practiced," customary actions or proceedings of the churches of Christ in Dallas. By "Churches of Christ in Dallas," I mean those churches of Christ in Dallas that are following the teaching of Christ. Those that are the pillar and the ground of the truth. 1 Timothy 3:15. Those that contend for the faith, Jude 3. "Scriptural," that which is furnished by the Scriptures, 2 Timothy 3:16,17.

God's order has been on this wise: First God said, "This

is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." Matt. 17:5. Second, the Son said I must go away, "Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth." John 16:13. The Son said he was sending the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth. The Holy Spirit came to inspire the apostles to preach and write the gospel of Christ. Third: As the days of inspiration were drawing to a close Paul wrote to Timothy and Titus and taught them to do the work of an evangelist. "And the things which thou hast heard of me from many witnesses, commit the same to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Timothy 2:2. This is the chain. It is God's order. The apostles committed unto such men as Timothy, the things that were to be committed to others.

An evangelist must be, first, a faithful man; second, able to teach others. These are the requirements. These things were committed by the apostle Paul to Timothy and the chain must continue to be followed by faithful gospel preachers. I am indebted to many faithful gospel preachers of the past, who have committed to me that which they learned from God's eternal truth. Many of these men have gone to their reward. I am thankful to them and their memory for their confidence in me. That was God's plan then and it is His plan now.

The great commission was given to the apostles by the Master before the church was built. All the conditions of salvation are not found in one account of the great commission. It is my purpose to show that all the work of the evangelist is not found in one of the letters written to an evangelist. In Matthew 28: 18, 20, Jesus said, "All authority is given me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. And Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Notice "teach," and "baptize" those that are taught. Teach those that are baptized to observe the things I have commanded you. Mark 16:15,16, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Matthew did not tell them what to preach. Matthew did not use the word gospel. Mark used

the word gospel. Again, Luke says, "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." We find some things in Luke's account of the great commission (Luke 24:46) that are not in Matthew's account. But again note this rule of interpretation: Where there is a condition or conditions of salvation mentioned in one passage of scripture you cannot comply with less than that condition, or those conditions, to be saved, although there may be other conditions elsewhere stated. We have used this rule with the denominations for years. It is true and effective. We will use this rule as we continue our affirmative speech.

Now to the gospel of Christ. First, there are facts to be believed. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved . . . . For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day." 1 Corinthians 15:1-4. These are the facts that must be believed—the death, burial and resurrection.

Second: Commands to be obeyed, "To you who are troubled rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thessalonians 1:7,8.

Third, there are promises to be enjoyed from the gospel of Christ. "Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of him that called us to glory and virtue, whereby he hath granted unto us exceeding great and precious promises." 2 Peter 1:3,4.

**THE WORK OF THE EVANGELIST:** The work of the evangelist is outlined in first and second Timothy and Titus. It is three fold. Just as the great commission sets forth the conditions of salvation, and Acts of the apostles shows how the commission was put into effect, there were letters written to show how the evangelists were to carry out their work.

These letters are first and second Timothy and Titus. Their work was three fold: First, laying the foundation where the gospel had not been preached and Christ had not been named, such as, 1 Corinthians 3:10. Second, set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city. Titus 1:5. And third, put the brethren in mind of these things, and if they do this they shall be faithful ministers. I will develop this as I continue in the affirmative. I am to be in the affirmative two evenings on this subject.

Now you will find that first of all there were evangelists who were to lay the foundation where Christ has not been named. Second: They were to go to a church, to set it in order, and to appoint elders in every city. Third, Timothy was left in Ephesus where there were elders. That is the third part of an evangelist's work. Again, when I called attention to the fact that preachers are employed, or secured, by churches of Christ, I mean they are paid. 2 Corinthians 11th chapter, 7th through the 9th verse. "Did I commit a sin abasing myself that ye might be exalted because I preached to you the gospel of God for naught? I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, that I might minister unto you. When I was present with you and was in want, I was not a burden on any man, for the brethren when they came from Macedonia supplied the measure of my want. In everything I kept myself from being a burden unto you and so will I keep myself." Again, 2 Thesalonians 3:8,11, "Neither did we eat bread for nought at any man's hand, but in labor and travail, working night and day, that we might not be a burden to any of you. Not because we had not the right, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you, that you should imitate us. For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly, that work not at all, but are busybodies." Again, "Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." 1 Corinthians 9:14. The man who preaches the gospel whether it be to those who have never heard the first principles of the gospel, or to those who are in the church, must live of the gospel.

The evangelist preached the gospel to those out of the church and to those in the church. The gospel supplies the sinner with conditions to be complied with in becoming a



Christian, and Christians were instructed in righteousness, godliness and how to worship. But someone will say, now I do not believe you can preach the gospel to the church. All right, let's see about that, in Romans 1.15-17, "So as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ. For it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein (in the gospel; therein) is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." Notice Paul said he would preach the gospel to the church in Rome. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. Now hear me: No prophet, priest, or king ever called anything the power of God unto salvation except the gospel of Jesus Christ, or the story of the cross. Therein, in the gospel, is revealed the righteousness of God from faith to faith, as it is written, the just shall live by faith. Now note: The Christian lives by faith. My opponent teaches that preach, and teach, are different terms. He teaches that you cannot preach to the church. He teaches that the gospel is to sinners only. I ask him to consider this! Please say something about Romans 1:15. I have but one more speech tonight. Of course I'll have some more—other speeches tomorrow evening.

In Psalms 119:172, "My tongue shall speak of thy work. All of thy commandments are righteous." Where are God's commandments revealed? In the gospel. All of God's commandments are righteous. Therein, in the gospel, is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, for it is written, the just shall live by faith. Again, when Paul was talking to Timothy about righteousness, he said, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3:16. Where is the container out of which you get God's righteousness? Paul said it's the gospel of Christ. If you can't preach the gospel of Christ to the church, then you can't announce all the righteousness of God, and Christians do not have the righteous acts, God's commands, given unto them, for Paul said, it is revealed in the gospel of Christ. Not only that, but my opponent limits the grace of God. Grace reigns through righteousness, unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ. Romans

5:21. My opponent says the gospel is to sinners. But the gospel reveals the righteousness of God. He teaches it is preached to sinners only. Grace reigns through righteousness. How long? Unto eternal life. But that's not all. Acts 20:24: "But I hold not my life of any account as dear to myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus Christ to testify the gospel of the grace of God." Acts 20:24. Grace and righteousness through the gospel of Christ. Righteousness revealed in the gospel, But that's not all.

Galatians 1:6, 9, "I marvel that you are so quickly removed from him that called you in the grace of Christ"—watch it, grace and gospel—"unto a different gospel, which is not another gospel, only there are some that trouble you." And there are some today too, that trouble you. "And would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach unto you any other gospel other than that which you received, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, if any man preach unto you any gospel other than that which you received, let him be anathema." Brother Ketcherside would remove you from the grace of Christ unto a perverted gospel. Why? He limits it! He says the gospel is to sinners only. There are those who trouble you—what? With a perverted gospel. What? Gospel to sinners only. Not to the church. You can't preach it to the church. That's not all. These men limit the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel to the sinner only. These men limit the grace that reigns through righteousness. Why? Because the righteousness of God is revealed through the gospel of Christ. Any man that preached any other gospel to the churches of Galatia was accursed. So are men today who pervert the gospel, or preach any other gospel.

The churches in Galatia had the gospel preached to them. Paul said if any man preach any other gospel unto you, other than that which you received, let him be accursed. We find some more along this line in 2 Peter 1:3. "Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness through the knowledge of him<sup>1</sup> that called us by his own glory and virtue." Now notice, his divine power —The gospel hath called us to glory and to virtue. It has

granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. What has<sup>1</sup>? His divine power. That which called us. I take it that he agrees with the apostle Paul when he says the gospel called us. We are called by the gospel. The divine power is the gospel of Christ. It has given unto us all things that pertain to *life* and *godliness*. Remember this, here is the difference. The gospel to sinners only would bring people to life, in Christ Jesus. But, this divine power instructs people, not only in becoming a Christian, but. in their godly living. Furthermore, Peter said it was to call us to *life* and *godliness*. Does the divine power teach godliness before or after life in Christ? The divine power grants all things that pertains to *life* and *godliness*. What is "godliness"? Piety and reverence. Divine power—Grants all things that have to do with piety and reverence. If it applies to the sinners only, and you can't take the gospel and preach it to the church, out goes the righteousness of God, godliness, and other things all along the line. *Life* and *godliness*—Let the apostle Peter put the two together. 1 Peter 1:22,25: "Seeing that you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently. Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. All the glory of man is as the flower thereof. The grass withereth, the flower thereof falleth away. But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the *gospel* is preached unto you." Two things here: Born, number one. Life comes as a result of that. Born into Christ. Life. Again, "see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently." This is instruction to Christians. By the way, that has to do with edification, too. 1 Corinthians 8:1: "Knowledge puffeth up; love edifieth." When we get on edification we are going to deal with this very thing. Now note: Here is one thing—*Life*. Here's another, *love one another*. Here is instruction to Christians. Peter says, "This is the word, which by the *gospel* is preached unto you."

In Acts 20:17 Paul called for the elders of the church at Ephesus. Gave them instructions, and in the twenty-eighth verse, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock of which the Holy Spirit hath made you Bishops to feed the church of

the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock. From among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, and draw away the disciples after them." Note, here is where Paul instructed the elders. He said, grievous wolves shall enter in among you not sparing the flock. Men shall arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Paul made this speech to the elders of Ephesus. Five years later, about A. D. 65, he wrote Timothy. 1 Timothy 1:3: "As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine. Neither to give heed to fables and endless genealogies which minister questions, rather than a dispensation of God, which is in faith unfeigned, from which things some have swerved, having turned aside unto vain talking." He continued on, cataloguing the sins that he wanted him to teach against, and finally he said, "And if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God which was committed to my trust." I wonder if brother<sup>1</sup> Ketcherside will say that sound doctrine doesn't come from the gospel of Christ. Here are the things that you are to do. Where is he? He's in Ephesus. The church had elders. And I'm leaving you there. And here are the things that I want you to do: Some in there—Charge them. What's the matter with them? They're not teaching sound doctrine. And he tells him further what he is to do. And then said, if there be any other thing contrary to the *sound doctrine according to the gospel* of the glory of the blessed God which was committed to my trust. Here's an assignment given to Timothy with a church that had elders. Don't say it's temporary. Just try it. An assignment 's given to Timothy with a church that had elders, not to teach a different doctrine. (Verse three.) Again, if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine, according to the gospel of God.. Now all *sound doctrine* is according to the gospel. Unsound doctrine is not according to the gospel. Timothy was to teach sound doctrine *according to the gospel*. That's what all gospel preachers do. Now note: Paul left Timothy in Ephesus with a church, that had elders. He left Titus in Crete to do another work—Set in order a church. Titus 1:5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that

thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge." Because Timothy was left in Ephesus with a church that had elders, does that mean that Titus could not do the work he was left to do? It has been customary for those who have been contending for this very thing, to use Titus 1:5; and they capitalize upon *Titus—Titus*. As I said at the beginning of this speech, that all of these letters, all of them, first and second Timothy, and Titus, are to evangelists. They must be taken together, just as the great commission must be taken together. Not one account gives all of the conditions of salvation. Neither in one letter are all of the duties of an evangelist given. Once more, because Titus was left with a church, and told to appoint elders in every city, does this mean that Timothy could not preach to a church that had elders? Timothy was to (2 Timothy 4:5,) "do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." In 1 Timothy 4:6, "If you put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ." Where was Timothy? He was in Ephesus. They had elders. Here's the church. What do you do? "If you put the brethren"—Who are the brethren? Those who are on the outside? No, sir. "If you put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ." What brethren? The brethren in Ephesus where Paul left him. More than that—They had elders.

In 1 Timothy 3:15, "If I tarry long that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God; which is the church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth." Paul told Timothy when he left him there, I'm writing to tell you how men ought to behave in the church. I'm writing to tell you also how widows should be treated, how the women should conduct themselves. Old women, young women, and then old men, and young men. Timothy was left there to do that work. (2 minutes.) There is not time to use another argument. And I thank you very much.

## KETCHERSIDE'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ,  
and friends:

First of all tonight, let me assure you of the deep pleasure which I have at the opportunity which is now' afforded me of discussing with you one of those issues which today trouble the brotherhood of the churches of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I am gratified at the response to the announcement that has been made which has caused those of you who possess honest hearts to come, and I trust that tonight you will lay aside all personalities, and personal attachments, and in view of the judgment and in a proper fear of a just reprisal for our deeds done upon this earth, which are contrary to the word of God, that you will constitute yourself an audience jury, and weigh carefully everything that is said by both of the speakers. Give your earnest attention to the things which are stated by brother Colley, and listen just as sincerely and seriously to the things which I shall say. In so doing, it may be possible for you to formulate a decision which will cause you some day, without fear and with a clear conscience to stand before our God and to give an account for the action taken with reference to this matter.

I want, before I proceed, to commend my respondent for the courage that he has manifested. Those who practice the system which he is attempting to defend are notorious in many places, it seems to me, for their evasion of this issue. There are few of them who dare stand before an audience and preach the things which they practice. But I am happy for the fact that he has been willing to appear before you tonight, to attempt a defense of his own conduct, among you, and 'that of those who occupy the position as the ministers of the various congregations in the city of Dallas.

I think that as an audience you have a perfect right to know something about the conduct of this discussion and our approach to it, and I want to assure you that I am here with but one fervent desire in mind, and that to set forth my earnest convictions upon this matter which now confronts us. In doing that, I shall attempt to the very best of my ability to preserve all quiet, and peace with orderly conduct. We are ob-

ligated to do that as Christians. I shall not interrupt my brother while he is speaking, regardless of what he may say, ask or do. I shall content myself to await that moment when I step before you to present, those things which I believe will countermand the ideas that he has advanced. If it is possible for us to agree upon those things which he sets forth, I shall acknowledge that and tell you what are the points of agreement as well as the points of disagreement. I could not be fair with myself and with you, and I could not be honest before my God, and do otherwise. I want if I can, through the grace of God and your prayers, to approach this discussion in a serious and sober mien. The issues before us are matters of such grave consequence to the church of the living God that it seems to me that the church itself may well be weighed in the balances by those about us with regard to the decisions we may reach upon these matters.

Now I feel very sincerely in my heart that our brother has not tonight touched the proposition which he has affirmed. I would like to read it to you again. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural." In his first speech my brother has said a great many things with which I can agree. There are some implications he has made with which I am not in agreement.

I would like at this juncture to advance the thought that the question which directly concerns us now, is being discussed in a state where surely it should be carefully weighed, for it seems that it was here in Texas that the system which I now oppose, began less than fifty years ago. I hold here before me the bulletin of George Pepperdine College, which contains a number of speeches made on the subject "The Church and Sound Doctrine." I would like to quote to you from page 36 of this bulletin: "More than a generation ago a congregation in north Texas had some sort of vision. It wanted to do something. It heard of a young preacher in a little Tennessee county seat town who was doing things. The church and the preacher got together. So forty three years ago this month that preacher began a ministry at that place which lasted for twelve years. You think that to be commonplace? Well, in January, 1906, there was not another preacher in all the

churches of Christ south of the Mason-Dixon line who was devoting his entire time to the work of one church. In the north there were two or three such. I speak of North and South, because at that time nowhere else counted much in the churches of Christ."

Thus, I would have you know, my friends, that this question which now confronts the churches of Christ, is a question which has arisen within the last fifty years. It is a question which at least to some extent troubled the pioneers among us who pleaded for a restoration, but mind you, those men all opposed the system. They opposed it with all of the strength and power which they possessed. Fortunately they were able until a half century ago to keep out of the church that hireling system which I believe is now selling the church of the living God down the river.

Next I want to call to your attention some of the things which we must definitely understand about this proposition. As to our point of controversy tonight:

1. It is not a question as to whether or not a preacher may preach the gospel of Christ.
2. It is not a question of whether a preacher may remain in the same city indefinitely. I have lived in Saint Louis, Missouri, since 1937.
3. It is not a question of whether a man may be sent out as a gospel proclaimer by a congregation.
4. It is not a question of whether such a man may have his needs supplied by individuals and churches.
5. It is not a question of whether a man may labor with a congregation he has planted until talent is developed and men qualified and appointed to the office of bishops.

But the question which brother Colley must face tonight is whether a congregation with elders has a right to contract for a specific sum for a preacher to sustain an integral relationship to that church requiring his resignation or dismissal upon leaving, if such departure is prior to the period agreed upon in the contract, and to be the recognized minister for



dispensing the truth to that flock each Lord's Day, and to do at least a greater part of the teaching and preaching for that congregation. That is the thing commonly practiced in Dallas, and that is the thing brother Colley is going to have to find in the Book.

It is not a question of finding what the apostle Paul did at Corinth, or what he did at Ephesus, unless brother Colley can prove that the apostle Paul was in favor of the hireling ministry system which is practiced by the brethren in Dallas. That is the thing he must do, and that is the one thing he has not touched. And he will not touch it! Listen, I want you to understand this and make no mistake about it. What he is obligated to do if he sustains his proposition is not to locate scriptures for preaching the gospel. It is not to locate a scripture indicating a man remained in a place for a given number of months. Those things have nothing to do with this proposition. But he must locate the scripture authorizing a congregation with elders *hiring a preacher to preach to the church*. Timothy will not do. because I will ask him before he gets started if the elders at Ephesus could fire Timothy and send him back to Paul. If they couldn't fire him, they couldn't hire him. Now just let him tell us if they could fire Timothy!

2. He must find the scripture which authorizes a congregation to arrange trial sermons for prospective candidates for a clerical vacancy.

3. I want him to find a scripture which authorizes elders offering a contract binding a preacher to work for a specific period.

4. I want him to find the scripture obligating the church to pay a guaranteed salary to a preacher for proclamation of heaven's truth.

5. I want him to find the scripture where a church has the right to own real estate in the form of a manse, parsonage, rectory or minister's home, and maintain such for a special caste of men and their successors. That is what he is asked to find.

6. I want him to find where the elders of a congregation

are authorized to secure a man from without the congregation to act as spiritual consultant, program director, moral adviser, and visiting disciplinarian. That is what he has to find.

7. I want him to put his finger on that passage in the Old Book which teaches that the elders have a right to stand before their group and announce the acquisition of a preacher as *the minister* of the congregation. I want brother Colley to come up to this issue and face it. He is affirming this system *as practiced in Dallas*. Not as practiced in Corinth. Not as practiced in Ephesus. Until he can show that the apostle Paul was a practitioner of this hireling system for gain, he hasn't introduced a forty-second cousin to his proposition. He will not do it, either. If he does, he will insult the apostle Paul to high heaven, and one of these days when he stands by the side of Paul to face the God of heaven and give answer to the charge that he attempted to delude this congregation) into believing that the apostle Paul was the kind of man he is representing tonight as a part of the "minister caste" in Dallas—my friends, what will brother Colley have to say when he must answer for that?

But I am not through yet. If he is going to prove this system as it exists in Dallas, and as you brethren believe in and practice it, is right:

S'. He must find the scripture that authorizes a church to provide special office facilities for congregational management for the one whom they have hired. Imagine providing an office for someone who is not an officer. And brother Colley will say that he is not one.

9. He must find the scripture that authorizes the elevating of the name of a hired hand to special prominence on church signs as a regular office fixture in the church.

10. He must find the scripture which authorizes the derogating of the ministry of all other servants in the church by giving a special limited sense to the word "minister." That is what he must find. Never mind, brother Colley, turning to the place where Paul said "you will be a good minister." Just find a place where Paul told them to hire a man as the minister

of a congregation *as practiced in Dallas*. That is what you have to locate.

11. My good brother has to find something else. He has to find the scripture that authorizes the receiving of the resignation of the local minister, thus giving official recognition to him. You cannot resign from an office that you never held.

12. He is going to have to find, if he defends this system that is practiced in Dallas, that it is right for congregations to advertise for applications for vacated positions by located ministers. If he denies that is the common practice in Dallas, I will prove it is. I do not think he will deny it. Brother Colley knows that is what you practice, and I am confident of the fact that you all realize it. No doubt a lot of you are ashamed of such practices but never knew what to do about them. We're going to tell you what to do. That is the purpose of this discussion.

My friends, I would have you know that we approach this thing with hearts filled with reverence for God's word, and with a great deal of respect for brother Colley. I know he has a tremendous task cut out for him. I realize that. But we must now notice some of the things that our brother has had to say. I will ask you to bear in mind what he must find to sustain his position. I will ask you to keep before you the proposition: "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural." Timothy will not do. The elders did not hire Timothy in Ephesus. They didn't hire him and couldn't fire him. You have to find someone besides Timothy. Why they no more hired Timothy than they hired Paul. You know if you can hire a man to start you can hire him to stop. I would like to have seen someone hire the apostle Paul to quit preaching. Brother Colley, you'll have to locate someone besides Paul and Timothy. They will not do you any good.

'Let us just notice for a minute that brother Colley says the work of an evangelist is three fold: first, it consists of laying a foundation; secondly, it consists in setting in order the things that are wanting; thirdly, he says the work of the evangelist consists in putting the brethren in mind of certain things. Then he gives us 1 Timothy 4:6 as corroborative of that.

You know my brother made one excellent point, and I want to agree with him wholly on that. He said that when we are dealing with a proposition we must get all of the Scripture upon that subject. That is true, but we also have to get all of the background if it is possible, and thus understand the commands and directions that are given. Surely he recognizes that fact. It is impossible for us to interpret any scripture out of its context or selling, and he also realizes that to be true.

Now by the introduction of Timothy at this place, brother Colley seems to imply, and you should get this, that Timothy was left at Ephesus, exactly as brother Colley came to Pearl and Bryan Streets. That is the general practice in Dallas, the way he worked at Pearl and Bryan, and his point must be that Timothy was at Ephesus on the same basis as he was at Pearl and Bryan Streets Church. That is ridiculous and absurd on the face of it. I would ask you this one question, and I want you to think with me very seriously about it. Does the fact that *Timothy was left at Ephesus by the apostle* sustain the idea! of the one-man hireling system in the churches as practiced in Dallas?

If there were no elders at the time in Ephesus, the case is invalid in this discussion. But if there were elders did they hire Timothy? Did they employ him? Did they secure his services? If not, he has not proved his proposition by that. He has to prove the employing of a preacher by a congregation having elders is scriptural. That is what this proposition well states. He has to show that such a thing is scriptural. Did the elders contract with Timothy at Ephesus?

Now brother Buchanan and a few of the boys around Dallas sign contracts. That is the way it is done. Did they do that with Timothy? But you may say that you never *signed* a contract in your life. That makes no difference, whether you sign one or make it verbally. Did Timothy have a contract with Ephesus? Did he make a contract *with the elders* or did Paul just leave him there? If Paul arranged for him to stay, I wonder on what basis he made the arrangement?

Friends, let us just take Timothy for a moment and consider his labors. Ephesus is not the only place where Paul ar-

ranged for him to work. He also sent him to Corinth. "For *this cause* have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son. and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church" (1 Cor. 4:17). Here Paul made a very noticeable *faux pass*, according to my good brother Colley. He should have said "As I *preach* everywhere in every church." But Paul never made a mistake like that. He knew better, and brother Colley will know better before the next four nights are over.

When Paul sent Timothy to Corinth, was he to be their "local minister"? If he was, please explain this: "Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear: for he worketh the work of the Lord as I also do. Let no man therefore despise him: but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me, for I look for him with the brethren" (1 Cor. 16:10,11). When these preachers went some place, the church wasn't told to keep them, but to get rid of them and conduct them forth. You know, it is a strange thing about evangelists in the New Testament. They were always getting ready to go some place else. In the case of Dallas, they are always getting ready to find some place they can settle down in. But every time you read of one in the New Testament, he was getting ready to go to another place, he was finishing his work and moving on!

Paul also sent Timothy to Philippi. "Trust in the Lord to send Timotheus shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. For I have no man like-minded who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's" (Phil. 2:19-21). Now if I wanted to be real mean, I would say that is a description of a great many of our brethren today who are preaching for gain, but I will not say it. Paul continues: "You know the proof of him, that as a son with the father, he has served with me in the gospel. Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly" (verses 22-24).

Please get this. Paul said to the church at Corinth, "I am

going to send Timothy." When he gets there, he tells them to send him forth in peace. Why was he sent to Corinth? To put them in mind of the things which the apostle taught everywhere in every church. Then he said he was going to send Timothy to Philippi, but adds that he trusted in the Lord that he would himself come shortly. When he got there, was the church going to fire Timothy so Paul could take over? Was Paul going to be his successor? Paul said that he was coming shortly and when I get to Timothy in Ephesus, I shall show that Paul was going over there and take that job away from him also. All he was to do there was to teach until Paul came, and when Paul arrived, I presume he would take over the job and draw the salary from that time on. Yes, Paul was going over to displace him, and the very passage my brother read to locate Timothy, is the one I am going to quote.

Paul also sent Timothy to Thessalonica. "Wherefore when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone; and sent Timotheus, our brother, and minister of God, and our fellow laborer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you and to comfort you concerning your faith, that no man should be moved by these afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto" (1 Thess. 3:1-3). Paul sent Timothy to Corinth in order to bring them into remembrance of his ways in Christ. He sent him to Philippi for the purpose of knowing their condition or state. He sent him to Thessalonica so that no man would be moved by his afflictions.

Again Paul says to the Hebrews: "Know you that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom if he come shortly, I will see you" (Heb. 13:23). But our brother Colley ignores all of these. He ignores the fact that Timothy was sent by Paul from place to place, and he falls upon Ephesus. Why? I think we may be able to agree upon something here. What was the nature of Timothy's work at Ephesus? That is virtually the only example my brother produced tonight and he says it is to be correlated with the type of work that he does in Dallas. But for what reason did Paul beseech Timothy to remain in Ephesus?

According to the chronology of Conybeare and Howson, Paul first went to Ephesus in the autumn of 54 A. D. He then

left Ephesus for Macedonia in the summer of 57 A. D., which will indicate that he had remained there for about three years, as Paul himself declares. I want to throw that in, because brother Colley might have forgotten it. Paul was at Ephesus for three years, and I presume Timothy succeeded him over there. The apostle left Corinth and stopped at Miletus in the spring of 58 A. D., and while there, just as our brother pointed out, he predicted that men would arise among the elders speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.

Now the apostle wrote to the Ephesians from Rome in the spring of 62 A. D. and there was not a hint of any schism in the church. But he writes Timothy from Macedonia about the summer of 67 A. D. and although I think my brother placed it a little earlier than that, we will not quibble about the chronology. But what do we find? Timothy is at Ephesus! For what reason is he there? Brother Colley says he was over there because there were some men in the eldership who were beginning to teach some things they ought not. And Paul left him there for the purpose of setting those elders straight. *That was a special work.* I do not think that brother Colley would intimate for a minute that it is his job to go into a congregation which had elders that were faithful, and start ordering them around and telling them what to do.

Friends, I want you to get this one thing, that nowhere does Paul say he left Timothy at Ephesus for the purpose of preaching to the church as these brethren are settling down with congregations in order to preach to them. The work of Timothy at Ephesus was definitely outlined. He was to charge some—get that, he was to *charge* some! He was left there for the specific task of charging some that they teach no other doctrine. Nothing was to be taught contrary to the doctrine of the apostle Paul as that doctrine had been set forth in conformity with the great good news or glad tidings which he had previously announced.

Is that why brother Colley was hired at Pearl and Bryan? Was he there for the purpose of setting in order a disorganized church? Let me tell you that so long as a congregation is properly organized and functioning with a faithful eldership, there is no work which an evangelist has as an integral part

of that congregation, and no living man can find it. It isn't in the Book. The work of evangelists is with congregations that are not organized or that are disorganized. And when Timothy was left at Ephesus it was for that specific purpose. He was left there in order that he might settle that condition, and that he might correct the state of disorganization. And when that disorganization was corrected, he, like Titus, would have fulfilled his work as an evangelist, and he would move on.

My brother seemingly has a very peculiar idea about the work of an evangelist. He has to have a peculiar idea about it. But don't you forget that when he introduced Timothy tonight, his point was just that Timothy was in Ephesus doing the same work he once did at Pearl and Bryan Streets, in Dallas. If Timothy was not doing that type of work, then that is not a case in point, and his example is irrelevant and lost. If Timothy was doing the same thing in his! estimation, then I want my brother when he comes before this audience tonight to tell us plainly if Timothy was doing the same kind of thing at Ephesus as he did at Pearl and Bryan, and if the circumstances of his coming into the work at Ephesus were the same as his at Pearl and Bryan. Was Timothy hired by the elders? Was he employed by a congregation having elders? If not, that will not prove his proposition.

My brother has signed a proposition and I insist that he stay with that proposition and demonstrate that Timothy was employed by a congregation having elders exactly as brother Colley was employed by Pearl and Bryan. And since Paul wrote to Timothy, as my brother himself quoted, and said "hoping to come unto thee shortly," was Timothy the supply pastor for that interval? Did Paul expect to become the regular minister for Ephesus when he arrived? You know Paul said to Timothy, "*Till I come give attention to reading, exhortation and teaching.*"

Why did he not consult the elders at Ephesus about how long Timothy was to work there? Paul did not tell Timothy that "When the elders set you going, or fire you, or dismiss you." He did not say, "When you resign with the consent of the elders." He said "Till I come give attention to reading, exhortation and teaching." Did that mean that Paul, when



he came, would he be the successor? If so, did the elders hire Paul? Could they have fired him? Could they have fired Timothy whom Paul left there? If they couldn't fire him, they couldn't hire him. And if they couldn't hire him, then this is not a case in point. Ah, no, brother Colley, you will have to get someone besides Timothy. He is not going to do your case any good.

Brethren, I have a very deep respect for brother Colley, but I want to tell you what this man is doing. He is standing before you and arguing that the apostle Paul actually endorsed this one-man pastor system which is in vogue in Dallas. I deny that. I deny it with all the power, with all the spirit, with all the fervency, with all the love of truth at my command. Although I respect brother Colley, on this matter he is absolutely wrong. And I will tell you there is no greater insult to the memory of<sup>1</sup> the apostle Paul than to imply that he who taught for several years in his own rented house, he who was often hungry, homeless and houseless, would settle down over a congregation with everything made ready to his hands, and carry on the kind of work that is being done by these brethren today.

Mind you, my brother does a great deal of talking on the subject of the preaching or proclaiming of *the gospel*. Regardless of what the outcome might be in discussion of that phase, regardless of what I might say about it, or what he might prove concerning that matter, it would have nothing to do with the proposition we have before us tonight. If he were to prove that it is right to preach the gospel to the church, that would not prove it is right to hire a preacher to do it as commonly practiced in Dallas. That is what he must prove.

Suppose you proved that it was right to preach the gospel to the church, or suppose that I just came out tonight and candidly admitted that it was possible to preach the gospel to the church, then my friends, the question would still remain as to whether the New Testament authorizes the hiring of a man at a specific sum, and of providing for that man special facilities to set him apart from the rest of the congregation as a member of a special caste or class, to do that work? And he would not be able to prove his proposition then!

I am going to follow my brother just as far as I can follow him. I want to tell you that it is a very definite conviction of mine, and that conviction is not based merely upon my own reasoning, that there is a distinction to be made between the preaching of the gospel, that is the announcing of the terms of the good news of heaven and the acceptance of the same, and the instruction in the apostles' doctrine. Why is my brother so interested in that matter tonight? I'll tell you why. If it can be, sustained that the work of proclamation of the gospel was the work of the evangelist as he admits, and then I can demonstrate that the work of proclamation of the gospel had nothing to do with churches that were already established with their elders, he is forever sunk! And he knows it!

I want to call your attention to a statement or two that I think may be of some assistance to you. I know there has been a great deal said about this subject of preaching and teaching. I realize that fact. But I want to make this statement clear so that my brother can meet it tonight. The work of an evangelist, as that work is comprehended in the New Testament, and according to the very etymology of the term, was not the work to be done in a local congregation, but the work of an evangelist was essentially the work of one who went about, who travelled taking the gospel to other places. The very terminology used by the apostles shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the evangelist was not one who was located, but one who went out and carried the news to the farflung corners of the earth in his day. Will my brother deny that the word "evangelist" contains that as a very part of its construction, and that the Bible so teaches? If so, my friends, we can have a discussion which you will long remember.

Is the preaching of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the teaching of the apostles' doctrine one and the same thing? The entire scholarship of the world in dealing with the Greek terms is opposed to my brother. I want to read from Commentary on Romans, by Moses R. Lard, since my brother has gone to Romans. Here is what he has to say about "teaching." "The teaching here mentioned I doubt not, consisted strictly in instructing the church. It did not include preaching

the gospel to those without, This was the work more particularly of the prophet, The didaskalia was for the members of the church, and had for its object their enlightenment and duty. It bore the same relation to those within the church that preaching did to those without. The design of preaching was to bring men in. The design of teaching was to perfect them when in. Teaching was the work chiefly of the overseers of the congregation" (Commentary On Romans, page 385). Now get that! The teaching bore the same relation to those within the church that preaching did to those without. Was Moses E. Lard a Ketcherside-ite?

Now I shall read you another. This is from Alexander Campbell in *Millennial Harbinger*, April, 1862. "There was teaching, there was singing, there was praying, there was exhortation in the Christian church. But preaching in the church, or to the church, is not once named in the Christian scriptures. Paul, once in his first letter to the church at Corinth, said he would declare to the Corinthians that gospel which he had preached to them, which also they had received, wherein they stood. We preach, or report, or proclaim news. But who teaches news? Who exhorts news? We preach the gospel to unbelievers, to aliens; but never to Christians or to those who have received it. Paul taught the Christians. He admonished, exhorted, commanded and reproved Christians, and on some occasions declared the glad tidings to them who had received them, but who seemed to have forgotten them, as he wrote to the Corinthians."

Will my brother affirm that Campbell was so ignorant and so ridiculous that he who gave us that wonderful translation "Living Oracles" did not know the meaning of these terms? Was Alexander Campbell a Ketcherside-ite? Was he just ignorant when he said "We preach the gospel to unbelievers, to aliens; but never to Christians or to those who have received it?" Was Alexander Campbell just trying to make himself ridiculous in these assertions? Or do these modern brethren have an axe to grind which makes brother Colley stand before you tonight and try to lead you down a road of misunderstanding and misconception?

When my brother comes back to this platform, let him

remember what he has to prove. Let him recall that his proposition calls for him to deal with a thing as "generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas." I call upon him to find the scriptures, and to furnish them, for the elders of a congregation hiring a preacher to preach to the church. Let him do it!

Where is the scripture for trial sermons for prospective clerical candidates? Where is the scripture for a contract binding a man for a specific period to a congregation? That is the way it is practiced in Dallas and he knows it!

Where is the scripture obligating a church to pay a guaranteed salary to a preacher for the proclamation of heaven's truth? That is the practice in Dallas.

Where is the scripture for a congregation owning real estate in the form of a manse, parsonage, rectory or minister's home? That is practiced in Dallas.

Where is the scripture for securing a man from without to come in and at a price act as a spiritual consultant? That is practiced in Dallas.

Where is the scripture for announcing the acquisition of a preacher as *the Minister* of a congregation? That is the practice in Dallas and I have the proof of it. I thank you!

## COLLEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Ketcherside, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen :

I am grateful to you for your conduct as you listened to brother Ketcherside's speech. Brother Ketcherside, is this your watch? I did not want to be responsible if it was missing. (Laughter). I think we are in a good humor, but I want to say frankly that he did not answer my speech. He did not touch top, side, nor bottom of it. He thought I was coming another way—I know what he thought. He read passages of scripture that had no bearing on the subject. He might as well have read about Jesus Christ and his blood-lineage in the first chapter of Matthew. It did not have a thing on God's green earth to do with the subject under consideration.

He said that I did not touch my proposition. Well, let's see what the proposition is, and you be the judge. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders as generally practiced among churches of Christ in Dallas is Scriptural." Did I say anything about wages? Did I say anything about pay? Did I say anything about preaching for a congregation? Did I say anything about preachers preaching away from a congregation? Did I say anything about establishing churches?

I want to add another example to those I have given. I preached for Pearl and Bryan church for eight years. I also preached for the Trinity Heights church for six years. A few steps from this theater, on the corner of Woodin and Beckley I held a meeting. This meeting was conducted under the stars, and a few lights hung on poles. If I remember correctly, nineteen people made the confession and were baptized. This was preaching where Christ had not been named. On the Lord's day I preached in the building of the Trinity Heights church. This illustrates two of the examples given in my first affirmative speech.

Brother Ketcherside did some dodging in his speech. Now he is not going to dodge the issue. He is not going to do it. Let us consider some of the things he said. He thinks the first preachers of congregations, and ministers with congregations,

started about fifty years ago in Texas. There have been preachers for churches of Christ longer than fifty years. Timothy was in Ephesus. The church in Ephesus had elders. And the men Paul told Timothy to "charge" were not the only members of that church that were to be corrected. Timothy was told, in 1 Timothy 5:17, the elders that sin reprove before all that others might fear. It was not certain men only. It was the church including the elders. He tells us Timothy was left in Ephesus for a certain work for a few men! It was for the WHOLE CHURCH! I am not mad about it. (Laughter). I though he was going to be difficult to meet. We note some more, January, 1906, not a preacher south of the Mason-Dixon Line. Brother Ketcherside, the first church of Christ in Texas was established about 18-55. Maybe these churches did not have time to develop preachers to place OVER churches! We will get to that some more. We won't forget.

All right, where are the elders of the church to pay a man? I'll try again. I tried to show you that Paul said he robbed other churches, taking wages of them. He took wages. Get the definition of wage. What does it mean? You pay wages to those that work for you. Paul said I robbed other churches. What for? In order that he might preach the gospel to the church in Corinth. Now what are wages? You working men know what they are. Of course everybody on God's earth can get some kind of working agreement—except a preacher. No, according to my opponent the churches cannot agree to pay a preacher wages. No, no stipulated amount. Now, brethren, I have been along the line. I have been preaching for over thirty-two years. I know how to abound and I know how to be in want, as Paul said. Wages. Sure preachers are paid wages. I showed where the gospel was preached to the church in Ephesus. Timothy preached it. Those that proclaim the gospel shall live of the gospel. Brother Ketcherside asked where a preacher was ever hired. Well, when they are paid wages are they hired? What do they pay them for? Those that preach the gospel are to live by the gospel. Preachers preach the gospel, they live by the gospel, they are paid wages.

All right. You'll not dodge, brother Ketcherside. You are going to meet the issue. You are not going to use logic

like this—Jesus wept, Moses slept. Peter went fishing. Therefore: Nebuchadnezzar ate grass. (Laughter). That's logic? Your prepared speeches are not for me. You need not come up here and read them! And I am not mad. (Laughter).

Hear him some more, "As practiced in Dallas." Brother Ketcherside, the reason I used Timothy, if you will read, is because it is a Scriptural example. I showed you by the Scriptures where Timothy preached to a church. If he wasn't paid, it was not according to Clod's commandment. For God appointed that those who preach the gospel, live by it. All right, now some more. He called minister THE minister. My proposition does not say "THE MINISTER." It says A minister. When I signed these propositions with brother Ketcherside, I had not read his debate with brother Wallace. In fact, I do not remember reading one line from the pen of brother Ketcherside, before I signed these propositions. While we were preparing these propositions, I told brother Ketcherside I would not sign them with "THE MINISTER" in the proposition. There is something else that will simplify this discussion if he will just cut a lot of "stuff" from his speeches from now on. And that is he need not get up here and read where my brethren have written that they were "the minister." I do not believe in "the minister" of a congregation. I don't believe in "Associate minister." I do not believe in "Assistant minister." I condemn such as much as he does. Brother Ketcherside used the word "officers." He has a Greek Scholar near him—by his side. Please tell us the Greek word for office. What does it mean? We will discuss this before the debate is over. He might as well get set for it. He has used the word "office" many times. I want to know what office an elder holds in the church. That will give him something to study about.

Now some more of his speech. He wants Colley to find where they resigned. Yes, a place where they resigned from the office. Here is his answer. He said Paul was going to Ephesus and take Timothy's place. If that is true I suppose he resigned when Paul got there. We note again, Find the Scripture that has a church hiring and firing. Well, when Timothy quit what did he do? Maybe he had to quit if he re-

proved some of the elders. Preachers usually do! (Laughter). If you don't know how that's done, I can tell you, because I've been there. (Laughter). Brethren, you may smile inwardly, but don't smile out loud. Thank you just the same. I don't need it although I appreciate it. Do not do that for either one of us.

Now further: He wants to know about hiring and firing. He tells us the church in Ephesus did not hire Timothy. Now study about it. They did not hire him. He preached the gospel, "If there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; According to the glorious gospel." He preached the gospel in Ephesus. Those who proclaim the gospel, live by the gospel. Now here is something else: "Paul never did take anything from the church he was preaching for." He said, Paul was not a hireling. Wasn't a hireling! Hireling! Bless your time when you cannot answer an argument you say, "hireling." I resent that, sir. My brethren are not hirelings. No, sir. We have all made mistakes, brother Ketcherside included, but when these men use a word to designate my brethren that is not complimentary, I resent it. Brother Garrett had an article from the pen of A. Campbell regarding "nicknames" in one of his "Bible Talk" magazines. I might take the time to read it, if he continues with his "hirelings."

Once more, "Paul was not a hireling." "He worked with his hands." Yes, Paul worked with his hands, but he said I have a right to be paid. Yes, I have that right. Paul also said, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? 1 Corinthians 9:5,6.

Paul wasn't married. Paul said he had the right to lead about a wife. He said I have that right. I can lead about a wife. I can marry a wife like the apostle Peter. I can do that. Paul said he had the right to take support, too. Brother Ketcherside thinks because Paul did not take money from churches, no preacher should now. Brother Ketcherside is a married man. He exercises a right that Paul did not. Brother Ketcherside says Paul might have taken money from churches, but he did not. He worked. Therefore, preachers cannot receive



money from the churches they are working in. Now brethren continue to marry in keeping with the Lord's teaching. You have the right to do it. Paul was not married, but he said he could be married if he wanted to. No, the conclusion does not follow, that because Paul supported himself by working with his hands, that all who receive support today are hirelings. Paul was the apostle that said he robbed other churches taking wages of them. Paul also said, those that proclaim the gospel are to live by it. 1 Corinthians 9:14.

"Evangelist always going some place else." We heard some passages regarding Timothy going "some place else." Brother Ketcherside, that was not the passage I gave for your consideration. I know evangelists go "somewhere else." I said that in my speech. I also gave passages that showed that ministers and evangelists can preach for a church that has elders. Note, he said Ephesus was a disorganized church. He has said that before. I want him to prove it! Yes, he read from one of the authorities. I want him to prove that Ephesus was disorganized. Go to Acts 20. I know where you will go. I want you to do it. I dare you to do it. Now you have said things like that all along. Prove that Ephesus was a disorganized church! No, I am not mad about it, I just want you to prove it.

All right, he said Timothy was to settle some conditions. There'll be conditions in the churches as long as there is time. They will need gospel preachers to settle them. Do not forget that. And do not forget this: the very thing that caused the apostasy was placing one man over more than one church, or one man over a church. It started in the eldership. Gospel preachers did not start it. There may be some preachers that keep their ears to the ground to hear what the elders want them to say, but they are not worthy to be called an evangelist.

Now some more of his speech, till I come, Paul said, give attention. Not when the elders said get going. Elders fired him. I do not know whether the elders fired him or not. I do not know when he left. I am prepared to show that he stayed in Ephesus long enough to get the second letter from Paul. Preaching and proclaiming the gospel—he says this has nothing to do with the proposition. It is proof of the proposition!

You know that! He did not touch my proof text. He did not do it. I wanted him to do it. Nothing to do with the proposition! It does, too. It has this much to do with it. A preacher preaching to a church can be paid. He may read a passage of scripture where preaching and teaching are used, and then say if Colley had been there he would have said you cannot preach and teach. He can put words in my mouth. He does it all the time. He did it in his last speech. I will not have another speech tonight, therefore 110 opportunity to answer him. Preaching the gospel does have something to do with the proposition. He teaches that the gospel cannot be preached to a church. He read from Campbell and others. I have held several debates, but I have never given A. Campbell as an authority. This is not because I do not think he was a great man. I do. Brother Campbell wrote profusely, and on many things. He came out of error and learned as he lived.

Evangelists are heralds. You did not develop that much. Just a little. I will let that go. Scholarship of the world—Campbell not a Ketcherside-ite.

These brethren do know what Ketcherside ites are. I did not call any of the brethren that, I am not going to allow you to call my brethren hirelings, without getting after you *plenty*. I didn't call anybody a Ketcherside ite, Campbell never was a Ketcherside ite. None of these brethren here are, that I know. And I don't think they will be when you leave.

"Will brother Colley affirm that A. Campbell did know about these passages of Scripture?" No, I'm not affirming A. Campbell. I'm not affirming any man. My proposition says, the Scriptures teach. That 's what I am affirming. Now let me continue with some more. How much time do I have, brother Swim? Ten minutes. Thanks.

Here is some more evidence, McKnight, preface to First Timothy, page 439 section four: "Of the use which the church in every age is to make of St. Paul's epistles to Timothy and Titus" after describing Timothy's work in Ephesus, paragraph two, "The very same things, indeed, the apostle about the same time wrote to Titus in Crete, but more briefly because he was older, more experienced minister than Timothy. Nevertheless,

a repetition of these precepts and charges is not without use to the churches still, as it maketh us more deeply sensible of their great importance, not to mention that in the epistle to Titus there are things peculiar to itself, which enhance its value; in short the epistles to Timothy and Titus taken together contain a full account of the qualifications and duties of the minister of the gospel, may be considered the complete body of divinely inspired ecclesiastical canons to be observed by the Christian clergy of all communions to the end of the world.<sup>7</sup> I said in my opening speech, and he did not touch it, that the evangelist's duty in the main, was threefold. I also said that it takes all three of these letters to Timothy and Titus. I used the great commission, and the rule we have used all along the line.

Once more, the gospel in Romans 1:15. I asked him to say something about it. He did not say a word. He did not say a word about Romans 1:16 either. I offered that as a proof text. Romans 1:17, "For therein (in the gospel) is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." The gospel must be preached to the church in order to preach the righteousness of God. He did not touch it. He didn't even get close enough to get singed. Now why! He will have to do better than that. That's all right in Missouri for you to debate with some of those fellows. But down here in Texas we are the men from Missouri. We have to be shown. Romans 1:15. I want you to say something about that, brother Ketcherside. Please do. You and I are going to be friends when this debate is over. We are going to be friends, but you are going to have to meet these arguments. I cannot allow you to get up here and mislead these people. I know your strength, it is not answering my arguments. You absolutely ignore them. Don't put words in my mouth, either.

Paul said he would preach the gospel to the church in Rome. Said he would preach to the church in Rome. Why not give what Doctor MacKnight said about that? Doctor MacKnight? Why not give what somebody said about it? Just anybody, I do not care. NOTICE ROMANS 1:15. "That so much as in me is, I am ready to preach, the gospel to you that are in Rome also.' ' He said that doesn't have any bearing on

the subject, brother Colley. Yes, it does! For those who preach the gospel to churches are to be supported by the churches. You got up here and said they couldn't be hired! Certainly it has a bearing on it.

What did you say about the righteousness of God being revealed in the gospel? Paul said, "grace reigns through righteousness," and that it must be preached to the church. The gospel is the container. The righteous acts are those by which the Christian lives. The just shall live by faith." The righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel. And you didn't say anything about it. You talked about preachers, and no doubt they have made some mistakes. I am not defending them. Here is my proposition: the method of hiring or securing the services of a preacher by a congregation to be a minister, as generally practiced by the church of Christ is scriptural. He mentioned a written contract between preacher and church. If the elders and preachers want it that way, it is their business. It is not mine. If brother Buchanan wanted to write his agreement with the church that is his business. It is not yours. It is not mine. When Paul said, "I robbed other churches taking wages of them"—wages; if he received wages from a church they paid him. When Jesus taught the parable of the laborers. They were paid. "A laborer is worthy of his hire." He would have you believe gospel preachers are not worthy. They can not have a congregation pay them. Again we note: preachers that live in preacher's homes. About twenty years ago I lived on the next street from here, 819 Woodin. At that time I lived in my own hired house. I preached the gospel in many parts of Trinity Heights. Now he said we have preacher's homes. A preacher's home is part of his wages. It is part of the preacher's wages.

What did you say about Galatians 1:6,9? "I marvel that you are so quickly removed from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel, but there are some that trouble you." What is a perverted gospel? Preaching part of it to sinners and saying that the other part cannot be preached to the saints. That is it! What did you say about that? You didn't say anything. You read what some of the preachers said, and what Alexander

Campbell said. Again: brother Colley, you surely know that brother Campbell wouldn't do so and so. Yes, brother Campbell knew those passages were there, but that has no bearing whatsoever.

What did you say about his divine power that calls us unto life and godliness? And he hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. His divine power is the gospel of Christ. You have not said anything about that yet. He said I'm following. Brother, I sure would hate to lead a calf that followed like that! You are not doing anything of the kind. You did not follow my argument. Now those young men that came down here from St. Louis told me they wanted a debate in which the scriptures were used. I told them to bring their little *black books*. I want them to look in those *black books*. I mean the New Testament. I am not interested in A. Campbell. I am not interested in authorities. I am interested in what God's eternal truth teaches. I am interested in the sound words, and sound doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That is what every faithful gospel preacher is concerned with, and interested in. Every time there is an error of any kind, those who teach the error will resort to the Greek. They did it on psalms—The digressives did. We changed their mind about that. Then the Methodists and Presbyterians on baptizo. Yes, they resorted to the Greek. A few years ago here in Dallas on the eldership question, they resorted to the Greek. They are gone. Their resorting to the Greek did not get them anywhere. I have always believed that the 47 men that translated the King James Version, and the 101 that translated the American Standard Version knew what they were doing. I can give what they translated. It will be the truth. It is the way-bill that will take you from timely things to things which are perpetual and eternal in their nature.

Once more, the apostle Peter said, "You purified your souls in obeying the truth through the spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently. Being born again not of corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. All flesh is as grass, and the glory of man as the flower thereof. The grass withereth, the flower falleth away. But

the word of the Lord endureth forever. This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.' ' What did you say about that, Not one thing. He followed me! Yes, he followed me! He can't sing, "Where he leads me I will follow." He did not do it! Here is what he *did* do. He asked for an example where the elders actually hired anybody in the New Testament time. Brother Ketcherside, that is a dodge. Now one for you: Show me where any preacher, in the New Testament, baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? If they did not do it they did not do what Jesus commanded. I have engaged men in debate that affirmed that baptism was only in the name of Christ. I answered them by saying, "If the apostles did not baptize into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit they did not do what Jesus told them to do." More than that, hear it—Let him alone brother Garrett, I want him to get this. Now you let him alone. (Brother Garrett was talking to brother Ketcherside). You can talk when you get home. Show me an example, brother Ketcherside, show me an example where the elders ever held a business meeting without a preacher. Get the New! Testament and show me. Now you try that. Show me an example! You tell us that a preacher can't work in a congregation with elders. Show the example! Put your finger on the passage!

All right, furthermore, elders had their business meetings. The New Testament records them. It just so happened that a preacher was present. Now a question, can the elders have a business meeting without the preacher? Certainly. Certainly. If the elders didn't pay Timothy, then they did not do what God told them to do, for those who preach the gospel are to live by the gospel. God has ordained it, He asked me to put my finger on the passage where they ever actually paid him. Where did they ever pay him! Where did any preacher baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit? If they did not do it they did not do what Jesus told them to do. If the church did not pay Timothy when he preached in Ephesus, the church did not do what God ordained they should do. Preach the gospel, live by the gospel, take wages of the gospel. *That's it.* "Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel shall live by the gospel." (Time). Thank you.

## KETCHERSIDE'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ,  
and friends:

I am sure that when any man among us attempts to uphold a sectarian position he must employ all of the tactics that every sectarian in the land has used, and will continue to use so long as he attempts to defend that kind of a position. I realize that this hireling system, and I use the term not in a sense of disrespect but as a descriptive term, has so gradually crept upon us that the churches have been taken unawares. I know there are a great many of you sitting here tonight who believe there surely cannot be anything wrong with it, and that it cannot be so insidious as I picture it, nor a matter of such grave importance or fraught with such terrible danger.

And as you listen to our brother as he flounders about from one place to another in his attempt to evade the proposition which he signed, it may occur to you that he has even done the thing which he agreed that he would do. Let me just read the proposition again. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural." The churches of Christ in Dallas, that is the majority of them, have followed the policy of hiring a man to come in from elsewhere, often after that man has been called upon to preach a trial sermon for approval, and the elders have hired that man for a stipulated sum to be the minister of the congregation.

They recognize him as the minister, and they so announce him. The congregation recognizes him as the minister, and so calls him. Now a great many of these brethren are attempting to evade and elude the sad state or condition in which they find themselves by changing the designation. They want to call themselves evangelists. I want you to know that these men definitely understand that when they are doing this work they are not doing the work of evangelists. Their speech betrays them.

My brother doesn't want me to read about his brethren. But just let me tell you that he signed a proposition to defend

the practice of his brethren. I do not blame him for not wanting me to tell on them, but that is what he signed to defend. If he cannot defend the practice of his brethren let him give lip this proposition. If he cannot defend this system as practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, if that practice is wrong and he cannot uphold it, let him say so. That is all he has to do. He said, "Oh, don't let brother Ketcherside get up and tell you what is practiced by this congregation or that one, or by this brother or that brother. They all make mistakes, yes, all of us make mistakes!"

But he is here tonight affirming that a certain system is scriptural. That system is the one in vogue among the churches of Christ in Dallas. I have a perfect right to establish what that system is, and my friends, I would have you to know that the system that is so prevalent in Dallas is not limited to this city alone. It is widespread throughout the length and breadth of the land. But mark you, these brethren know the difference between the located minister system, which is nothing more nor less than a one-man pastor system, such as they used to fight in the Christian church, and the work of an evangelist.

I'll just give you an illustration to prove that. In the Firm Foundation, January 16, 1951, occurred this statement: "ANOTHER REQUEST. Have you arranged for a preacher for your meeting? There is a preacher of unusual ability and experience both as a located minister and as a preacher in gospel meetings who has decided to be released from the work of the church where he is now preaching and spend his full time as an evangelist." They know the difference. Indeed they do.

I want to read again from Firm Foundation, October 20, 1953. Here it is under the heading "Preachers of Today." It says: "Brother Hardeman never served as local preacher, but did much evangelistic preaching and much work in the field of Christian education." Then doing evangelistic preaching and serving as local preacher are two different things. They know it. You do not have to go to the Bible to prove the difference exists. They know there is a difference.

Now I want to call your attention to this statement made



in Firm Foundation, September 29, 1953: "Brother J. B. Kenny has resigned as minister of Twelfth and Drexel congregation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and has taken up the work in Lebanon, Tennessee. We feel deeply indebted to the elders of the church in Fayetteville, Arkansas, for releasing brother Fred W. McClung from a new two year contract so he could begin work as our minister on September 13, with a gospel meeting." No wonder he doesn't want me to read these things. He knows that I will let the cat out of the sack!

In the Gospel Advocate, March 30, 1939, appears this: "The elders and deacons of the Cowart Street church in Chattanooga, submit the following recommendation of R. C. White, of Chattanooga, Tennessee. We heartily commend him to any church desiring his services for protracted work during the summer and fall as *we have agreed to some evangelistic work.*" They know that when this man goes out into the field to proclaim the gospel of God's Son, he is doing the work as an evangelist; and when he stays as a local preacher as they employ the term, he is nothing more nor less than a pastor. He is there doing the work that God has ordained for the elders in the church to do. He is usurping the functions which belong to others.

Now I do not know just what point my brother made, or attempted to make here, when I pointed out to you from the bulletin of George Pepperdine College that in January, 1906, there was not one preacher in the state of Texas who was working full time with a church, that is, there was no one doing the kind of work these brethren now are doing. Not one! It said there were three or four in the north, but not one in Texas. The point I made, and it stuck with you I am sure, is that fifty years ago there was not a man in the churches of Christ following this course of procedure. Not one, brethren!

But what does he reply to this? He says there were preachers in the church of Christ more than fifty years ago. Of course there were. But there were no preachers *acting as pastors* in the church of Christ more than fifty years ago. That is the thing I am talking about. And he said, "Timothy was in the church of Christ more than fifty years ago." Certainly, but Timothy was not acting as a salaried pastor in the

churches more than fifty years ago. There wasn't even one in Texas, no not one, until they hired R. C. White to do that work. Now friends, you can see his dodging. Talk about someone dodging. I proved to you from this statement that fifty years ago there was not a preacher working full time with a local congregation, and he comes back and says for you not to let anyone tell you there were no preachers in the church of Christ fifty years ago. Certainly there were preachers, but they were not hiring out as pastors fifty years ago.

He then returns to the question of paying a man. He says that I asked him where the Bible says that the elders were to pay a man. I did not ask him that. I asked him nothing of the sort. I'll just read you what I did ask him with regard to that, and I want to show you that he did not touch it. I asked, "Where do the scriptures authorize or obligate a church to pay a *guaranteed salary* to a preacher for the proclamation of heaven's truth?" Where does the Bible authorize that? I said nothing about this matter, but he gets on the word "wages" and he makes a considerable ado about that word.

He lights upon the word "wages" and seems to think that because the apostle Paul said he took wages from other congregations, that this means he was accepting a stipulated salary as these men in Dallas are doing. That is the question before us, the practice in Dallas. Now let me read to you from Edwin Hatch, M. A., Vice-Principal of St. Mary's Hall and Grinfield Lecturer in the Septuagint, Oxford. On page 52 of his book, "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches" he says this: "The funds of the primitive communities consisted entirely of voluntary offerings. Of these offerings the office-bearers whose circumstances required it were entitled to a share. They received such a share only on account of their poverty. They were so far, in the position of the widows and orphans and helpless poor. Like soldiers in the Roman army, or like slaves in a Roman household, they were entitled to a monthly allowance. The amount of that allowance was variable. When the Montanists proposed to pay their clergy a fixed salary the proposal was condemned as a heretical innovation, alien to Catholic practice. Those who could supplemented their allowances by farming or trade. There was no

sense of incongruity in their doing so . . . . There is no early trace of the later idea that buying and selling, handicraft and farming, were in themselves inconsistent with the office of a Christian minister. The bishops and presbyters of those early days kept books, practiced medicine, wrought as silversmiths, tended sheep or sold their goods in the open market."

This outstanding Greek student from whom I've read, and he has challenged me to inquire of the Greek student sitting next to me (Leroy Garrett), but this outstanding Greek student makes it clear beyond any shadow of doubt that the early Christian brethren were supported, not with a guaranteed or stipulated salary, but just as was anyone else who was poor and needy. I think that preachers of the gospel should be supported exactly like poor widows are supported, and exactly like orphans are supported. They should be supported according to their needs. And I challenge my brother to put his finger on one passage of scripture that ever intimates that anyone received any amount from congregations of the churches of Christ, except to relieve a need.

The salaried pastor system is not in the Book. He knows it is not there. He cannot find it. I challenge him to put his finger on one Scripture that even intimates that anyone—widow, preacher, elder or anyone else—ever received any amount except for the relief of his needs. Let him find it. And I suggest to my dear brother that he had better stay off the word "wages" or I'll show you what the apostle Paul actually took from those people, and I'll prove beyond a shadow of doubt that he did not engage in the kind of a system that you brethren are practicing.

Brethren, you have the hireling pastor system, which you borrowed from the same Christian Church you used to fight. You have swallowed it lock, stock and barrel. That is why you cannot speak against it any more when you go out to show the differences between the Christian Church and churches of Christ. Yes, you have it, and may God have mercy] on you, if you do not get rid of it. It is just as wrong tonight as it was when you used to condemn it. It will be wrong fifty years from tonight if it was wrong fifty years ago. Yes, I am sorry for you. It is a shame, and the worst shame of all is that the

church of the Living God has fallen into such a state of hiring system, that members shift their responsibilities to men who are professionals for gain, and who make it their business to sell the gospel of the Son of God across the pulpit just like other men peddle prunes across the counter. And he dares to insinuate that the apostle Paul and Timothy were in such a class or category. It is ridiculous, upon the very face of it!

Listen to R. C. H. Lenski, in his book on First and Second Corinthians. Dealing with this word "wages" he declares: "Paul caused this truth to smart: 'Other churches I robbed by taking support for my ministry unto you.' The Corinthians deserved this mortification in order to drive out their ingratitude. For what is meaner than to slander a benefactor for bestowing his benefaction gratis? But note, Paul says that he 'robbed other churches.' He took from them what he really should not have taken, namely *opsonion*, sustenance. 'Wages' is too liable to be misunderstood as regular pay, which Paul never took from any church, 1 Cor. 9:15,18. This Avas a fixed principle with him."

There goes your word "wages." I did not say that the brethren were not to be supported. The very first thing I said when I reached this platform was that we agreed they were to be supported. But I said that the system you have is not in the Bible. Brother Colley, it just is not there. As practiced in Dallas, it is not in the Book, and what the apostle Paul did is just as far from what you do in Dallas, as the very things you once condemned in the Christian Church are that far from God's Book.

A. T. Robertson, A. M., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., in his "Word Pictures in the New Testament" has this to say about 1 Corinthians 9:7, "The late word *opsonion* (from *opson*, cooked meat or relish with bread, and *oneomai*, to buy) found in Menander, Polybius, and very common in papyri and inscriptions, in the sense of rations for food, then for the soldier's wages (often provisions) . . . ." Provisions! The apostle Paul was to be provided for. Whatever his needs were, he was entitled to receive for those needs. But this idea of a man hiring out, and selling the gospel at so much per week, and using the pulpit of the church of the Living God as a counter

across which to dispose of truth for a hundred dollars per week, friends, that just isn't in the Bible. He talks about his "little black book" but that is one thing that isn't in his little black book. He will not find that either in the Greek or the English versions.

Again, my brother is very careful. He does not want me to refer to the fact that his brethren call themselves "*the* ministers." He knows that the congregations look upon them as just that, and he realizes that they are the ministers of the churches. He knows that, but he doesn't want me to refer to it. He says that he will condemn his brethren as! quickly as I will for talking about "associate ministers" and that sort of thing. Brother Colley is recognized as the minister of the church where he is located. And when the time came that they got ready to publish a list of the churches of Christ in Dallas, they did not publish the names of the elders. They just published the names of the ministers. Will brother Colley insist that his name did not appear in that publication among the ministers? Will he do that? If he does do that tomorrow night, it will be interesting. He is very careful now and he is afraid that I'll say something he cannot answer tonight. But he has another night. Will he say that his name did not appear there? Did these brethren publish the names of all the ministers in that congregation where he is, or just the one who gets the salary? The minister. Which one did they publish? Did they put them all in? Let brother Colley tell you. Friends, we are debating this thing as it is practiced in Dallas. He knows it and he doesn't like it but he should not have signed the proposition.

Now again. I brought up the case of Timothy. Why did I bring it up? Because my brother introduced it. And why did he introduce it? Undoubtedly he was trying to show that Timothy was occupying exactly the same position as this whole list of ministers of the churches of Christ in Dallas. If Timothy was not in that position, he should not have been introduced. If he did occupy that position, certainly I have to meet it. So I proposed the question that since the apostle told Timothy to give attention to reading, to exhortation and to teaching, "till I come," if Timothy was to quit and if Paul would get

his job? If so, did Paul have to write the elders' and ask if they would hire him? Did Paul have to preach a trial sermon? Who hired Paul? Brother Colley didn't like what I said about that so he suggested that maybe Timothy had to quit. He said that if Timothy rebuked the elders he might have had to quit and he said he supposed that he resigned when Paul got there. What did he resign from? What did he resign for? To go out and do evangelistic work? That is why these brethren resign. They resign from a local congregation to go out and do evangelistic work. Is that what Timothy did, or are these brethren mistaken on that? Ah, brother Colley is afraid to defend his brethren, but after all is said and done, that is what he agreed to do.

Again he says, "Let him prove that Ephesus was a disorganized church." I do not have to prove it. Brother Colley has already admitted it, That was the very point he made, that the church in Ephesus was disorganized. Disorganized in what respect? Why, its officers were teaching things contrary to the word of God and Paul had to leave a man there to rebuke them for it. If that is not disorganization I wouldn't know how to prove it. Yet that is the very thing our brother says Timothy was over there to do. He proved it was disorganized. Does everyone have to go haywire before a thing can be disorganized? Would everyone in the United States have to lose his mind and go berserk before the government became disorganized? Brother Colley showed that the church at Ephesus was disorganized when he said that Timothy was sent there to rebuke the elders.

But he says there were certain conditions in Ephesus that it took a gospel preacher to settle and there will always be conditions that will require preachers to settle. Let me ask why the elders could not settle them? Why do you need a preacher to come in and settle conditions? If the elders were all doing as they should, why could not they settle conditions? I want to ask you this one question, brethren, and I want you to get it, What condition can arise in a congregation requiring a preacher to settle which *faithful elders* cannot settle? What condition? I want to put that down again. What condition can arise in a congregation requiring a preacher to come in

and settle it, which faithful elders cannot settle? What condition? Just let brother Colley say, "Well, a preacher has to stop the mouths of false teachers." I'll take him right over to Titus, chapter 1, and show what the elders were for. So you have lost Timothy again, brother Colley. You had better leave Timothy alone. He is not on your side of the matter.

Next my brother gets on Romans 1:15, and oh, how he pleads with me to notice that. And why is brother Colley so anxious for me to pay my respects to that. He thinks he has a grand point. He thinks the apostle Paul went over there to preach to the church, to preach the gospel to the church. He thinks that Romans, chapter one, demonstrates that. And he says, "Let him read from someone. Let him show it. Let him prove it. Let him read from MacKnight. Let him go to James MacKnight. Just read from anyone. Bring MacKnight into it."

All right, I will just do that. Yes, sir, I'll just do that very thing. He asked for it, and now he is going to get it. Here it is from James MacKnight, D. D., and his subject is "The Occasion of the Writing of the Epistle of Romans." Now watch it, for this is the man from whom he wanted me to read. "From the pains which the apostle Paul took in this letter to prove that no Gentile can be justified by the law of nature, nor Jew by the law of Moses, and from his explaining in it all the divine dispensations respecting religion, as well as from what he says, chap. 1:7, 13, 14, 15, it is reasonable to think that it was designed for the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles at Rome, as well as for the brethren; who therefore would show the copies which they took of it to their unbelieving acquaintance. And inasmuch as the apostle professed to derive his views of the matter contained in this letter from the former revelations, and from inspiration, it certainly merited the attention of every unbeliever to whom it was shown, whether he were a Jewish scribe, or heathen philosopher, or a Roman magistrate, or one of the people; some of whom I make no doubt read it."

Now, I will not quit with that. He said for me to read from MacKnight and I shall continue to take him up on that. I am going to do that, and I ask you to hear what MacKnight has to say in his very translation of the passage at issue. Lis-

ten, here is his free translation: "Being the apostle to the Gentiles, I am bound to preach both to the Greeks, however intelligent, and to the barbarians, both to the philosophers and to the common people. Therefore, notwithstanding your great proficiency in the sciences, I am willing, according to my ability, to preach the gospel even to you unbelieving Gentiles, who are in Rome" (Romans 1:14,15). That is what you asked for, and now you have it. But wait a minute, MacKnight did not stop there. He added a footnote which I shall read to you.

"In regard that Paul, after acknowledging he was bound to preach the gospel both to the Greeks and barbarians, adds, 'I am ready to preach the gospel to you who are in Rome,' the idolatrous inhabitants certainly were included in the expression, 'you who are in Rome.' This verse, therefore, as well as the following, is a proof that the epistle to the Romans was intended, not for the Roman brethren alone, but for unbelievers also, to whom copies of it might be shown." Thus MacKnight says that the very passage you quoted (Romans 1:15) shows that it was intended for the unbelievers in Rome, and he is the very one that you wanted me to read from.

He has another speech coming up tomorrow night and he can handle it then. He is a little bit afraid of the Greek. Brother Colley knows of course that the Greek term for "evangelist" has the idea of itinerancy in it—moving about from place to place and taking the gospel to those who have not heard it before. And he is afraid of that. So what does he do? In order to try and thwart it and keep me off it, he tries to sidetrack you. He knows that the New Testament was written in Greek, but he doesn't want me to get on the original language of the Book. He tries to sidetrack us by implying that when a man goes to the Greek, he is in a bad state of affairs. He says, "Look at the Christian Church with the word *psallo*." How did the brethren answer the argument made on *psallo*? I'll tell you what they did. They took the Greek lexicons and showed that the word *psallo* didn't mean what the Christian Church said it did. Then our brother says, "Look at the Methodists with the word *baptizo*." How did our brethren handle that? They took the word and showed that it did not mean what the Methodists said it did.



Now, let him take the word evangelist and handle it that way. I affirm tonight that the Greek term for evangelist definitely contains in it the idea of itinerancy, the heralding of a message, the moving about from place to place and taking the gospel to those who have not heard it before. Let him handle it like our brethren handled psallo and baptizo. Just let him try that, my friends, and it will be interesting when he does.

I would like to read another thing here. Not long ago I came across a very wonderful book, compiled by a number of the most outstanding Greek students in the world. Among them was Dr. J. Y. Campbell, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament, Westminster College, Cambridge, in England. I sat down and wrote him this question: "What is the original import of the word 'wages' as used in 2 Corinthians 11:8? Are we to understand from the expression that Paul was laboring on a stipulated and guaranteed salary basis in his proclamation of the gospel of Christ? "

I hold here Dr. Campbell's letter written in his own handwriting: "The word *opsonion*, 2 Corinthians 11:8, is more often found in the plural, and usually means 'wages,' 'salary,' especially a soldier's pay (cf. Luke 3:14; 1 Cor. 9:7). But it can be used of any provision made for a person's support, and this is quite certainly the sense in 2 Cor. 11:8. The R.S.V. translates 'accepting support' which is correct. The next verse suggests that the money first provided was exhausted during Paul's stay in Corinth, and that then the Macedonian churches again came to his existence. So the answer to your second question here is, No!" But if Paul did not receive it on a stipulated basis as these men do, he was not engaged in a practice like Dallas, and that is the thing brother Colley has to locate. No wonder he does not like the Greek!

Brethren, our good brother is going to appear before you tomorrow in another reply to this. I want to put this down then to where he can grasp it, and we can attack the basis of this thing that is practiced in Dallas. It is an unscriptural practice. I'm sure that most of you realize that it is, and I am confident many of you know it cannot be defended, because it is not in the Book. But I want to show you

why I believe it is an unscriptural system. I am going to file certain objections to this system, the ministry system which you have, which amounts to nothing more nor less than the hiring at a stipulated wage of one man to come and act as the minister for the congregation in the proclamation of the Word. That is the condition that we face, that is the thing we must try to meet. That is the thing this proposition calls upon him to meet.

I am going to say tonight that this system is unscriptural and I shall set forth certain objections to it on that basis.

1. The man does not live who can cite a passage from the Bible which even intimates that a New Testament congregation with elders hired a man as their located minister for a stipulated fee, as is now generally practiced in the Dallas churches.

Since my brother affirms that it *is scriptural*, we want our brother to cite the scripture that even hints at a church with elders announcing the resignation of a local minister. That is practiced in Dallas. From what does such a man resign? Does he resign from gospel preaching? Does he resign from use of the talent which God has given him? Or, does he resign from some office? What does he resign from? If he resigns from something, what is that something? Where is it mentioned in the Scriptures? What are its qualifications? What New Testament evangelist ever served in that capacity?

It cannot be the office of evangelist, for many resign from it to go out and do evangelistic work. What were they doing from which they could resign? I want to read you a little statement, signed by brother Lee Starnes, published in Firm Foundation, September 30, 1938: "It is with much thought that I am tendering my resignation to become effective for 1939."

But let us get a little closer home. Here is the Boles Home News, for October 10, 1953. I think our brother was once associated with Boles Home. Now let us read from their News. "Gayle Oler will speak at a lectureship at the Granbury and Turner Streets church of Christ, in Cleburne, Texas, Sunday night, November 1, using as his subject, 'Dangers to the

Church from Within.' Brother Lloyd Frederick is minister of the Cleburne congregation. Monday night, November 2, Minister Oler" — it's coming to be a title now — "Minister Oler begins a revival meeting with the church of Christ in Ganado, Texas, where brother Jack E. Orbison is the local minister. The meeting is scheduled to continue until November 11."

Now, listen to this: "Gayle Oler, superintendent of Boles Home, is preaching at Lamar Avenue church of Christ in Paris, Texas, until the coming of their new minister. Brother Perry B. Cotham recently resigned as the minister of the Lamar Avenue church is currently engaged in evangelistic work." These boys know the difference. Brother Colley knows the difference, too. They know the difference. I'll tell you they have something they cannot defend. And the only way they can get out of it is to cut and cover.

Where is the scripture in this Old Book that hints at a church with elders advertising that their pulpit would be vacant and soliciting candidates to file applications for the job? You practice it, where is the scripture for it? Where is the scripture that authorizes for the arranging of trial sermons for various aspirants to fill the position? What New Testament gospel preacher ever arranged for a trial sermon to submit to a congregation wanting a hired hand? What New Testament church ever followed that procedure? What New Testament church ever contracted to pay so much for one to preach to the congregation each week? What New Testament congregation ever announced the name of a man hired as the minister?

Brethren, it just isn't there. You are sectarian in your practice. You are right on many things, but you are sectarian on this practice. You just have no scripture for it. Brother Colley cannot find it. No one can find it. It just isn't in there. Why don't you give it up and go out and do evangelistic work — all of the time? Just resign once and then stay resigned! It is when you go back and quit resigning that all of the trouble starts. Why don't you just do the work of an evangelist all of the time? Instead of resigning periodically to do the work of an evangelist, why don't you just resign and stay

out in the work of an evangelist? Then we'll have no difficulty over this.

2. The system is anti-scriptural in that it creates a system of one-man ministry which makes it impossible to carry out the heaven-ordained system of mutual ministry clearly taught in the New Testament Scriptures. I want to make it clear to you that God's plan for the edification of the church is through the use of every member and the exercise of every gift and faculty. Is it any more unscriptural to centralize the work of all the congregations under one church, than it is to centralize the work of edification of all the members in one man? You are opposing the centralization of all the work of all the churches in one congregation, then turning right around and affirming the centralization of all the work of all the members of the congregation in one man. What is the difference? You have as much scripture for one as you do for the other. Consistency demands that you either drop the one, or else go over with the other.

In Romans 12:4-8; Romans 15:14; 1 Thessalonians 5:11 and in Hebrews 10:24,25, the apostle consistently uses that term which is so frequently translated "one another" and is from the Greek word for "mutual." And MacKnight on Romans 12:5 says: "The meaning of the figure ('as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members of another') is that Christians depend on one another for their *mutual edification* and comfort as the members of the human body depend on one another for nourishment and assistance."

Where does the Bible give us the authority for one man in the congregation rising to such a position of prominence that he can say to the rest of the members that they dare not occupy the sacred stand, and that it belongs to him by right of the fact he has been hired? "Upon what meat hath Caesar fed that he hath grown so great?" Other members of the congregation are subjected and cowed, must sit back and are not allowed to edify their brethren, and may not stand before them, A man is hired to do that, and the rest of you have no right to occupy the pulpit. Humble, sincere, contrite, con-

scientious brethren never permitted to stand before the congregation. Just think of a congregation of 800 members, and only one man in it that is capable of edifying the church—a congregation of 800 members with one mouth only and no arms or legs!

Brethren, I want to know this one thing, by what manner of reasoning can any individual on the face of the earth subjugate and sublimate the rest of his brethren, hundreds of them in a local congregation, and then plant himself forward as the hired servant of the church to do that work which God has ordained for everyone to do? Here is the thing I would have you see tonight. Before you have stood two men. One of these men has pleaded for a system in which a congregation of four or five hundred members is so helpless, weak, sickly, childish, uninstructed and unlearned, that even though they may have men qualified and appointed for elders, they have to send off and import someone to spoon feed them at so much per week. The other man has stood before you tonight and pleaded for the liberty of all the members of the congregation who have the ability to stand with an equal right upon the same platform.

I tell you the God of heaven never placed a pulpit in the church to be made the particular realm in which one man or two may pace back and forth, and such a man only because he gets paid to do it. That is true, because when his salary stops he will resign and go out and do evangelistic work. God never arranged that kind of a system. He never did it. I plead tonight for the rights, privileges and prerogatives of every priest of God. And do not forget, friends, that in the New Testament priesthood is as extensive as ministry. If it is right for one man to be hired as the minister of the church, you can hire him as the priest of the church. If it is right to place on your sign "Flavil Colley, Minister" it is right to put up there "Flavil Colley, Priest," Every man and every woman is a minister of the church. No man can be *the* minister of a church. And while my brother claims to deplore the use of the term, he endorses the practice. Deplores the term and endorses what it stands for.

But, beloved friends, God's word tonight stands just as it

has always stood, for the right of every Christian to edify his brethren limited only by his faithfulness and his ability. May God help us that we shall shuck off these sectarian things that we have borrowed, strip them from us, and let the church stand forth in all of its pristine glory and apostolic simplicity—the church of the Living God with every Christian a minister, every minister a Christian; every Christian a priest, every priest a Christian, and all of us working together in God's universal priesthood in universal ministry. Thank you so much.

## COLLEY'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Ketcherside, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen :

I am happy for renewed opportunities and privileges that are mine. And that I can come before you once more to affirm the proposition that has been read in your hearing. The definition of terms was made last night, and there was no criticism so far as I remember, to the definition of them. I want you to know, my friends, first of all, that those propositions read, "The securing of a preacher to be a minister of the church of Christ." I am not defending what a preacher does after he is secured by a congregation. My proposition does not read in any sense of the word, that I have to defend their acts when they are working with a church. Brother Swim, please let me have those propositions. Thank you. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation as generally practiced"—Now play was made on the word "practice." The impression was made by brother Ketcherside last night that I was to defend the practice of the preachers, not only in Dallas, but everywhere else. The proposition does not say any such thing. "As generally practiced among churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural." I am affirming that a church having elders, can secure a preacher as a minister. That is a general practice among the churches of Christ in Dallas. I am not defending what those preachers may do when they are with a congregation. I would not defend all that my brethren do. No. If they call themselves THE MINISTER of the congregation, I am not responsible for that. And I won't defend them in it.

I want to notice some things that were said in his last speech. This is the last night of my affirmative. Tomorrow evening he will be in the affirmative. I might say that I am not getting this on the tapes I bought to record this debate. Brother Smith has been paid to record the debate. Something has been removed from the recording equipment. Brother Moore is also recording the debate, and we will transfer it from his tape to mine.

Here is his speech of last evening. "Colley has used denominational tactics." The denominations do not use the

New Testament and passages of Scripture for proof texts. I used them. I laid down an affirmation and I am going to stay with it. There were many things that he said Colley did and did not do. He cannot fool you. No, he can't fool you, my friends. No, I did not use denominational tactics. We note some more, hiring a preacher to move and become a part of the church. Just a hired hand. Why doesn't he know that when a preacher works with a church he becomes part of that church. His family is part of the church. My wife and children are members of the church, like other members of the church. He had much to say about a preacher from the outside that goes to work with a congregation. Of course THEY can go for two weeks and preach for a church. THEY can preach for a church without elders. THEY can receive money for it. THEY believe they ought to be paid and paid well. When it comes to business affairs, and a business arrangement, why, No, WE can't do it. They want to tell us we can't do that.

He tells us that the practice of preachers preaching for a congregation is not limited to preaching—It is the pastor system. Assertions are cheap commodities. You can get them on an open market for nothing, but facts are stubborn things. My brethren as ministers are not pastors. They can be a minister with other members, with other ministers, in a congregation. That is exactly what these men who are ministers, mean when they speak of the church. We are all ministers. That is right. Here is a minister, "Do the work of an evangelist. Make full proof of thy ministry." 2 Timothy 4:5. Brother Ketcherside spent much of his time reading from the Firm Foundation. He read where some preachers left their work as THE minister. Brother Ketcherside, if you will let me have half of those clippings, I will spend half of my time reading them, and I will condemn them, too. Then we can get along into other things. No, I have not agreed to defend the practice of my brethren when they misuse Bible terms, or when they use the language of Ashdod in describing their work. He reads from the bulletins again and about located preachers. Yes, we have heard a lot about located preachers. The big problem of our day is preachers you can't locate on anything. Oh, yes, he worries about located preachers. I know some



preachers that are located. I know some preachers that can be located by what they teach. I know where they stand on vital issues. There are some preachers that cannot be located on anything. Some of the speeches he made last night, especially the first one—I could not locate him on anything. Some preachers would have tried to deny the affirmative arguments I made last night.

“Where do the Scriptures authorize the church to pay wages?” Where—that’s the question he asked, and I’ll answer your question, sir. Paul robbed other churches, taking wages of them. Paul said he did it. I read it to him last night, In 2 Cor. 11:7, and through the ninth verse. “I robbed other churches taking wages of them, that I might minister unto you.” That’s the question. There is the answer. Paul said he took wages of them. He asked where do the Scriptures authorize the church to do it? Well, Paul did it. He was an apostle. If he wasn’t authorized to do it, he can talk to Paul about that. I don’t know why he did it. That is what he did. He said he did. You asked me the question, there’s your answer. He said the Roman Catholic church would not accept this innovation of paying—I believe he said a specific wage. If I misrepresent him on this I will stand corrected. Anyway, I am not concerned about the Roman Catholic Church, so far as this question is concerned. I’m not. My concern is about what the Bible teaches on this subject. Yes, my concern is about the Bible teaching in securing a preacher for a minister of a church.

He tells us no man ever took anything above his need. No widow or preacher or anyone ever took above his needs. Now think about this. Gospel preachers (many of them are not here tonight due to Wednesday evening services) do not have social security. Most preachers must own a car. When one car is worn out they have to buy another. The gospel preacher has expenses that other people do not have. Now what about men who are as able financially as brother Ketcherside, making statements of this kind? He thinks preachers should not have more than a bare living. That is what he said. Note again: “Paul never took wages.” Yes, he did. He said he did. Let us notice another: “Selling the gospel over the

pulpit like selling prunes over the counter." I am not a mercenary merchant of the gospel of Christ. Most preachers could make more money if they turned their efforts into the commercial world. They could make more money selling prunes, etc. My brethren are not mercenaries. That's simply another one of his assertions. Here is another. Colley is known as the minister, in the minister's directory of Dallas. Well, brother Ketcherside, I do not think that is so, either. Here is the directory of the churches of Christ in the city of Dallas, and Dallas county, printed May, 1953, Texas Printing Company. All of these churches, over sixty of them, colored churches, Mexican churches, etc., are listed with their addresses, and the men that preach for these churches are called "preachers." There is one exception, the Vickery Church of Christ which meets at 7003 Fair Oak Street in Dallas, Texas. When they listed this church my name was given. Yes, Flavil Colley, and they did not even call me a preacher. I think I am. Brother Ketcherside, you may have this if you want to see it. I want it back when you are through with it,

All right, I wanted to show you. I am not listed as a minister. I am not listed as a preacher. I'm left out, I sure do feel bad about it. And he said I was listed as the minister of one of the churches! That's the directory. They did not even call me a preacher. Now there may be some other list that I haven't seen. That's possible entirely. That just happened. You said it and I looked it over and that is it. You should not make assertions like that, Brother Ketcherside. All right, we're not mad at anybody. Now some more about Timothy and preachers who resigned to go into evangelistic work. A man is doing evangelistic work when he is doing the work of an evangelist. I showed you last night that his work was three-fold. He can be preaching where Christ has not been named. The evangelist can go to a church that does not have elders and set that church in order and appoint elders. Titus 1:5. The evangelist can go to a church that has elders and work with that congregation as Timothy did in Ephesus.

"What condition can arise that the elders cannot settle?" That is not hard to answer. Over in Ephesus there was a church that had elders. There were some conditions the elders could not settle. They call in Timothy, although Paul had been

there too. Yes, sir. Now Romans 1:15. I tried to get him to say something about Romans 1:15 last night all along. I didn't get him to do it, Now let's see about that. Romans 1:15. Paul said, "So much as in me is I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Now before I go into this, he said that preaching the gospel did not make any difference—whether you preached it or not, I want to show you what these brethren believe. I have the Wallace-Ketcherside Debate: on page 22 and about the fourth paragraph, "My friends," this is brother Ketcherside speaking, "My friends there is a great difference between preaching and teaching. Our brother has repeatedly spoken about preaching to the church. I want you to know that you cannot preach the gospel to the church. And here's a good place for us to settle this discussion. Let my good brother put his finger on the passage in the New Testament Scriptures where it indicates that anyone ever preached a gospel sermon to the church. Let him put his finger on the place. Let him bring just one such passage of Scripture, and we can close this debate tonight, if he will do it," On the opposite page which is page 23, now listen to what brother Leroy Garrett said: "The words for teach, exhort, etc., apply to those places where the church is built up. In other words, one preaches when he tells sinners about Christ, and he teaches when he edifies the church. There is no record of anyone preaching to the church in the New Testament," That's what brother Garrett said. Brother Ketcherside said it did make a difference whether we preach to the church or not, He said he would base his whole debate with brother Wallace on that, Will you be that good to me? Romans 1:15 says, "I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are in Rome." YOU that are in Rome. But he says, Now that doesn't mean that he was going to preach the gospel to the church. And he read MacKnight, All right, here's MacKnight, here's the book, and here's the place where he read. I need not read all of it. He did, and that was all right. I have nothing to hide. "This verse therefore, as well as the following is proof that the epistle of Romans was intended not for the Roman brethren alone. " It was not intended for the Roman brethren alone. That's right. What else? "But for unbelievers also to whom copies of it might be shown." He would have preached the gospel to the church,

but not to the church *only*. That's exactly what I said. That's what MacKnight says.

Brother Garrett and brother Ketcherside both said, "You can't preach the gospel to the church. Yes, they tell us the gospel is to be preached to the sinners. It is not to be preached to the church. Paul said he would preach the gospel to the church in Rome. Why? "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Doctor MacKnight is your witness. You gave him up. That's not the first time you have used Doctor MacKnight on that, Dr. MacKnight said it's not to the *church only*. That's right. But it's *to* the church.

When a man preaches, NOT TO THE CHURCH ONLY, well, is he preaching to the church at all? If a man supports his family, and not his family only, but supports an orphan too, does that mean he's not taking care of his family? It does not take a man with a lot of sense to see that. And it's going to take a lot of dodging to get away from it. He said, "I'll close the debate if you'll put your finger on a passage where they ever preached the gospel to the church." All right, there it is. There it is. But that's not all.

Brother Ketcherside, Romans 1:11 Paul said, "I long to see you that I might impart some spiritual gift to the end that you might be established." Now the same "you" that he longed to see and impart some spiritual gift, was the church. The same YOU, I long to see YOU. Was Paul going to give everybody in Rome a gift? No. "I long to see you, that I might impart some spiritual gift to the end that, you might be established." That was the church in Rome. And then he said, "I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are in Rome also." That's the same YOU. I do not have to go into any kind of grammatical construction to get you to see that it's to the church in Rome. "I long to see you that I might impart some spiritual gift," That's not to all of the Romans, all the people who lived in Rome, that's to the church. But Paul said, as far as the gospel is concerned, I'll preach the gospel to YOU.

Now we have about the best answer brother Ketcherside gave to anything said last night. I want to compliment him. Best answer! He said, well when the brethren debated with the instrumental music advocates on psallo, and baptizo, those w<sup>h</sup>o taught sprinkling for baptism, etc. We went to the Greek to combat it. All right, bring on your Greek. Go right ahead. If you want to do that I assure you it will be all right. Now we will try some of that on "wages." He has given us some statements about "wages." He said a preacher ought to have a bare existence, didn't he? He tried to get that meaning into the word "wages." Now, let us learn what the word "wages" means. Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary gives this: "Wages: Compensation, pay, to hire a person for services of any kind. Hire, salary, fee." That's what I mean. Now hear what Paul said, Romans 6:23, "For the wages of sin is death. But the gift of God is eternal life through Christ Jesus our Lord." The wages of sin—He tells us that is a little pay along, as you need it! Just before a preacher starves the brethren will give him something to eat. "The wages of sin is death." Let him deal with that. That comes from the same Greek word, too. I am not a Greek scholar, but let him see if that doesn't come from the same word.

The "Boles Home News" calls brother Oler, Gale Oler, Minister Oler. He said, I believe you had something to do with Boles Home. Yes, I did. I secured the land for the church. I baptized brother Boles. I conducted a double funeral for brother and sister Boles, when they died. I did everything I could to get the home started. It was through my efforts, and my father's efforts, that it was brought into existence. Later it was placed under a board, and I cannot defend it. I can't defend anything under a board, with men from several congregations, different congregations, composing the board. It's larger than a local congregation in government. I do not believe in it. It might be love's labor lost, but just the same, I have a principle that I've always stood for. When it violates New Testament teaching I can't go along with it, even if it is the fruit of my labors.

He talked about arrangements for trial sermons. I do not care much about that. I have never preached a trial sermon

that was very good. That's the reason some of the brethren, sometimes, call me without hearing me. I'm glad of it. I hope they continue, if I have to move. We note again, one man in the church doing it all. Now that isn't so. In a congregation there are many members that take part in the worship service. He said, One man does it all. We will be on that proposition tomorrow evening. He introduced Romans 12:1-4, and even read MacKnight on that. That's all right. I think MacKnight is pretty good on that, too. I am not on that subject tonight. He is to affirm on that tomorrow evening.

He said, Flavil Colley, the minister, it might as well be Flavil Colley, the priest. No, sir, my proposition says A MINISTER. All of God's people are priests. I do not know why he said that. He has admitted that preachers should be paid well. He has admitted they should be paid in keeping with their needs. That's right. I agree with that. Is it a question of method? I've known of my preaching brethren having sickness in their home and the brethren paid more than they had agreed to pay. Yes, they took care of the needs of the preacher. Is that what he means? My brethren believe in a business arrangement. In Romans 12:11, "Not slothful in business." It is a business proposition. The Lord said that. Not a haphazard way of doing things. Now if a preacher gets fifty dollars one Sunday, and one hundred five the next, or maybe one hundred fifty the next, and then twenty-five the next, there is not much business to that. No, sir. I want to know so I can pay my debts. I want to know when I can pay my bills. And that's what the church wants.

Once more: Back to Romans 1:15-17. Last night I showed you that Paul said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith." The righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel. Psalms 119:172. "All of thy commandments are righteous." Where revealed? In the gospel. Brother Ketcherside and brother Garrett say we can't preach the gospel to the church. But again, "Grace reigns through righteousness, unto eternal life through Christ

Jesus our Lord." Romans 5:21. Grace reigns through righteousness. Where is the righteousness revealed? In the gospel of Christ.

Brother Ketcherside said last night that Ephesus was not an organized church. We read some more from Doctor MacKnight, page 438, "Preface to First Timothy," "When the apostle touched at Miletus, in his voyage to Jerusalem with the collections, the church at Ephesus, had a number of elders, that is of bishops and deacons who came to him in Miletus. Acts 2:17. It is therefore asked what occasion was there in an epistle written after the apostle's release to give Timothy directions concerning the ordination of bishops and deacons in a church where there are so many elders already. The answer is, the elders who came to the apostle at Miletus in the year 58 may have been too few for the church at Ephesus in their increased state in the year 65. Besides, false teachers had then entered, to oppose whom, more bishops and deacons might be needed, than were necessary in the year 58. Not to mention that some of the first elders having died, others were wanted to supply their place." Don't tell me they didn't have elders there. He said the church was disorganized. He teaches that a preacher is over a congregation until elders are appointed. That might be years. He said last night the church in Ephesus was disorganized. All those that believe like he believes, have to do, is in their own judgment keep elders out until the preacher is ready. Of course they can disorganize the church. They can disorganize it. The church in Ephesus was not disorganized. Last night I read to you from the speech Paul made to the elders of Ephesus, in which he told the elders that "from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them." that's right. What did he say? Said it was disorganized. Paul did not mean that all the elders left. Here is an example.

In "Bible Talk," volume one, page two, number two, page 37, December, 1952, brother Leroy Garrett doing the writing about the church he worships with, "Brother Reeves says the new church is an utter disgrace to the Lord's cause in our fair city. Except for the newly baptized, its membership is composed of former members of churches like Sunset. Most of

the leading brethren of this new work were elders or deacons of other churches." Paul said the church in Ephesus had some elders that would speak perverse things and draw away disciples after them. He said that to the elders of the church in Ephesus. The leading men in this NEW CHURCH, and that's where THEY work and worship, the leading men of THIS new church, are men that were elders and deacons in OTHER CHURCHES. Sunset and these OTHER CHURCHES have elders now. Yes, regardless of these men, who spoke perverse things and drew, away disciples AFTER THEM. Ephesus had the same experience. Timothy was doing something about it with the gospel. That's what I am doing! Don't tell me the church in Ephesus did not have elders. It DID have elders. Don't tell me all of the elders went away.

In 1 Timothy 5:17 Paul said to Timothy regarding the elders in Ephesus, "Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear." What rest? The rest of them that didn't sin. Timothy was in Ephesus when Paul told him to do it, The rest of the elders were to fear when Timothy reprovved those that did sin. Don't say there were no elders there. Don't say the church was disorganized. It isn't so. (Time.) Thank You.



## KETCHERSIDE S THIRD NEGATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ, and friends:

It is indeed a happy privilege which we have of addressing those of you who are present with us tonight, upon this matter which is of such grave import to the church of the Living God. I count myself happy to have you present in this audience, and I trust that you will again tonight, constitute yourselves a jury to weigh the evidence produced by brother Colley and myself.

I want to commend brother Colley again for the courage which he has manifested in attempting to stand before you in defence of a practice which I believe to be borrowed from sectarianism, and which is sectarian in its very content. A great many of those who are associated with brother Colley in the practice he is attempting to defend have not the courage which he demonstrates. I want you to feel tonight that although brother Colley has consistently and continuously evaded the issue, and has not even attempted to discuss the proposition which he signed, that nevertheless, brother Colley is doing the very best that anyone can do upon this question. I am sure that if there was anyone else in Dallas who could do better, surely they would step forward as champions.

The weakness of brother Colley in the presentation of this matter is not due to a weakness of the man. It is due to the fact that there is no scripture for his position. If there were such scripture I am sure he would find it. Let us not forget that those of you who are endorsing the system that brother Colley seeks to defend, although you may have unwittingly become involved in it, are now wrapped up in a practice which fifty years ago was fought by every faithful preacher of the gospel of the Son of God. Those who were members of the Christian Church consistently heard you sound out against the pastor system. You have that pastor system now. You have the one-man pastor system in its hireling form. I say that with no degree of intensity of feeling or passion. I say it merely because I believe it to be the truth. I say it because I believe it is not an unfair accusation, but a clear statement of the facts.

Brother Colley signed a proposition for this discussion in which he agreed to affirm that the securing, that is the employing or securing, of a preacher to act as a minister for a church having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural. If there is anything which this brother has attempted to get away from, it is the practice of the churches in Dallas. He does not dare touch that phase of the issue.

He did not sign a proposition to affirm that the work as done by the apostle Paul at Ephesus, or by Timothy who was left there, was scriptural. A man would be foolish to deny that kind of proposition. But he affirmed that he was going to prove that this system which you now have, and which you regularly and consistently employ in Dallas, is scriptural. We have to notice what that system is, and I want you to see it.

I have here in my hand an advertisement from your newspaper, and it represents the various churches in this city engaged in announcing their various locations, and sending out in regular news fashion certain items or statements about the church. It is headed "The churches of Christ salute you." If I were to go down this entire list, here is the way it would read: Ann Arbor Church of Christ, Edwin H. Amyx, Minister; Arcadia Park Church of Christ, Jacob Lee Hines, Minister; Bailey Heights Church of Christ, Marvin Walker, Minister; Beckley Heights Church of Christ, Winston F. Atkinson, Minister; Beverly Hills Church of Christ, Glover II. Ship, Minister. Clear on down through to Irvingdale Church of Christ, Sammy E. Swim, Minister.

My brother has just said tonight that every Christian is a minister. I want to know, if that is true, why one man who is no more a minister than any other, has been elevated to such a position of prominence, and has been given the term "Minister" as a special title? Does not brother Colley recognize that it is just as sinfully wrong for one to put the term "Minister" after his name as a title, as to put the word "Reverend" before it? When one calls himself Reverend Flavil L. Colley, Minister, he takes in the first title a term which belongs exclusively to God and makes it inclusive of man. And when

he takes the term "Minister" and puts it after his name as a title, he takes what belongs inclusively to all of the brethren according to his own testimony, and makes it exclusively the property of one who is doing a specific kind of work. So, my friends, my brother stands indicted by his own term tonight.

I hold here a bulletin of the Sunset Church of Christ. I "want you to see what the practice is; that is I want you to see what is the practice in Dallas. That is the thing he has offered to defend. Here is the 1950-51 directory for the Sunset Church of Christ in Dallas. I hold it here before you, and while you cannot read it, I am sure my brother will not deny it. He is welcome to have it if he wishes it. Here we have the elders listed. Under the elders come the deacons, and then the minister. Now notice that brother Colley said that all of God's people are priests, and all of God's people are ministers. I want to ask just this one question. If all of God's people are ministers, and it is right to take the term "Minister" and give it to one man, why would it not be right to call one man the priest of the church and just put the word "Priest" there? Why would it not be right? Brethren, you have endorsed Catholicism in its incipency. If all of God's people are ministers, and you can take the term "Minister" and make it a title for one man, as it is here given to Homer Putnam Reeves, then why can you not just take the word "Priest" and put it up there by Homer Putnam Reeves, and call him "the priest of the congregation"? I am sure brother Colley can see that.

I want to go a little bit farther. I now hold the Skillman Avenue Church of Christ directory for April, 1953. In the front of this (just to show you that the term evangelist is used in identically the same sense as the term minister) I find a list of the elders, then a great long list of deacons, and then the evangelist, John H. Banister. But I turn to the back of this same directory and I find it is the practice of the church of Christ to call these evangelists the ministers of the churches, for here is Skillman Avenue, John Banister, Minister.

I want to ask a question and I want you to think through with me on this matter. The term evangelist is used here as

a designatory term for the word minister. That term is used in exactly the same sense as the word evangelist. Now all of God's people are not evangelists. But all of God's people are ministers. Yet these people take the title and ascribe it to brother Banister. I say with no disrespect for my brother Banister who was present last night, that he represents the Skillman Avenue Church, and they represent the common practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas. He comes from Skillman Avenue with its Roman Catholic cross on its spire, its Roman Catholic Christmas tree in its lobby, and its Roman Catholic clergy in his office. He knows that, and brother Colley knows it. That is the thing he is obligated to defend. Let him step up here like a man and defend the practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas. That is what he said he would defend. He cannot defend it, he cannot touch it. He is scared to death of it and all the other "Ministers" are. If you're not we'll give you an opportunity when this is over to step forward as one of the ministers of the churches of Christ in Dallas and take his place, if you think you can do better job than he has done. No, my brother cannot touch the issue, and you cannot touch it. The man does not live who can stand under the cold, incisive logic of it.

Now, my brother has several times referred to the fact that we are calling these men "Officers" and declares they do not use that term. Is that right? Here is the directory of the church of Christ in Cockrell Hill, for 1951. Here they are "OFFICERS: Elders, Deacons, Minister." So the minister is under the list of officers of the local church in Dallas. At that time the minister was T. E. Spears. My brother may say, "Oh, they have corrected that." No they have not, for here is the Cockrell Hill directory for 1953. "OFFICERS: Elders, Deacons, Evangelist." When I am not after these boys they use any kind of terminology they wish. It is only when I begin to get after them that, like a ground hog, they go in a hole and try to pull the hole in after them. Ah, yes, they listed him as an officer.

I want to ask my brother to tell us, when he stands before this audience tonight, if this, the common, general practice of the churches of Christ is scriptural? Is this thing scrip-

tural? That is the thing we are after. That is the common practice in Dallas. That is what he said he would affirm. Brother Colley, tell us if this is scriptural? Is it? Is this (the newspaper advertisement) scriptural? Is this (Sunset Church Directory) scriptural? Is this (Skillman Avenue Church Directory) scriptural? Is this (Cockrell Hill Church Directory) scriptural?

I am not through yet. I will give you some more of it. I want to establish what is the general practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas. Here is the Edgefield Church. In front of this bulletin we have: "Edgefield Church. Evangelist, Leonard Mullins." But now I pick up this letterhead upon which is: Church of Christ, Edgefield at Seventh Street, Dallas, Texas. There is only one name on this letterhead. Now there are elders listed in the bulletin, a whole group of elders listed in the front of it, and a large group of deacons. But whose name appears on the letterhead? Who is the man of prominence there? The hireling, the man who receives the money—Leonard Mullins, Minister, 2'462 Alcoa Avenue. If you looked at this letterhead you wouldn't even know they had elders. There is just one man's name who appears on it, yet my good brother says we are all ministers.

Then, since you are not to show partiality among brethren, why did you not put the whole list there? Why did you not put the name of everyone there who is a member of the church? If all are ministers, and you are going to put down the ministers, why did you not place the whole church roll there? That is what you are obligated to do, if all are ministers. Why do you show prominence to one? He wouldn't be there if he wasn't paid to be there. All the rest of the ministers who come because they love God do not get their names listed, but the one who comes because he gets paid to be there gets the prominence and his name is there. Thus the evangelist of the church at Edgefield is the minister, according to the letterhead. Like brother Banister, in front he is an evangelist, and in back he is a minister. Yes, catch them out in front and they are evangelists, but get them in the back and they are ministers.

Brethren, listen, this is not going to fool anyone. You

know that you have a hireling pastor system. You hire one man to come in and do the feeding, teaching, and "preaching to the church" and you call him the minister. He puts his name down as the minister. When you list the churches these men are listed as ministers. Of course, lately they have been calling themselves preachers and there is a good reason why they have been doing that. I happen to know a little bit about who is behind that reason.

Nevertheless, I'm going to tell you that just as long as this is the practice in Dallas, brother Colley is going to measure up to it, or get up and tell you good people tonight, "Brethren, I signed a proposition I cannot defend. The practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas is indefensible. I have no defense for it. My brethren call themselves the ministers of the churches. I cannot defend that. The general practice of the churches in Dallas cannot be sustained." Just get up and say that. Never mind about going through all that about preach and teach, just get up and tell these folks that the general practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas is unscriptural and you cannot defend it. You said you would defend that general practice. But he now declares that he did not say that. Yes, he did say it, and I am going to call your attention to his proposition again.

My brother reads his proposition about like he read Mac-Knight. And I am going to show you what that proposition says. It says, "as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas." As generally practiced. And that general practice obligates him to defend this system in Dallas. But he says that he is not obligated to defend all that his preaching brethren do. I am sure that is right, and I'm not asking him to do that, I am asking him to defend the system by which they become the ministers of the churches in Dallas. He said he would do that. I'm not asking him to defend one of these preachers if he goes out here and gets involved with a woman. I do not ask him to defend that, I do not ask him to defend some preacher who cannot behave himself around the sisters, if there are any such preachers. I do not know if there have ever been any such around Dallas, but if there ever should be one, he is not obligated to defend that kind of thing. Of

course not! If someone should steal from the church treasury, he is not called upon to defend that, but the thing he is obligated to defend is the system by which they become the ministers of the church and advertise themselves as such.

Let me make it clear to you tonight that the Bible teaches that every Christian is a minister of the church, and no Christian can be the minister of a church. When a man puts his name out in front of a church building and puts the word minister after it, he uses that term as a designatory title. He robs God's people of something that belongs to them—borrows it or steals it—and makes it his own exclusive property. Why the term ministry in the New Testament applies to everything a person does from sweeping the church floor on up to going out and ministering to the poor. Every bit of it. If you were to place the names of any out as official ministers, you'd have to put the deacons' names there, because that is exactly the word that is translated "minister." So if you want to place the names of the ministers in an official sense put up the names of your deacons. That is what you'll have to do. But if you want to put up the names of those who are servants of God, you'll have to publish your whole church record out there, or else you'll be showing partiality.

My brother says that their terminology is the language of Ashdod. Do you know what he has done? He has calmly and coolly admitted that his brethren here are using the language of Ashdod, and that is the general practice. Thus, according to his statement, his brethren are generally practicing the language of Ashdod with reference to ministry. I thank him for that confession. He is right about that, and we certainly could not disagree about it. But he is obligated to defend it, or get up and say it cannot be defended.

Then he gets on the subject of wages. Last night I read to you a considerable amount of testimony concerning the term "wages" and showed you that the word he referred to in 2 Corinthians 11:8 is from the Greek *opsonion*. I also showed you and I presume it is necessary that I just call to your attention again tonight that I did not say, and have never affirmed, that a man should not be supported. I believe in supporting preachers of the gospel. I believe in supporting

them, and supporting them well. I believe in supporting them in evangelistic work, certainly I believe in that.

But I said that he could not find anywhere in the New Testament where the elders of a congregation ever contracted with a man for a stipulated wage as is generally practiced in Dallas. That is what I said, and he goes back and says that the apostle took wages. The question is not whether Paul received for his necessities or not, but whether the apostle was under such a system as is generally practiced in Dallas. That is the question.

I read from Edwin Hatch, Vice Principal of St. Mary's College and Grinfield Lecturer in the Septuagint at Oxford, who wrote in his book "The Organization of the Early Christian Church" on page 52: "The funds of the primitive community consisted entirely of voluntary offerings. Of these offerings the office bearers whose circumstances required it were entitled to a share. They received such a share only on account of their poverty. They were so far in the position of widows and orphans and the helpless poor. Like soldiers in the Roman army or like slaves in a Roman household, they were entitled to a monthly allowance. The amount of that allowance was variable."

Then my good brother gets up and states: "Ketcherside says that the Roman Catholic Church did not allow wages." I didn't say that, but Edwin Hatch said this: "When the Montanists proposed to pay their clergy a fixed salary, the proposal was condemned as a heretical innovation, alien to Catholic doctrine." According to that, they are worse than the early Catholic Church. When the Catholic Church tried to introduce this thing it was opposed as a heretical innovation. What does this prove? It shows that universally in the church up to that time the practice of fixed salaries was unknown. Its introduction was opposed as a heresy, yet this brother says that Paul practiced it and was guilty of it.

Once more I read to you from R. C. II. Lenski, who in his book dealing with First and Second Corinthians, says: "Paul caused this truth to smart 'Other churches I robbed by taking support for my ministry unto you.' The Corinthians



deserved this mortification in order to drive out their gratitude. For what is meaner than to slander a benefactor for bestowing his benefaction gratis? Note that Paul said he robbed other churches. He took from them what he really should not have taken, namely *opsonion*, sustenance. Wages is too liable to be misunderstood as regular pay, which Paul never took from any church, 1 Cor. 9:15, 18. This was a fixed principle with him."

Now if ever a man on the face of this earth should have been in favor of a regular stipulated hire it would be R. C. H. Lenski, this Lutheran. But he was too much of a scholar, and too honest in his interpretation to try and twist God's Word around and change it to justify a practice which the Lutherans have. It is only brethren in the churches of Christ who will do that. Even a Lutheran wouldn't do it. They have the practice, but Lenski would not try to twist God's Book to justify that practice in the Lutheran church. But this good brother will step forward and do it, and you heard him twist Paul's statement tonight.

But our brother goes even further than that. He even ridiculed the idea that as he phrased it "Brother Ketcherside says that this money can only be given in order to save people who are destitute, and just before they are starving. Just before they pass out of existence give them the money." All right, I shall take his word "wages" and show what this wages constituted. Listen to 2 Corinthians 11:8,9: "I robbed other churches taking *opsonion* of them to do you service. And when I was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to no man, for that which was lacking to me (here is your wages, that which he received) the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied. And in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome to you, and so will I keep myself."

Do you know what the word "lacking" means? That which was lacking was supplied, so that is what Paul received as wages. Do you know what the word means? That is the Greek *husterema* which means "poverty, want, destitution." And yet you use that as a regularly stipulated hire, justifying a man living in a minister's home furnished him by the church,

with a guaranteed salary. If you are going to provide a home for one minister, and you say we are all ministers, why not build a housing project and provide for every member of the church? What right does one minister have to a home provided by the church and the rest of the ministers have none? The most ridiculous thing of all is that he admits that the poor widows in the congregation are ministers, yet instead of providing homes for the poor widows who are ministers, the poor widows have to give their money to provide homes for the preachers, the professionals. That is the absurdity of it. The poor widows are ministers of God but they cannot have a minister's home. They tighten the financial screws on them and demand money from them in order to take care of "the Minister." Ah, brother Colley, do not try to cram that doctrine down the theological throats of these brethren. You will not get away with it.

Again he said that I declared that no widow or gospel preacher ever took anything above their needs. I did not say anything of the sort, Here is what I did say. I asked him to put his finger on a Scripture where any money was ever taken from the church treasury except to relieve needs. And he hasn't answered on that yet, and he will not do so, either, because there is no such example in the Scripture.

Then my brother goes a little further and says that I challenged him last night to produce a case the elders could not settle. And he says there was a case at Ephesus, and they couldn't settle that. I didn't say that at all. Here is what I did say. "I want my brother to name a single case that *faithful* elders could not settle." Now the elders could not *settle* the condition at Ephesus. Do you know why? Simply because, as he said, they were not faithful. He said that Timothy was over there to rebuke these elders who had gone wrong, and he actually cited Acts 20:30 where Paul said that some of the elders would go astray. That is what Timothy was over there doing. If those elders had been faithful they could have handled the situation according to Titus 1. It was their duty to stop the mouths of those who were perverters of the truth. But the elders were not faithful, so they had to have their mouths stopped. I said *faithful* elders. According to brother Colley, the elders where he now labors must not

be faithful. If they were they could take care of the situation, but since they cannot, they have to have brother Colley handle it for them, as Timothy was over at Ephesus.

Now I want to notice Romans 1:15. Our brother last night was extremely anxious that I should read from MacKnight, and he thought he had something. Now, brother Colley, I am sure you would not deliberately and wilfully misrepresent MacKnight, nor try to mislead these people who do not have a copy of MacKnight before them, as you have. I do not believe, brother Colley, that you would wilfully and maliciously misrepresent what MacKnight said, or what he intended. Surely you would not do that. But I do want you to know that you did not read what MacKnight said in the sense in which MacKnight said it, at all. You didn't do that!

Here is what brother Colley said, and I think I should like to have you pay careful attention to this point, since he was the one who introduced MacKnight, made a great deal over MacKnight, and had a lot to say about him. I want you to get the fact that the position of brother Colley is that when the apostle Paul said that he was ready to preach the gospel to you that are in Rome, he meant that he was ready to preach the gospel to the church there. He then took the position that MacKnight said that Paul was going to preach the gospel *to the brethren* as well as to Jews and Gentiles and unbelievers.

But MacKnight did not say that. Here is what MacKnight said and I ask you to listen while I read the very statement that brother Colley read: "In regard to Paul, after acknowledging that he was bound to preach the gospel both to the Greeks and barbarians, adds, I am 'ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome,' the idolatrous inhabitants of Rome certainly were excluded in the expression you who are in Rome.' This verse, therefore, as well as the following, is a proof that the epistle to the Romans was intended, not for the brethren alone, but for unbelievers also."

It was the epistle which was intended not for brethren alone, but for unbelievers also. See, there is a difference. Paul did not say the gospel was to be preached to the brethren.

MacKnight did not say it! I want to ask my brother this question. Was the epistle to the Romans a part of *the gospel*? Was it? If it was, then why did Paul say *he wanted to come and preach* it unto them? He was already writing the book to them. My brother says when he gets up and teaches the book of Romans, he is preaching the gospel. Then why did Paul want to go and preach the gospel to the Romans, when he was writing them the epistle to the Romans, if that is a part of the gospel? Was the epistle to the Romans a part of the gospel? My friends, this brother cannot show that the Roman letter was a part of the gospel. Ah, no!

I want to proceed a bit farther on this. He has clearly misunderstood and misinterpreted MacKnight. He said last night that he had not read Alexander Campbell. It is obvious that neither has he read James MacKnight, George Campbell and Philip Doddridge. I happen to have read everything that these men have written upon the matter of the distinction between preaching and teaching, which has been obtainable. I doubt that there have ever been greater exponents of the difference than George Campbell and Philip Doddridge. Now MacKnight was a contemporary and collaborator with these men. They clearly understood the difference between preaching, which was the work of a herald, *a kerux*, and that of teaching, which was the work of an instructor, *a didaskalos*. They not only clearly understood it, but MacKnight wrote copiously on the subject, and George Campbell gave one of the greatest dissertations on it ever to proceed from the pen of an uninspired man. Yet this brother gets up tonight and tried to make it appear that MacKnight believed and advocated the idea that the gospel was to be preached to the church. MacKnight opposed that thought all of his life.

Here is what MacKnight said under the heading "The Occasion of the Writing of the Epistle to the Romans." He will find it in the front of his book there. "From the pains which the apostle took in this letter to prove that no Gentile can be justified by the law of nature, nor Jew by the law of Moses, and from his explaining of all the divine dispensations respecting religion, as well as by what he says in chapter 1:7, 13, 14, 15, it is reasonable to think that it (the Roman letter) was designed for the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles of Rome

as well as for the brethren." The letter was designed for both, but the letter to the Romans was not the gospel. It was not the gospel. Paul was wanting to go over and preach the gospel to them, but he was writing them the Roman letter and telling them of that at this very time.

I would just like to ask my brother, while he is dealing with that one, to take up another one. He was so anxious to go over to the Galatian letter. I want to ask him if the Galatian letter was a part of the gospel. You watch him, just watch. You have another speech tonight, brother Colley, and you have wanted me to go over to Galatians, chapter 1, so you could tell these good brethren, if the Galatian epistle is a part of the gospel. Just tell them that, and be sure and tell them if the epistle to the Romans and the epistle to the Galatians, are a part of the gospel. Mind you, brother Colley, you take the position that when you teach the Roman letter and the Galatian letter you are preaching the gospel, so I want you to tell these brethren if these two epistles are a part of the gospel. And the rest of you watch what happens when he docs.

I think that will take care of the situation. You can see now that he did not correctly represent MacKnight on this matter. My brother says that he never did preach a trial sermon that was worth anything. According to that, he has preached them, and that is his practice and the general practice. Will he defend it? That is all I ask him to do. He says he preaches trial sermons and he admits that it is the general practice. Will he endorse that as a Scriptural procedure? That is all he has to do. Never mind whether he ever preached one that was worth anything or not. I do not know what kind he preaches, but is that system right? Is it right to preach trial sermons for a job, like it is generally practiced in Dallas by job-hunters? He says that may be the reason why he never got called to a lot of places. He tells us that a great many places have called him that never heard him before, and he hopes they will continue to do that. That is all right, but the general practice is to preach trial sermons. I want to ask him if he will defend the general practice? He engages in it, and while he says he does not do very well at

it, will he defend it? If he could preach better trial sermons, would he defend it then?

Again my good brother has a lot to say tonight about the number of elders over at Ephesus. I would like to ask him this question. Can a church be disorganized that has elders? Suppose you have six elders, and half of them, that is three, begin to teach a false doctrine, and they will not listen to the other three. Would you say it was organized, or disorganized, while those elders teach that false doctrine? I want to know if a church can be disorganized which has elders teaching things that are not right, He said these elders were doing that at Ephesus. Now just tell us if you can have a faithful church and a faithful organization with the elders teaching false doctrine and heresy. I want you to do that.

Friends, my brother has made a very grave charge tonight and I want to take the opportunity of denying it and I want to be very clear in it, and I want you to understand just what I am saying now, so there will be no mistake about it. This brother says that I believe and teach and advocate that preachers should be over elders. I deny that with every moral fiber of my being. I have never believed it, and have never taught it. I deny it. I have never held to it. I teach that elders are over preachers and I am sent out by a group of elders, and am amenable and subject to their discipline. One of them is in the audience tonight and if I were to teach what he believes is not true, I would be called before those elders and the whole congregation. You see, we do not have any rats under the corncrib, or any cats in the sack, where I come from. We let the whole church hear matters affecting its welfare, and I would be called before those brethren, and exposed by those elders, just as I ought to be. I believe that preachers are under elders, should be sent out by them, and labor under them. I believe that with all of my heart. I thank God for the faithful elders who are my overseers, and under whose discipline I am happy to serve.

Now we can boil this whole thing down. The general practice in Dallas is to hire one man to be the minister of a congregation. That man is designated by the term "Minister" and that term is used as a title. It has shown up in all of their

advertising, it is in front of their church buildings, it appears in the newspapers, it is found in their own publications such as directories. Now, my friends, the minister is there placed as an officer. In the Cockrell Hill Church, in both of their directories, I read to you where the officers were listed as elders, deacons, and minister. The minister was one of the officers. That is the common practice. They may not all be as frank as Cockrell Hill. Some of them might keep it hidden, some might try to go behind the woodshed with the practice, but that is just what they practice.

Cockrell Hill is just a little more open about it. I want to congratulate them. They have the practice and they are honest about it and are not trying to deny it. Some of the rest of them have tried to deny it, but Cockrell Hill just comes plain out and says they are officers. Now, when the apostle Paul wrote to the church at Philippi, he addressed his epistle to the saints with the bishops and deacons. Where did the apostle ever address a letter to the local minister of the congregation? Where did he ever do it? If he wrote to the congregation at Edgefield, he would have to write to brother Leonard Mullins, because that is the only address he would have. His is the only name which appears there and he is the minister of the congregation. It is a frightful thing, this taking of one man and elevating him above his brethren.

But I would have you listen to what I now say. I hold before you tonight, beloved friends, the constitution of heaven's church—the word of God. It was given by the divine power of the Almighty through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and conveyed to us by chosen and prepared ambassadors. This word is intended to govern and guide the church until our Lord returns. This is the constitution of the church of our Lord. It is an axiomatic truth with reference to all constitutional law, that any interpretation of law which is so liberal as to beget new law, or new offices not mentioned in the law, is subversive of all law. If such a procedure is allowed to go unchecked it will eventually produce decadence and the everlasting destruction of the institution which proposes to be governed by the law

Brother Colley, if you were to take the Constitution of the

United States, and interpret it so liberally as to create new laws, or create new offices and officers, not mentioned in the law, you would be sowing the seeds of dissolution for that Constitution. Yet that is exactly what you are doing with the word of God. You have taken heaven's truth, the constitution of the church of the Living God sent down from heaven, and have interpreted its teaching with reference to ministry, its teaching with reference to wages, so liberally and modernistically, that you have actually created another office that is not even mentioned in the Constitution of heaven—that of the local minister of the congregation.

I am sure you did not know when you signed this proposition, the grave import of this question. I do not believe you felt that what you were doing was derogatory to New Testament law, and to its constitutional government. I do not charge that you would deliberately trample upon the law of God any more that you would upon the Constitution of the United States of America. But I say to you that the interpretation of yourself and your brethren is destined to destroy the church in generations to come, upon exactly the same basis as the great Chief Justice Marshal warned that the United States could be destroyed.

Brethren, unless there rise up among us men who have the courage to face this issue and call for a complete return to New Testament practice; unless there can be established again among us the mutual ministry of all the saints and a recognition of the fact that no man can be hired as a substitute to do the work which God has given to all in the church to do; I say unto you, that unless men arise who have the courage to halt this thing and stop it now, the church is destined to go down the dark road which leads to another apostasy. The very same seed that you are planting in the hearts of these brethren, brother Colley, is the seed which in its incipency begat the archbishop, eventually the patriarch, and culminated in the pope as universal father. You are creating in a limited sense, in a congregational phase, the same autocracy which eventually resulted in the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Brethren, in the name of Almighty God, for the love of Jesus Christ our Saviour, let us turn back before it is too late.



Brother Colley, go before these people and tell them tonight that you cannot defend the practice of the churches in Dallas. Tell them that these churches are wrong in this matter. Let us all resign and go forth to do the work of evangelists, and stop this quibbling and quarrelling. Let those who resign, remain out to do the work of evangelists, and not return to constitute themselves as ministerial clerics in the church, as officers as practiced at Cockrell Hill and other congregations. Thank you.

## COLLEY'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen:

I assure you that I have heard brother Ketcherside in all of his speeches, but I have never seen so much fumbling around in papers and things of no consequence in trying to answer my arguments. I was under the impression that brother Ketcherside was a man that would answer arguments. I've never bemeaned anybody knowingly. I don't want to do that tonight. However, I do not like to be misrepresented. Now watch this, he repeatedly said, brother Colley would defend the practice of the churches in Dallas. Now that's misrepresentation number one. Once more let us read the proposition, "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders as generally practiced"—What is "generally practiced?" Securing the preacher. All you need to do, to understand the proposition is to read it. I do not have to explain what it means. Just read the proposition. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is Scriptural." He thinks I must defend the practice of the preachers after they are "secured." The only thing I have to affirm, and I have, and established it, is that the churches in Dallas have the scriptural right to secure a preacher as a minister! He continues to say I signed the proposition, "The general practice of all the preachers in the churches." Now that is misrepresentation number one. I'm ashamed of you, brother Ketcherside. You know better than that. You should know that you could not get by with that. You can't do it. That's not the only misrepresentation either.

His Cause calls for better than that. If you are here in Dallas trying to establish that Carl Ketcherside is a great man, I mean brother Carl Ketcherside—The way for you to do that is not by misrepresentation. You must not do that. Even if you are my brother and in error, you must be honest about this and not misrepresent me. I have not agreed to defend the practice of the churches of Christ, or the preachers of the churches of Christ in Dallas. That is not my proposition. I will let any honest man in this audience read this proposition and then tell us if I am obligated to defend the

general practice of the preachers in Dallas. What does the proposition say? It is the securing, it is hiring, a preacher to work with a local congregation that I believe to be scriptural.

Brother Ketcherside brought in all of that "junk" under this, "Brother Colley, you are defending the general practice of the churches in Dallas." Not a word of truth in it! I am defending the RIGHT to hire a preacher. That's the proposition. That's what I am doing.

Misrepresentation number two: Colley misrepresented MacKnight. If I did, it is because I can't read. Here is MacKnight. He read from his notes, here is the book. This is Doctor MacKnight's Apostolical Epistles. Now to Romans 1:15 where Paul said, I will "preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." You know how he answered that? That is my argument. That is from the Bible. That is the passage on which I based my argument regarding preaching to the church. You know how he answered it? He went to MacKnight. I said all right, MacKnight doesn't agree with him either. Then he said I misrepresented MacKnight. I did not misrepresent Paul, nor MacKnight.

Here is MacKnight on Romans 1:15, "In regard that Paul, after acknowledging he was bound to preach the gospel, both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, I am ready, adds, I am ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome. The idolatrous inhabitants of Rome certainly were included in the expression. You who are in Rome. This verse therefore, as well as the following is proof that the epistle to the Romans was intended not for the Roman brethren alone, but for unbelievers also to whom copies of it might be shown." NOT TO THE ROMAN BRETHREN ALONE. I gave the illustration that if you are supporting your family, and an orphan too, it is not your family ONLY, but you are supporting your family. Paul said he would preach the gospel to the church at Rome. Brother Ketcherside said I misrepresented him. That is a sly way of calling your attention from the argument. Yes, said I misrepresented him. I did no such thing. I do not have another speech tonight. We will have the same propositions tomorrow evening. He will be affirming. I will be after him just the same way. My friends, dodg-

ing, yes, artful dodging, is not debating. No, it isn't. Facts are stubborn tilings. This is a fact, MacKnight said the gospel was not intended for the brethren ONLY. I read it and I marked it so he will not have any trouble finding it. Why doesn't he borrow my book? He should have read it correctly in his last speech. I believe he should apologize for such statements.

All right, he said Colley is to be commended for his courage, because he will defend what he believes. Brother Ketcherside, I hope my brethren call me many times to meet you in debate. I enjoy it. The only thing I have to do in debate with him, and I have learned it, is to keep the brethren from being misled by his dodging and sophistry. That is all. We note some more: Colley now has the pastor system of hirelings. That is not true. We do not have the pastor system—that is an assertion. Oh, yes, brother Ketcherside, the man from Missouri continues to say that Colley signed propositions, and HE reads INTO the proposition many things that are not in them. Once more I am not defending the system of the Dallas churches of Christ. No, sir; that is not the proposition. If I had signed such a proposition I would try to defend it. I didn't sign anything like that. When we were talking about these propositions I changed the wording of his propositions to read "A MINISTER" in place of "THE MINISTER." That's scriptural, too. Brother Ketcherside thinks MINISTER is a title. He does not know the difference between a title and a work. Here it is: Second Timothy, chapter four, "Do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." That is the reason my brethren use the term evangelist, and then sometimes, they use the term minister. They are not saying they are the minister; their work is evangelistic. He knows that.

He said the Sunset church called their preacher the minister, and that they might as well call him the priest. I have made this distinction before. When you say a priest you are talking about a Christian. If I sign a proposition to debate with a Baptist and place the word Christian after my name, such as Flavil L. Colley, Christian, brother Ketcherside understands what I mean. I do not mean I am the only Chris-

tian. A minister with other ministers in the church. A Christian with other Christians in the church. Minister is a work and not a title. It is the work of the evangelist making full proof of his ministry.

Brother Ketcherside called Leonard Mullins a hireling. My father baptized brother Mullins. Brother Mullins does more constructive work than all the men I have seen trying to uphold brother Ketcherside's hands. The whole church is made of ministers. Can one be a Christian and not THE Christian. Brother Ketcherside has all male members evangelists. He should place the names of all the male members on the outside of the church buildings!

He says deacons are ministers. No disagreement there. Here is another attempt to get on mutual edification. He has tried this in nearly every speech. We will get to this in due time. He will not do any better when he affirms than he is now. He will have time to get all he wants of that subject. He need not be in such a rush to get there. I am not going to give you any more comfort when you get there than I have on this proposition. I have some more surprises for you. I will do a better job of following you than you are doing while I am in the affirmative. You have not touched my affirmative arguments.

Oh, now we have some Creek on wages. Every man in this audience that works for wages knows what they are. He knows that he must have them. He knows that if he does not get them he is going to do something about it. If he does not get his wages his wife will do something about it, too. I do not have to squirm around and say, Now brother Colley misrepresented me. Prove it! Do not get up here and cry any more like you did in your last speech. That is not debating, brother Ketcherside. I am ashamed of you. Again we have minister's home—I tried to show you, that was part of his wages. A preacher might not live in that home long. They have to move, you know. If a church furnishes the house for the preacher, that is part of his wages.

That is right, brother Garrett, help him out. Either one of you or both of you cannot fix it up. You do not agree,

anyway. I will show you. But first of all we are not debating the college question.\* I told him I did not want to debate the school question. But hear brother Ketcherside in his debate with brother Wallace, page 193, Wallace-Ketcherside Debate: "I want to tell you that at the time that Freed-Hardeman College was being given to the church of Christ, it is an absolute fact that the man who was president of the school, made appeals to the churches, not only did so but got notes signed by the elders of the churches for thousands of dollars to support the school. They never gave a cent of that money back so far as we know." I don't know either, but here is some more. "Now if it is robbery to take the money out of the church treasury, what is it to keep it when you learn better? Suppose that a man goes up to your grocery store and takes twenty-five dollars out of the till, and then later repents, but keeps the twenty-five dollars. What are you going to do about him then? What will you do with him then?" Brother Ketcherside said the schools took money from the churches. They learned better. He said they were robbers! He said they were **ROBBERS**. Now, brother Leroy Garrett preached for the Cockrell Hill Church of Christ, here in Dallas. They paid him \$100.00 per week for six weeks. Yes, he was paid \$600.00 He learned better than to preach for a church that had elders. He learned **BETTER**. Is he a robber? The schools were robbers because they learned better and kept the money. Leroy (pointing to brother Garrett) you owe that church \$600.00. Pay the church the money. (Laughter). Now you brethren can talk about this and straighten this matter up when brother Ketcherside comes back to the platform.

Now back to the affirmative. I told you at the beginning: First of all the gospel was preached in Rome. Romans 1:15-17. Brother Ketcherside asked me if the gospel was preached to the churches in Rome and Galatia. Yes, sir, and I dare him to say it wasn't. Let him get up and tell us that Paul was not preaching the gospel when he was writing those letters. Let him tell us that those letters were not the gospel. Just let him say that. My answer is **YES**, they are the gospel. Everything that inspired men said about Jesus Christ was the gospel. Everything.

Once more, Romans 1:15-17: "So as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome. For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed the righteousness of God from faith to faith: as it is written. But the righteous shall live by faith." The gospel of Christ—What is it? It contains the righteousness of God. He hasn't answered that. Of course in his last speech he might do it, but I'll be after him tomorrow evening. I dare him to say anything about it. He has not said anything about this argument the whole time. The gospel reveals the righteousness of God. "All of God's commandments are righteous." Where are they? In the gospel of Christ. What for? "Even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life." Now notice grace reigns through righteousness. Brother Ketcherside limits the grace of God. Brother Garrett and brother Ketcherside teach that the gospel can't be preached to the church. Christians cannot receive the gospel of Christ. Paul said the righteousness of God is IN the gospel of Christ. He cannot preach it to the church. He cannot preach it to Christians. He thinks the gospel must be preached to the sinner only. But the righteousness of God, those acts that a Christian MUST do are recorded in the gospel. Again: The gospel reveals "righteousness of God." Grace reigns through righteousness. Righteousness and grace must come from the gospel. Once more, Paul said, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Timothy, how do you instruct people in righteousness? Paul said it is in the gospel of Christ. He asked me if the Roman letter was part of the gospel? The Roman letter discusses righteousness more than any other book. Yes, sir. It is the gospel of Christ, YES, SIR. The righteousness of God is discussed more, and the word righteousness is used more in the Roman letter than any other book. Don't think I won't answer his questions. He thinks I did a dishonorable thing in saying the Roman letter was part of the gospel!

That's not all. We find that brother Ketcherside and those that stand with him, limit the righteousness of God.

They limit the grace of God. Why? "Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Christian is IN CHRIST. How long does grace reign? It reigns as long as the righteousness of God is preached to the Christian. It is REVEALED in the GOSPEL. Brother Ketcherside thinks the gospel reveals the righteousness of God, but he wants to tell us it is for sinners ONLY. Just for sinners only How long does "Grace reign through righteousness"? How long? "Unto eternal life." Every thing that was ever said about Jesus Christ in the New Testament, is the gospel of Christ. Yes, sir. I'll take that position—I'll stand by it. And it's so. Acts 20:24, "But I hold not my life of any account as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." The gospel of the grace of God. Grace reigns through righteousness. It comes from the gospel of Christ.

In Galatians 1:6-9, "I marvel that you are so quickly removed from him that called you in the grace of Christ." Notice GRACE AND GOSPEL. "Unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (accursed). As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any other gospel than that which ye received, let him be anathema." Brother Ketcherside would remove you from the grace of Christ, unto a perverted gospel. He teaches that the gospel is to the sinner and not to the saints.

My friends, in all of his speeches, he has dodged around and talked about rats under barns and nearly everything else but the proposition. About all he needs is a jazz band to keep the cadence of his words. He expects you to believe what he teaches. As a speaker and a dodger he is the best in the land. But as a respondent to an argument from God's eternal truth he is the sorriest. I have engaged the denominations in debates. Most of them would say SOMETHING about the proof text offered for their consideration. He doesn't. He talks about



denominationalism, and sectarianism, but not about the scriptures I gave for his consideration. He compliments me for my courage to meet him in debate. It's a pleasure. It's not courage, it's a pleasure. I will consider it a pleasure to meet brother Ketcherside or any of his brethren that feel equal to the occasion. I have no desire to engage the boys in a debate—but their representative men will find me ready.

Again, I call your attention to the apostle Peter's statement, in second Peter 1:3, "Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that called us by his own glory and virtue." The gospel of Christ is God's power to save. It is the power of God unto salvation. You can't find where anything else ever was. What does it do? It grants all things that pertain to LIFE and GODLINESS. Number one, the gospel is to be used to teach the heathen, just as Romans 1:15 teaches. Yes, that is what MacKnight said. That is what Paul said. The gospel brings LIFE when the heathen obeys it, But that's not all. "Godliness"—That's the Christian life. Both of these are taught in the passage. The divine power "grants unto us all things that pertain to LIFE and GODLINESS," that is the gospel of Christ. Peter puts them together again, here it is: 1 Peter 1:22-25, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: Being born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Two things recorded in this: Born again. What is the other one? "See that you love one another fervently." What teaches that? THE DIVINE POWER. What is the divine power? THE GOSPEL. Yes, the gospel of Jesus Christ. He teaches that the gospel is to the sinner only. Note: It makes a Christian out of the sinner. Then his DIVINE POWER grants all things that pertain to LIFE and GODLINESS.

Now what else? "See that you love one another with a pure heart fervently." Who are Christians taught to love?

Those who are Christians. Other Christians. What does this? Peter said, "This is the word which BY THE GOSPEL is PREACHED unto you." That's it!

Last night he asked for examples of hiring a preacher. I gave him some. Tonight he did not say anything about it. He didn't even thank me. Now here is misrepresentation number three: He said Colley tried to teach you that their preachers were over elders. I did no such thing. I said THEIR preachers are over churches without elders. He has affirmed it, and if I've misrepresented him, I'll apologize.

Now to the church in Ephesus. He thinks because I taught that some of the elders sinned, yes, some were teaching false doctrine, therefore the whole business was gone. I didn't say any such thing. I read what Paul said to the elders, and this was some five or six years before he wrote to Timothy, yes before he left Timothy in Ephesus. Hear him: "Take heed unto yourselves and all the flock in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them." (Acts 20:28,29). Now watch. The elders were to guard against grievous wolves. SOME of the elders were to draw away disciples too. Paul did not say ALL of them. No, sir. Now let us read some more about this church. Timothy was left in Ephesus. There were elders in the church. He left him at Ephesus to charge certain men, and to teach the church generally. Paul told Timothy, "And if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine; according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God." Now he said in the letter to Timothy, 1 Timothy 5:17, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and in teaching. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And the laborer is worthy of his hire. Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear." Note some of these elders were

ruling well. Some might fear when others were reprov'd. THE REST of whom? The elders. Did he think that was the rest of the church? There were some elders that were not led away. They did not lead the disciples away. In churches today one or two elders can lead some disciples away, but that does not mean that the whole church is disorganized. Many times it takes a gospel preacher to teach and encourage the elders. Paul said to Timothy, here's what I want you to do. Timothy, tarry in Ephesus—Do you remember the three-fold duties of the evangelist? First, they were to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named. Second, they were to go to churches that did not have elders and set in order those churches and appoint elders. "For this cause left I three in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." (Titus 1:5). Third: Timothy was left in Ephesus (I Tim. 1:3) where there were elders. Timothy was to teach young men how to live, he was to teach old men how to live; he was to teach old women how to conduct themselves; and young women how to conduct themselves. Paul gave him instructions he was to give to those in Ephesus. The second letter (2 Timothy) was written to Timothy while he was in Ephesus. I like to think of the gospel preacher in this respect, not as a mercenary hireling, nor pastor, but as Paul described him." I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:1-8). That is Paul's charge to Timothy. That 's Paul unto Timothy who is preach-

ing to a church. "I am ready to be offered, the time of my departure is at hand," Timothy. I am ready, for I am looking to the reward in God's after-while. My friends I want to say to you — (Time). — Thank you very much.

## KETCHERSIDE'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ, and friends:

I think our brother has labored under the misapprehension that it is thunder which kills, but unfortunately he is also wrong about that too, for it is the lightning that kills. We should have a little more light and less noise. An empty wagon sometimes rattles the loudest, and I am confident that if our brother had anything on his proposition he would have produced it. He hasn't done that so far, he has merely hit all around it. But he says he is getting a lot of pleasure out of this. My Book teaches me that I should please my brethren unto their good to edification, so I am going to give him a little more pleasure. There is nothing I like better than to please my brethren.

First of all, let us look again at the proposition. "The securing of a preacher in a church having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is scriptural." That is the thing he signed, and incidentally, when we went out to sign the proposition, brother Colley told us that he had written up a proposition in which he had placed the expression "the minister." I told him that I would not ask him to sign that, and it would be perfectly all right if he used the term "a minister." But I asked him that we might have the matter clearly before us if he would defend the work he did at Pearl and Bryan Streets. He said that he would do it, that he would defend the work he did with that congregation. Now that is the thing he is defending—THE KIND OF WORK that he did at Pearl and Bryan. He said he would do it.

Now it does not make a particle of difference to me whether my brother endorses the practices of the churches, or their practice of hiring a minister. I haven't called upon him to defend everything these churches do in Dallas. I have not expected him to do that. His proposition does not call upon him to do that. But it does call upon him to defend the practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas in the securing of a preacher to act as minister. He is obligated to do that "as generally practiced in Dallas."

That is what he signed and he cannot get away from the fact. All of his quibbling about it is not going to cause us to forget for one moment just what he said he would do. If I say anything tonight which misrepresents my brother I want him to be able to reply tomorrow night without any censure from me for that, and without any misrepresentation upon his part in the future concerning it. After all, we are in this discussion to learn the truth, and if I set forth anything that is incorrect I want my brother to bring out everything he has on the matter. I want to hear it and I want the audience to here it. I want all of us to be able to weigh all of the testimony that is given. So if there should be something which necessitates a reply tomorrow night, let our brother feel perfectly free to bring forth everything.

But I must again take up the question of what MacKnight has said. First of all, let me rehearse for you a brief bit of background. Our brother went to the Roman letter, chapter 1:13-15, and found this statement: "Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was hindered hitherto) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles. I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also."

My brother says this indicates that the apostle Paul was going to preach the gospel to the church, and he said, "I want brother Ketcherside to come up to this matter. I want him to meet it. Let him read from someone. Let him read from anything. Let him read from MacKnight." So I read from MacKnight, and now I labor under the accusation that I imposed upon your good sense and upon your sound judgment, by reading from MacKnight that which was not there. Now listen! My brother said the apostle Paul was going to preach the gospel to the church, and he said that MacKnight taught that. But MacKnight never taught that in his life. That is exactly opposite to what MacKnight taught. He taught that the gospel was preached to unbelievers.

To prove that to you, here is MacKnight's own translation of Romans 1:14,15 on the same page with the statement

to which he alludes: "Being the apostle to the Gentiles, I am bound to preach to the Greeks, however intelligent, and to the barbarians; both to the philosophers and to the common people. Therefore, notwithstanding your great proficiency in the sciences, I am willing according to my ability, to preach the gospel EVEN TO YOU UNBELIEVING GENTILES who are in Rome." That is what he said. "Even to you unbelieving Gentiles who are in Rome.

Now MacKnight did say that it was expected that when this letter to the Romans was sent, that THE LETTER WOULD BE READ not only by those in the church, but by those who were outside. The gospel was to be preached when Paul got there. The Roman letter was to be sent before he got there. The Roman letter was read, and I want you to get this, MacKnight says the Roman letter was to be read not only by those who were members of the church but by those who were not members of the church. But MacKnight says the gospel was preached to the unbelieving Gentiles. That shows that MacKnight knew there was a difference between the gospel and the Roman letter.

Now, I am going to read you again exactly what MacKnight said. He did not say Paul was going to preach the gospel to the church and to the Gentiles. Here is what he said: "This verse therefore, as well as the following, is a proof that THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS was intended not for the Roman brethren alone, but for unbelievers unto whom copies of it might be shown." In his free translation, MacKnight said the gospel was to be preached to the unbelieving Gentiles. But the Roman letter was to be read both by those who were members of the church and those who were not, That shows that MacKnight knew there was a difference between the Roman letter and the gospel.

But my brother says that the Roman letter is the gospel. Then I would like to ask a question. If the Roman letter is the gospel, how does it happen that in Romans 10:16, Paul condemns them because they had not all obeyed the gospel. How could they have obeyed the gospel? He hadn't written it yet for the Roman letter was a part of it, you say. And in this very letter in which he wrote that he declared that

they had not all obeyed the gospel. Why there had none of them obeyed it yet, according to you, because the Roman letter was a part of it. Yet he says "Their sound went forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Now mind you, brother Colley says the Roman letter is a part of the gospel, and yet in that very letter Paul condemns the people because they had not obeyed the gospel. They could not have all obeyed it. None of them could have obeyed it, because they didn't have it yet, according to brother Colley. The Roman letter was part of it, Friends, the gospel was proclaimed at Rome before the Roman letter was written, and the apostle Paul wrote the Roman letter and condemned certain ones because they had not obeyed the gospel. That is ridiculous to contemplate if the Roman letter was the gospel.

I also asked him about the Galatian letter. He said that it was also a part of the gospel. Don't you know that when Paul wrote the Galatian letter he did so to condemn the people because they had already received the gospel, and had departed from it. Yet he says that the Galatian letter was a part of it. How could they depart from something they never had before? Do you not realize that the Galatian letter was written unto people of whom Paul says, "I marvel that you are so soon removed from the grace of him that called you into the gospel of Christ, unto another gospel." They had already had the gospel of Christ, been in it and left it before the Galatian letter was ever written, and Paul wrote that letter to condemn them for the fact they had abandoned the gospel. Yet my brother says it is a part of it, so he has them leaving something before they even get it. He has them departing from something before they ever heard it. That is absurd! Friends, if the apostle Paul was including the Roman letter as a part of the gospel proclamation, the *kerugma* of the heralds, the thing which was proclaimed for the salvation of the souls of men, how could he condemn these people for departing from something which they had not yet heard?

Again, my brother emphasizes over and over, Romans 1:14,15, and he tries to make a connection by tying in that statement with the reference to the righteousness of God. I



would like for you good people to remember, since he has read this over and over to you, just what the Book does say. "The righteousness of God by faith, is revealed in it, in order to faith." The righteousness of God, according to the King James Version, is revealed in the gospel "from faith to faith." Literally, the passage would read thus: "For therein (in the gospel) is revealed the righteousness of God by faith, in order to produce faith." The gospel was the thing preached to produce faith. After a man had faith, and had accepted the gospel which produced it, he was then taught the *didache*—the apostles' doctrine.

Do you not know that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel to produce faith? It is not revealed to believers. It is revealed to produce faith. When a man becomes a believer he no longer hears the gospel, but he hears the *didache*. The *didaskalos* takes over, and he no longer requires the work of the kerux, or herald. That is made clear in the very version he has before him, yet he tries to make it appear to you that everything which pertains to the life of righteousness, all that has to do with the godly life of believers, is a part of the gospel. This verse does not teach that. It just does not say it.

The word "righteousness" in the Roman letter means justification. This says then that "God's system of justification by faith, is revealed in the gospel, in order to produce faith." After you have that faith, the gospel has served its purpose, and you will not of course, have the gospel longer declared unto you. You are then taught the *didache* — the apostles' doctrine. My brother can see that.

But at this juncture he goes back to Psalms and quotes "All of God's commandments are righteousness." Surely he has not checked the translations on that, and determined that the correct rendering is simply "All thy commandments are right," The psalmist is not there defining righteousness; nor is he defining commandments. He merely says that all of God's commands are right, in other words, God never gave a commandment that was not right. That is all the psalmist meant by his statement. It is apparent that not only has my brother not read what Alexander Campbell said, but he

has not read carefully what James MacKnight said, and he has not too carefully read the Bible either.

Now again we take up the subject of the expression "the minister." I showed you from the various documents which I have here that the term was used with reference to those who are hired, that is the term "the minister" is used to describe those preachers who are hired in Dallas. I mention again the Sunset Church of Christ. Here we have listed: Elders, Deacons, Minister, with the name of Homer Putnam Reeves under "Minister." I'd like to ask this question, and it is certainly in order for I have proposed it before, if all of God's people are ministers, are not the elders ministers? Are not the deacons ministers? Then why is it you have three classes here? Are not the elders just as much ministers as Homer Putnam Reeves? Are not the deacons as much ministers as he?

I pointed out to you a short time ago that the very word translated "deacon" is the word for minister. Yet they have the word "Deacons" up here, which is a translation of the very word for ministers, and down underneath that they have a special minister. Are not all of these ministers? Is it not true that every person in this church directory is supposed to be a minister? Then why does Homer Putnam Reeves appear here if he is not "THE Minister"? Is there not a difference between him and the rest of them? If not, why is his name singled out to appear here as "Minister"? My brother admits that all of God's people are priests. If that be true, and all of God's people are priests just like all of them are ministers, if you can single one of them out and put his name there as minister, you can just as logically put the word priest up there. Homer Putnam Reeves, Priest!

But you do not need to pick on brother Reeves. You can take any of the rest of them. Here is Cockrell Hill again. In Cockrell Hill we have officers of the church. Officers! And among the officers of the church are the elders, the deacons, and the minister. That is the way it is practiced in Dallas. The minister is one of the officers of the church according to the very document we hold here which is the directory of this church of Christ. I am sure that when a con-

gregation publishes a directory and sends it forth, that directory is intended to show what that congregation practices. And in hiring a man to act as the minister of the Cockrell Hill Church, that man is listed as one of the officers. That is the practice of the Cockrell Hill Church.

But my brother declares he is not obligated to defend all of the practices of any congregation. Neither is he obligated to defend some of the practices of all of the congregations. But he is obligated by his proposition to defend the practice of hiring a preacher to serve as minister of these congregations, and please notice that what we have said has direct reference to that proposition. Here are the men who are hired; here is their relationship to the church. Do you notice that he wants to stay away from their relationship to the church? He even says that if his brethren use the term "assistant minister" he will condemn them. He will condemn them for hiring an assistant minister, then turn around and uphold them in hiring a minister. He affirms it is right to hire a minister, but wrong to hire an assistant minister. Why is it wrong? Let him show the passage he will use to condemn the hiring of an assistant minister and then watch what I do with that same passage on hiring a minister. Now just wait for him to do that, Any time that he gets ready during the next two nights, let him produce the passage he would use to condemn his brethren. He said "Just let one of my brethren talk about the assistant minister and see what I do to him. Ill get after him just like brother Ketcherside gets after him." Now just let him show by the Bible it is wrong to hire a preacher as an assistant minister, and I'll use the same passage and show you it is wrong to hire one to be a minister of the church.

Now, what Scripture will he use to condemn an assistant minister? Why is it wrong to hire an assistant minister? What makes it wrong to hire an assistant minister and right to hire a minister? My brother says that it is wrong to do that. But why is it wrong? Why would he condemn his brethren? On what ground would he condemn them? What Scripture will he use on them? Why would he get after them about that, and say it is all right to hire a minister, but it is all wrong to hire an assistant minister? What Bible proof would he of-

fer? Let him find the Scripture he would use and do it any time, and when he does I will take it and prove that it is wrong to hire a minister for the church. I'll use the same passage. He says he would get after his brethren, so I want to know just how he will do that. I'd like to see him get after his brethren on that issue and I'd like to see just what he says to them when he gets after them.

I am going to hand this book (MacKnight On Epistles) back to him, the book from which I have read. And I am going to suggest to my good brother that tomorrow night he read Romans 1:17 and MacKnight's comment on what the apostle Paul means about the righteousness of God which is revealed in the gospel. I am going to suggest to him that he read that and I think he will have a lot of pleasure and a considerable amount of learning and knowledge which he does not so far have. Thank you for the book!

I ought to read this directory again, but I suppose it will not be necessary because I think we have completely substantiated the fact of the churches in Dallas with reference to the hiring of a man as minister. My brother says I do not know that the term "Minister" is used to describe a work and is not a title. Of course I know that, but his brethren do not. That is exactly our point, that his brethren do not know that, and it is on that basis they use the term as a title. I would like to ask if, when they put out in front of their houses, Homer Putnam Reeves, Minister, are they just describing a work, or are they describing the function of a man in a special sense in that congregation? Are they designating the man there as one of the officers as is the case with brother Good-night, over at Cockrell Hill? That is what I want to know. Are they merely defining a function or work just as any other member of the congregation would perform? And if they pay one minister for serving and doing what God expects him to do, why do they not pay all of the members for doing the things God expects them to do?

He has had a lot to say about Timothy being over in Ephesus and a great deal to say about Paul taking wages. I think it well that we remember this one salient point, that he is trying to prove that the apostle Paul accepted wages on

the same basis these brethren in Dallas have their regular salaries, and that Timothy was at Ephesus on the same basis that these brethren are the hiring ministers of the congregations in Dallas. I would like to know if the apostle Paul would have preached had he not been paid. If he had not have received wages would he have preached? Would he have continued to preach when he did not receive wages? He says that it is obligatory upon the congregation to support him, but suppose the church does not do so? Would the apostle Paul have continued to preach there? Would he have continued in that same relationship? Paul declared that he was entitled to receive support from his brethren, he was entitled to have sustenance, but he said, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel!"

To compare a grand old Christian soldier like that, with a modern mercenary who contracts, as these brethren have contracted for jobs here, some of them making signed and others verbal contracts, to peddle so much gospel across the pulpit for so many weeks for so much money with a house and expenses thrown in besides—to compare that system with the work of Paul and Timothy, if I may be allowed to voice it, is nothing but rank heresy. While I make that accusation I do not mean to insinuate or imply that my brother is wilfully a heretic upon this matter.

My friends, he has been led into this system exactly as many of you have been led into it. Blindly he has grown up in such a system and has not yet recognized the true light from heaven with regard to the work of the church. He has not come to see the great picture, the panorama of God's church at work, with all of the ministers serving, and with no one man exalted as minister above any other. No one with his name as the minister, designating himself either by a title, or as a special functionary, in front of the meeting house or upon the stationery of the congregation. I trust that my brother will see that picture, and we shall do our very best, God being our witness, to point it out to him tomorrow night.

He mentions 1 Peter 1:25 where the apostle refers to the gospel, saying, "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Surely my brother knows that this

correctly translated is in the past tense. Surely he must have known that when he read it. Did he not know that the original correctly rendered is "The gospel which *was* preached unto you"? The correct translation will prove that is the proper reading of the passage. Peter never preached the gospel to a congregation of believers. Paul never preached the gospel to the church. He never preached it to believers.

I read to you last night a statement from Alexander Campbell with regard to this matter. I would like to repeat that to you again tonight. Alexander Campbell said: "There was teaching, there was singing, there was praying, there was exhortation in the Christian church. But preaching in the church or to the church, is not once named in the Christian Scriptures. Paul once, in his first letter to the church at Corinth, said he would declare to the Corinthians the gospel which he had preached to them, which also they had received and wherein they stood. We preach, or report, or proclaim news. But who teaches news? Who exhorts news? We preach the gospel to unbelievers, to aliens, but never to Christians, or to those who have received it. Paul taught the Christians. He exhorted, admonished, commanded and re-proved Christians, and on some occasions DECLARED the glad tidings to those who had received them but who seemed to have forgotten them, as he wrote to the Christians."

Again I read to you the statement of Moses E. Lard, who says in his Commentary on Romans, page 385: "The teaching here mentioned I doubt not consisted strictly in instructing the church. It did not include preaching the gospel to those without. This is the work more particularly of the prophet. The didaskalia was for the members of the church and had for its object their enlightenment and duty. It bore the same "relation to those within the church that preaching did to those without. The design of preaching was to bring men in. The design of teaching to perfect them when in. Teaching was the work chiefly of the overseers of the congregation."

Moses E. Lard, Alexander Campbell, and a hundred other worthies in their day, men who understood the Greek, like James MacKnight, Philip Doddridge and George Campbell, were the outstanding exponents of these matters. They clearly

understood them. They had no axes to grind. They sought not to justify a hireling clergy. My brother has accused me of using nicknames when I refer to the "hireling clergy." That is not a nickname. That is the designation of a condition which exists.

When a man sets himself up as a professional dispenser of the truth, and offers himself for hire and that to the highest bidder, when he preaches trial sermons as my brother admits he has preached them, for the sole purpose of making a living out of the dispensation of the truth of God, he is selling that truth and peddling the gospel across the pulpit as certainly as a grocer peddles prunes across the counter. And that is the system you have in Dallas tonight!

But it is not in Dallas alone. It has spread throughout the length and breadth of the United States of America, and is fast encompassing the earth. And what is the result? Those men who have the greatest ability are tied down with great churches having 400, 600, 800, or 1000 members, and those churches are so weakened, so emaciated, so helpless, that they cannot stand alone without this imported crutch, who is paid a tremendous price to stand before them and guide their feeble thinking. The robins that build their nests have more sense than those of us who profess to be Christians. When the old mother robin gets her little robins reared to a certain stage, instead of going out and digging worms for the lazy little outfits, she gets into the middle of the nest, spreads her wings, and kicks them out, and she makes them fly alone and dig their own worms. But we have a system whereby we train members in the nest, settle there, and when these fledglings get to the place where they should soar on their own wings, they still have to have someone dig their theological worms for them, and poke them down their hungry little throats. So enfeebled and weak are they, that they cannot fly or stand alone.

Brethren, I say unto you that this system is degrading to the church of the Living God. It presents the sorriest spectacle upon this earth. And when men brag about buildings costing \$600,000 into which people will come, a thousand of them, so helpless, so weak, so emaciated spiritually, that they

cannot raise an arm to feed themselves, it is disgraceful. They are utterly dependent upon someone to throw the worms down their throats. If he isn't there they have to get busy with telegrams or telephones and call someone else to do the feeding. I say it is ridiculous to call that the church of God, and to make it appear that this was the thing for which Christ died on Calvary's rugged tree.

Let us send these preachers out where they belong. When they resign they go out to do the work of evangelists. Now the secret of this thing is to let them all resign, then do not let them come back. If you will just keep them out in the field, support them there, and support them well, we'll have this problem solved. If they will just do all the time, what one or two of them do occasionally, we'll have the thing fixed. That will take care of the matter. We will put them all out in the field, taking the gospel to those who have not heard it before, for that is where the gospel should be taken, and the elders can feed the flocks. Let the churches stand upon their own feet, and let the brethren learn to edify one another.

Isn't it a shameful disgrace that in a city as large as Dallas, having 57 congregations calling themselves churches of Christ, that everyone of them has to have a hired feeder to dispense the truth to them? These brethren are spiritual weaklings. They have arrived at the place where they have been led to believe, under this system, that they do not dare march across the platform to edify their brethren, that this is a sacred sanctuary which belongs to a special ministry, a special priesthood and a priestly caste. They have been under the system so long now that they have become weak and helpless, nor have they learned that they should be able to feed anyone else. Isn't it a shame that we find such a condition existing among us, and that the churches are weakened and sapped of their vitality and strength by this, while countless millions of the earth who never heard the gospel are dying tonight in sin, and no one goes forth to take the word of life unto them?

Friends, I want you to know that the apostle Paul and Timothy could never have been, could not possibly have been, the kind of located ministers that these brethren are talking



about. Why reason alone would set that forth. How could the apostle Paul have been the minister of a local congregation? He was an apostle to the whole world to bear the good news to all the Gentiles and to all the people. You might as well say that President Eisenhower is mayor of Dallas as to say that the apostle Paul was the minister of a local church, or that he would ever instigate a system which would tie Timothy down to that kind of work. You refer to their work at Ephesus, and yet it was in the letter to Ephesus the apostle sets forth the idea that the church was to edify itself. Then you talk about someone being sent there to do it, or the hiring of someone to do that edifying.

Did you notice that my brother never did touch the question I asked him as to whether the elders at Ephesus could fire Timothy. Could they have sent him back to Paul? He left that question alone. Do you know why? Those elders couldn't fire him, because they didn't hire him. And my brother is obligated to find the system of elders hiring a man. These elders couldn't fire Timothy, because they didn't hire him. Paul left him over there. Last night, brother Colley said he guessed that when Paul got there that Timothy resigned. Do you recall what else he said? He went so far as to declare that if Timothy rebuked the elders, and they were like some of the elders around Dallas, they probably sent him packing! That he would have resigned and done so pretty rapidly. Do you realize what the church at Ephesus would have been doing in that case? I'll tell you. They would have been acting in direct contravention to the order of an apostle, for it was Paul who left Timothy there.

The church did not send for Timothy. They didn't hire him. He said tonight that the elders over there sent for Timothy. Oh, no, they didn't. The apostle Paul said he left him there and he left him for a particular purpose. The elders at Ephesus did not hire Timothy and they could not fire him. And because they could not hire him, and could not fire him, they were not like the eldership in the congregations about which he is affirming. He has not established the practice of the churches in Dallas with reference to hiring

a man to serve as the minister. It is impossible for him to do so!

I must notice again some of the objections I filed to this system. First, I said last night that it was *unscriptural* in that no man could cite one passage of Divine Writ which even intimates that a New Testament congregation with elders ever hired a man as their located minister at a stipulated fee as is practiced. I think I would like to say that again. *No man can cite a passage of Divine Writ which even intimates that a New Testament congregation with elders hired a man as their located minister for a stipulated fee as is now practiced.*

That is what he is obligated to do. But, as I pointed out to you, he affirms that it is scriptural. So we are going to ask about this system. Where is the scripture which hints at a church with elders announcing the acceptance of the resignation of a local minister? From what does such a man resign? Does he resign from gospel preaching? Does he resign from the use of the talents God has given him Or, does he resign from an office? If so, what is that office? What are its qualifications in the Scriptures? Where is it mentioned? What New Testament evangelist ever held it?

It cannot be the office of an evangelist, as I pointed out, for many resign from it to go out and do evangelistic work. What were they doing from which they could resign? I read to you the statement of Lee Starnes in Firm Foundation, September 29, 1938: "It is with much thought that I am tendering my resignation to become effective for 1939." From what was he resigning?

I repeat that in Firm Foundation, January 16, 1951, appears this: "There is a preacher of unusual ability and experience both as a located minister and as a preacher in gospel meetings who has decided to ask to be released from the work in the church where he is now preaching and spend his full time as an evangelist," My brother says when he was there he was doing the work of an evangelist. So he has to be released from doing the work of an evangelist so he can go out and do the work of an evangelist. Now what was he doing before he asked to be released and go out to do the

work of an evangelist? These brethren know the difference. Brother Colley knows the difference. The Firm Foundation knows the difference. They all know the difference!

Then I asked where the scripture is that, hints at a church, with elders advertising that, their pulpit would be vacant and soliciting candidates to file applications for the job. It has been done in Dallas. Where is the scripture that arranges for trial sermons of various aspirants to fill the position? My brother says he has done that. He said that his trial sermons were not too good, they didn't register very heavily, but he admits that he has put out a few trial sermons while looking for a job. That is why you put out a trial sermon, you know. It is like sending up a trial balloon—you want to see what is in it when you haul it back down. So he has preached a few trial sermons, in spite of the fact they were not too good. We'll not criticize the quality because we didn't hear them. I don't have very much occasion to be around the places where that kind of thing goes on. At the same time, he said he had preached them, and now I wonder if he will uphold that?

Will you uphold this general practice of preaching trial sermons? Where is the New Testament scripture that arranges for a gospel preacher to submit a trial sermon to a congregation that wants a hired hand to do its feeding and throw down its gospel fodder *to the church*, as my brother says? What New Testament church ever followed the procedure of contracting to pay so much per week for someone to preach to the congregation, or that ever announced the name of a man who had been hired as "our minister"?

Beloved brethren, the sad thing about all of this is that it has crept upon us, and it has come about so easily and Satan has worked so subtly, yet at the same time so effectively, that we have become engulfed in it without realizing it. Sadder even than this is that men will stand up and try to defend the system. But saddest of all is that they will try to defend it by the word of God. I feel sorry for those men who do so, and must some day face God and answer in the judgment for saddling this kind of system upon the churches and maintaining it there.

Friends, I want you to think seriously about this matter. I trust that many of you will get down upon your knees and pray over the situation. The church of God stands tonight facing a desperate crisis. It is just as it was in the stirring days of the Revolutionary War, when the Continental army was surrounded by the hired Hessians upon every side. Then it was that Tom Paine, sitting in the light of his flickering campfire, extracted a fagot that had burned out, and scrawled upon his drum head, "These are the times which try men's souls." That night General Washington looked at his snow-bound troops and gave this terse order: "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

I say to you that before us and around us on every side are such circumstances and conditions as will cause the church of God to go down underneath the weight of our own apostasy. We have created new offices and brought into existence new systems which God never authorized. I pray God from the depths of my soul that all of us, brother Colley, brother Swim, brother Garrett and myself, as well as all of you good people who love the Lord Jesus Christ will study these issues more seriously than we have ever before studied them. God grant that we shall have men with the courage of their convictions to stand before others and plead for a complete return to Jerusalem—a restoration of the New Testament church as given by our Lord. I thank you, and may God bless you.

**KETCHERSIDE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE**

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ, and friends:

We become the affirmant tonight in the proposition that has just been read in your hearing. For the past two nights my honored respondent and brother in Christ has been presenting to you the facts as he sees them with reference to the proposition which he signed. The proposition has changed its wording only in a few particulars tonight. Again I read it in your hearing: "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is contrary to the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures."

That we may avoid unnecessary delay, I accept the definition of terms as laid down by my respondent in his prior proposition. I would have you know that in the discussion of this phase of the subject, my purpose is not to oppose any man as such, not even my respondent. I am opposed to a system of which he is the victim, either wittingly or unwittingly. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in the heavenlies." I shall lay the axe at the root of the tree, and when the tree crashes, it will bring down all of those harbored in its branches. They will fall, not because they are individuals, but because they are connected with a system which will be proven false.

The subject tonight is fraught with the gravest consequences. Woe unto that individual who reverses God's telescope, and limits and restricts his vision to local circumstances only, building mountains out of molehills, and erecting towers of brick and slime upon which critical individuals may climb to a position of prestige and power. This question involves the whole philosophy of sacred ministry. The eternal purpose of God is being weighed in the balances by puny men, and the priesthood of the Sunlight Age is threatened with eclipse. For the subjects of priesthood and ministry are so carefully intertwined in God's revelation, that any attempt to unravel them, leads into a labyrinth of human speculation.

Religion belongs unto man in a sinful state. In the primeval garden of Eden there was no religion. The very word comes from Latin derivations which mean to "bind back." Before man left his God, he did not require anything to bind him back.

Every religion consists of at least three elements: sacrifice, altar and priest. This is true whether that religion be pagan, Jewish or Christian. In God's revelation of acceptable religion He has ever sought to maintain the dignity of the individual spirit, and to climax the march of the centuries with a Golden Age in which, through the blood of His Son, the ransomed and the redeemed will all stand upon equal footing before His throne, and not be brought into a servile state by any system of sacerdotal distinction or priestly pretension.

Thus the divine mind originated two preparatory schools in the childhood age of humanity. The primary school, which we designate the Patriarchal Age, demanded the ministrations in behalf of others, of the oldest member of the clan, and here were taught the elementary principles pertaining to the altar, the sacrifice and the priestly function. But false gods were invented, false altars erected, and false priests were appointed. And when such became universal and every nation had chosen its gods, the God of the universe saw fit to choose for himself a nation.

After tempering them in the fires of the smoking furnace of Egypt for weary centuries, He led them to the foot of a mountain which constituted a divine rostrum for this great constitutional convention. And here God made such a proposal as was never before granted unto any people. In Exodus 19:5,6 I read: "Now therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then you shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, for the earth is mine. And you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which you will speak unto the children of Israel."

Now to be a kingdom of priests, that is, a kingdom in which priesthood is co-extensive with citizenship, and where the terms which admit to citizenship admit also, and introduce one into all the rights and privileges and prerogatives of priesthood, demanded two things. First, a willingness of each person to

hear the word of God for himself that he might thus receive God's instruction personally. Second, a faithful adherence to the worship of the one true God. But Israel proved unworthy in both respects. When God spoke from the mount, the people as well as the mountain trembled. They said, "Why should we die? If we hear the voice of our God any more we shall die." They entreated Moses to go near and hear all of God's words and relay them unto them. So God sent the people to their tents and told Moses to remain by Him. The nation was not ready to dispense with an earthly mediator.

While Moses was upon the mount securing the law, they stooped to idolatry and degradation. At the shrine of the golden calf they failed as the priests of God, and the tribe of Levi stepped out upon the Lord's side. Instead of a kingdom *of* priests, Israel became a kingdom *with* priests—a special caste to be supported with tithes and taxation, to minister for them in things pertaining unto God.

Thus for a period of 1500 years more, God had to send his people to an elementary school, kept under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the Father. Korah, Dathan and Abiram opposed the limited priesthood, and contended for a universal priesthood, saying to God's special ministers, "You take too much upon you, seeing that all of the congregation are holy, every one of them." They were destroyed, not because the thing they opposed was wrong in itself, but because they sought to alter God's system of priesthood and ministry. When God has a limited priesthood, he dies who seeks to make it universal. But when God establishes a universal priesthood, will he not be damned who would seek to restrict all of the congregation from serving, seeing they are all holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them?

Friends, God looked forward to that great ideal. The evangelical prophet declared of the gospel era, "The people shall all be righteous, they shall inherit the land forever. The branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified" (Isa. 60:21). And in the same prophecy he further says, "But you shall be named the priests of the Lord, and men shall call you the ministers of our God" (Isaiah 61:6). Thus, in the Golden Age of the Gospel Dispensation, every priest is to be a min-

ister, and every minister is to be a priest. He who is called a minister is so called because he is a priest; and he who is called a priest is so called because he is a minister. Then to hire one as a minister is to hire him as a priest, and to recognize one as a special minister is to recognize him as a special priest.

It is noteworthy that God's ideal of universal priesthood is stated in direct conjunction with that prophecy of the ministry of our Lord, about which, in his home congregation at Nazareth, he declared: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21). When our Lord was coronated in heaven, he became a high priest at the right hand of God (Heb. 8:1). The special priesthood of Aaron was abrogated, the priesthood of the order of Melchisedec was installed. Under this new regime, everyone who is a child of God is a priest of God, and a minister of God. All who come near under Christ are in this category. Peter says, "To whom coming as unto a living stone . . . you also as living stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable unto God by Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2:4,5). He continues, "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that you should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

Thus, my friends, I say to you that at Mount Sion we received what Israel lost at Mount Sinai. Those people who could at one time, have become a peculiar people unto the Lord above all nations, and with that, could have become a kingdom of priests, forfeited their right to become so, because they turned from the voice of God and became an idolatrous people. Now we reach the fruition of God's great plan of the ages in the church of the living God. Woe be to that man who seeks to go back to the limited and restricted priesthood of another age in which men were hired and supported by the tithes and taxation of the people, in order to minister unto God in their behalf.

The plan of the ages reaches its culmination when everyone who comes to the living stone, everyone who has been called out of darkness into light, may show forth the praises of him who hath done the calling. Any system which makes the speaker's platform the exclusive property of any group, clique or caste, or which bars, or tends to bar from it any humble disciple of the



King from speaking to the royal family in which he is a prince; or which places a price upon the privilege, is sired by false ambition, born of presumption, nurtured by unholy pride, and destined to destroy the church of the Living God.

My good friends, the apocalyptic writer upon lowly Patmos wrote: "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us to be a kingdom of priests unto God. to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." We are a kingdom of priests because Jesus loved us, and because our sins were washed in his own blood. Everyone who embraces the blood of Jesus and acknowledges the sovereignty of the King of kings, is a priest and a prince in his own right. No special priest on earth has any special rights to minister for us in things pertaining unto God. We have no earthly mediator, no earthly high priest. All of God's children are priests. All are ministers. All have the same right to approach unto God. All have the same right to edify their brethren as far as priesthood is concerned. Our priesthood grants that privilege. Nor is that all, but it imposes it as a fearful responsibility!

The writer of Hebrews in 10:21-25, says: "And having an high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, for he is faithful that promised, and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as you see the day approaching." The words "one another" are from the Greek term for "mutual, reciprocal." It is because of our relationship to Jesus Christ, as our high priest, that we are to mutually consider and to mutually encourage unto love and good works. It is because of this we are to mutually exhort, This is not something done to us, or something done for us, but it is something we must do. It is not something we can hire done. It is something we must personally do!

The very apostle who reveals that we are a kingly priesthood to show forth his praises, lays down the doctrine of mutual ministry. In 1 Peter 4:10,11, we read: "*As every man hath*

received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." In this one verse we learn that every man who receives a gift is obligated to minister. Unto whom? We are obligated to minister the same one to another. The words "one to another" are from the Greek for "mutual, reciprocal." Thus we have mutual ministry. "As every man hath received the gift even so minister the same one to another. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever. Amen!"

A universal priesthood and mutual ministry go hand in hand. "For priests are ordained for men in things pertaining unto God" (Hebrews 5:1). They are to offer gifts according to God's law (Hebrews 8:4). They are to accomplish the service of God (Hebrews 9:6). Now, any system which provides for hiring a minister to officiate in behalf of the congregation in things pertaining unto God, or which restricts or restrains the offering of any gift or talent to God's service, or which confines the accomplishment of God's service to a special group of skilled professionals and hired specialists, is as contrary to God's plan as the recognition of the pope or papal hierarchy, and is a growth of the same nefarious seed.

This is not my view alone. I hold in my hand tonight the book called "The Church, The Falling Away and The Restoration," by J. W. Shepherd. On page 32 I find this statement: "Congregated for worship and service they were not only a priesthood, but their edification was committed to the whole body of the male members, excluding from ministering therein only those incapable of edifying. There were elders required to be 'apt to teach,' not to be sole instructors of the church, but taking part therein, securing order and propriety upon the part of all. Every member was taught to attend the worship regularly, but this was not the end. Even if every member attended regularly and punctually, this was not to be the end of the teaching, the worship or the service. The end of all the teaching and training of men in the church was that they might bear fruit in doing good unto men. Every member of the church was to

participate in all the services of the church, and the members were not only competent to do all the work pertaining to the church, but they needed this work and service for their spiritual growth. In this service alone could the Christian find the food and exercise needed for his growing wise and strong in the inner man. The spiritual man could no more grow strong and active without himself doing the worship and work of the church, than the body could grow strong while refusing the food and exercise needed for its growth and life."

Now, listen again to this from page 34: "Every child of God by virtue of his birthright into God's family, a family of priests unto God, had the right to perform any and every service connected with the church of God, limited only by God's direction, and by the ability to do it decently and in order. All were encouraged to take part in the service, and in doing the service, each member manifested his talent for the work, and trained himself for fitness in God's work." Amen, brother Shepherd. You have certainly written as God's Book teaches, you have certainly told the truth about it!

Now I would like to read to you from page 130, of Volume 2 of the Millennial Harbinger. "Christ's service is a: personal trust, He has entrusted the building up of His body to the saints personally and they have no authority to attempt its delegation, or to hire substitutes to do their work for them. Nothing can be more at variance with the spirit and design of the Christian institution, nothing more pernicious to the Redeemer's cause, than the prevailing system, which has so long prevailed. Can anything be more absurd, more incredible, than the fancy that Christ should, after qualifying and commanding everyone of his friends to do his work personally, permit them to abandon its personal performance and entrust it to hirelings and substitutes? And what has produced the deplorable, the loathsome, the disgusting spectacle which Christendom has long presented and now presents—the children professedly of the same Father, the subjects professedly of the same Sovereign, the friends professedly of the same Benefactor, the promoters professedly of the same glorious cause, torn into countless factions, creeds, sects, confessions and communions into bodies and individuals, continually fighting wrangling, abusing and vilifying one another—

what has, I ask, produced this mournful, this distressing, this horrible sight, but the hireling system? Never could this wretched spectacle have been exhibited to the derision, disdain, alienation and ruin of an astonished, ignorant, thoughtless and deluded world, had every professed friend of Jesus Christ performed *personally*, with the love of his God in his heart and his fear before his eyes, his just share of his Master's work devolving on him. Incalculable have been the faithlessness and criminality of Christ's professed friends in this matter . . . . Were every saint to perform diligently, in his own person, his just share of his Master's work, to the entire disuse of hirelings and substitutes, what a glorious change would soon arise! We would soon behold the splendid era, foretold by ancient seers, realized before our astonished eyes . . . ." My friends, the use of the term "hireling" did not originate with me. It was a term used by men, ancient worthies, who sought to set forth the teaching of God and the plan of high heaven.

And now, I want to take time to arraign the present system of one-man hireling ministry as practiced by the preponderance of churches of Christ in this area, upon the following counts:

1. It creates a special professional caste, and for a price, places in their hands the accomplishment of the service of God in behalf of the church. Since this is the duty of priests, this system has foisted upon the church a group of priestlings who (serve for gain. "The prophets prophesy falsely, the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so, and what will you do in the end thereof!" (Jeremiah 5:31). I unhesitatingly charge that this system has become a tradition without Scriptural sanction. And I affirm that like the other sectarian groups among God's people in the days of Jesus, you make void the law of God by this tradition.

2. It nullifies the use of the gifts of all, by concentrating the right to serve publicly in the hands of the few. It fosters the impression that humble saints whose educational attainments may be limited, can never appear before their brethren gathered around the festal board, to testify of the grace of God. Thus the church grows weaker through lack of exercise as the professional caste grows stronger by constant use. Too the mass of the membership, by submission to this system, is reduced to servile

acceptance of almost intolerable conditions by the belief that one's right to minister publicly must be determined by his scholastic attainments in a secular school, rather than his spiritual devotion in the sacred college of our Lord. In essence, this is the doctrine of Rome, that no man can be trusted as an expositor of God's word except he be admitted to the fraternity of a special priesthood.

3. It destroys the divine doctrine of equality as set forth in 2 Corinthians 8:13,1-1, where the apostle Paul says: "For I mean not that other men be eased and you be burdened, but by an equality, that now at this time, your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance may also be a supply for your want, that there may be an equality." Laboring men with large families, and even poor widows, are urged to contribute to the support of those who receive many times the earnings of their contributors. The homeless are taxed to pay for a minister's home, although its occupant receives a weekly sum in excess of what those who contribute receive for hard labor. Men in power draw up a budget, a thing unknown to primitive Christianity, and the pressure is exerted to worm out of the communicants a sum which they had no voice in determining. Those who may not lift up a' voice to pray, are threatened with damnation if they do not pay to support a system which eases some and burdens others.

What is the difference in principle, although I admit there is a difference in degree, of this system and that of the Romish priest who milks the purses for gain by threats of purgatory? The poet has truly said

*"Earth gets Its price for what earth gives us,  
The beggar is taxed for a corner to die in;  
The priest hath his fee who comes and shrives us,  
We bargain for the graves we lie in."*

It has come to the place where religion has been reduced from a soul saving basis to a cold dollars-and-cents proposition. It is no longer a question of what we may put into it, but of what we may get out of it. And men are bargaining and selling the gospel of the Son of God across the pulpit, so much for each week, so much for each month, so much for each year, exactly as the hireling contracts his time on a building project.

4. I offer as my next objection to the system generally practiced here that it elevates above his fellows one who is recognized as the minister of the church. No amount of cavilling will offset the fact that the churches have purchased houses appropriated to the use of a special ministry, known as "the ministers' homes." If all are ministers, why do the brethren thus show partiality? Is such a home provided because a' man is too poor to provide his own? If so, why is the church not obligated to provide a home for all who are too poor to own one, seeing that all are ministers of God? If not, then why should the church provide from its treasury real estate for those not in need, seeing that the contributions are for the relief of poor saints? The churches have provided offices for the ministers in which they function as congregational directors and arrangers, the while they protest that they are not officers. They have provided minister's studies as if provision should be made for only one man in the church to study the word of God, and that man a professional. What is the difference in such provisions and the Presbyterian manses, the Methodist parsonages, or the Episcopalian rectories? Are not all of these special provisions made by sectarian bodies for their respective clergymen? Are not such provisions made by the churches of Christ for their clergymen? If not, why not? How will you explain the difference to an untutored world? What difference is there to explain?

No, I do not stand alone when I attack this system. David Lipscomb in *Gospel Advocate*, 1873, page 481, says: "After a church is planted the idea of retaining a man to preach constantly for that congregation is foreign to the whole scope of Biblical teaching."

James A. Harding said: "The minister is not a necessity. He is a fungous growth upon the church, the body of Christians, dwarfing its growth, preventing the development of its members, and until the church gets rid of him, it will never prosper as it should. In the Bible we find all of the necessities and we cannot find him there."

James A. Allen says: "Not only did Lipscomb and Harding teach that it is sinful for a man to become the minister of a

church, but they just as unequivocally taught that any church that hires a minister has gone digressive."

No, I am not alone. Lipscomb, Harding, Allen! The latter says: "We wish to very sincerely and very humbly submit that the churches of Christ are facing a great crisis. We also kindly call attention to the fact that a decision must be made. Many of the best and wisest of the church have long warned that we are drifting. No intelligent man can deny that today the fact is we have already drifted. The momentous question is, are there enough faithful and consecrated and courageous men and women in the church today to stem the tide and roll it back the other way. Brother Harding said that the pastor system is one of the most radical departures from the apostolic order and one of the greatest hindrances to the success of the gospel."

No, I am not alone. David Lipscomb in *Gospel Advocate*, May 31, 1906, said: "A church that has to send to others for help to conduct its services and worship or work is not a self-supporting and self-edifying church. This is true, no matter how great the number, the talent or the wealth of the congregation. We have scarcely a male member (in the Foster Street Church in Nashville) who will not lead in the worship if desired. Such a band of earnest working Christians is much more effective for converting the world than a rich church of a thousand wealthy, fashionable members, supporting one of the most learned and eloquent preachers in the land to study, teach, pray, exhort and admonish for them, while they live at ease and support him."

Again, with regard to the trouble that exists and the fountain from which it comes, I find David Lipscomb, in *Gospel Advocate*, Volume 15, page 69S, saying: "The great fountain evil on the subject is the over-anxiety of the churches for preaching, meaning by that sermonizing.! The demand for eloquent, or fascinating, or sensational preaching, as the condition of the church meeting and the means of edification and worship, absolutely deprives the church or any member of its members of all opportunity for developing or training talents within themselves. In our fully-equipped churches there is absolutely no opportunity for young or old unofficial members actively or openly to participate in the worship. They have no opportunity

of exhorting or admonishing the brethren or the world. Their first earnest desires, are quenched, and then these desires are permanently stifled. This desire unfed and unexercised soon dies. The desire suppressed, the talent of course, must become unused, undeveloped and becomes dormant."

I charge tonight in arraignment of this system that exists in Dallas that you have departed from the truth of high heaven. You have crucified God's system of ministry. You have desecrated God's ideal of priesthood. My friends, you have sold out in this last great age of the world, the great plan of high heaven for which our Saviour gave his life's blood upon Calvary's rugged cross.

But my chief objection to this system is its unwarranted abrogation of the rights and privileges of all the ministers of Christ into the hands of the few. Is it conceivable that in a congregation of eight hundred professed Christians there is not one capable of edifying his brethren? Is it so that there is not a wise man among you, no not one who is able to build up his brethren? Is such a congregation so spiritually destitute, so halt and lame, so shrivelled and crippled, that it must import a single individual to dispense the bread of life and dole out the milk of the word? Must men be called in from the famishing fields of sin to prescribe for the ailments of a helpless, hapless, hopeless group of hundreds who have never been weaned from the bottle? Must hundreds of spiritual fledglings crowd the nest to capacity while a hired hand thrusts crumbs of truth down their parched and hungry throats?

Such a system is debasing. It is a mockery of God's great plan, a feeble caricature of the divine system of ministry. Noble men like Luther, Huss and Zwingli, unchained the Bible from the pulpits, wrested truth from the covetous grasp of a mercenary clergy, freed it for circulation among the millions enslaved by superstition. What a tragedy that those who profess to be leading a restoration movement should devise a system which would reverse the process, borrow a leaf from Rome's clergy album, and start once more on the march to the Dark Ages? You are on your way.

Do not point to your temples of pride with their spires like fingers pointing to the very heaven whose decrees you ignore,



or with their crosses signaling your borrowed trapping of the crucifix of Rome. Do not brag about your budgets of thousands, as if you could make up in gold what you lack in consecration. These things are but the first signs of a spiritual decadence, the stumbling stones cast before blindfolded and helpless men. And do not sneer at the humble groups of saints who, meeting on the fringes of your great city, seek to keep kindled the glowing spark of God's great plan of the ages. Here may meet the holy ones who weep when the cracked voice of some aged disciple, weary with the battle of life, bids his fellows in rude language, to press on until the close of life's day, and then rest until the day dawn and the shadows flee away.

I choose to take my stand with those who may be hounded by your persecution, saddened by your misrepresentation, ridiculed by the mighty, driven out by powerful politicians, and who may be counted the filth and offscouring of the earth, and I thank my God that I can stand with that kind of men tonight. Here where all are equal, where the mutual ministry of God is freely exercised without money and without price by those who sit down at the thanksgiving table of my king, is found the true spirit of restoration. I would not exchange that for all of the cushioned pews in the largest temples ever built by men's hands in Dallas.

*“Where men have held the vision clear,  
Of brotherhood before their eyes,  
The holy angel message still  
Comes singing from the skies.  
Where earnest seekers of the truth,  
Follow her beckoning from afar,  
Forever through their dark and doubt  
Shall shine the guiding star*

## COLLEY S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Ketcherside, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen :

I would be untrue to you if I did not thank you for your presence, and for the attention you gave to the speech to which you have just listened. If you had been listening to brother Ketcherside reading poetry from some book you would have gotten about as much sense out of it as you did from his speech. It was nothing but a tirade from start to finish. As far as the scriptures are concerned, I want you to look at your notes, and notice the quotations from men. He has used these quotations over and over. There's nothing new or scriptural in the quotations. The sweet little speeches of "Mary had a little lamb" are all right and tickling to the ears of some. That was what Paul meant when he said unto Timothy, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." That is exactly what he put before you this evening. Fables, nothing but fables. He has tried to turn your ears from the truth to fables. Some with itching ears may be turned. While in St. Louis, I remarked to the young preachers that were talking about attending this debate, that they should bring their *black hooks*. The next time they come I want them to bring a man that will use the little *black book*. Yes, sir.

Last night when I was in the affirmative on this subject, I asked some questions. We are going to consider Romans 1:15 first, (I'll get this big book out of the way.) Brother Ketcherside is not going to get away from Romans 1:15. In my first affirmative speech I called attention to Paul's statement about preaching to the church in Rome. "So much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." He has not touched this argument. Every speech he has made has been a tirade, like the speech we heard to-night. Then again I have asked him to say something about Romans 1:15. Yes, I requested him to read MacKnight, if

he could do no better. He read MacKnight in the debate with brother Wallace. He was discussing Romans 1:15. He read MacKnight's statement last night. I called his attention to the fact that MacKnight said it was not to the church only, but it was to the heathen as well. That is what MacKnight said. He took my book, he didn't have his, and he read the statement to the audience, then turned around and denied it, Yes, he can make pretty little speeches, but God's eternal truth is going to continue to be before these people. I am going to take the lid off. Last night he continued to misrepresent me regarding the wording of our propositions. Yes "generally practiced" does not mean that I am to defend the general practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas. He knew that when he did it. His tirades against my brethren and his denominational method of debating will not do. He has used every ugly word that he can to describe gospel preachers. I am going to show you that he misrepresented MacKnight as well as the apostle Paul. First, get the argument. Paul said he would preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome. I made this observation, that to preach the gospel to the church, preachers that preach the gospel were to be supported by the gospel. 1 Cor. 9:14. That wheresoever the gospel is preached, by gospel preachers, they can be supported by the church. That 's the argument I made and there is the reason he is dodging it. Yes, that is the reason, and in place of answering the argument made in my first speech, in his second speech he finally read MacKnight. I challenged it and told him MacKnight would not sustain his position. Here is MacKnight's statement: "In regard that Paul, after acknowledging he was bound to preach the gospel both to the Greeks and to the barbarians adds, I am 'ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome', the idolatrous inhabitants of Rome certainly were included in the expression, 'you who are in Rome.' This verse therefore, as well as the following, is a proof that the epistle to the Romans was intended, not for the Roman brethren alone, but for unbelievers also to whom copies of it might be shown." Who were the barbarians included in the expression? Those that were OUT of Christ. Paul said I would have preached the gospel to YOU, the church.

In Romans 1:11—This is in your Book; this is not what

brother Allen said. This is not what brother David Lipscomb said, or A. Campbell said. This is in your *little black book*, the New Testament, That 's it. Now watch it, Romans 1:11, "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established." Get the picture. Here is the church in Rome. Paul wrote to the church in Rome and said: "I long to see YOU"—the church in Rome—"that I may impart unto YOU some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established." Now what for? I want YOU to be established. I want to impart some spiritual gift to YOU. Who are the "YOU?" It is the church in Rome. Now in the fifteenth verse of the same chapter Paul said, "I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Preach to whom? The same YOU of the eleventh verse. The church in Rome. I want him to pay some attention to that. His pretty little speech didn't amount to a hill of beans! I am going to uncurl it. Don't think I won't. I want him to use the New Testament when he comes down here again. That is what to use. That is what we fight with. And when you boys bring your New Testaments bring a man who'll use it.

Now to some things he said last night. He gave Romans 10:16, and said, brother Colley, you didn't know that was in there did you? That did not have a thing on earth to do with Romans 1:15. "They have not all obeyed the gospel." Certainly they haven't all obeyed today either. That is a quotation argument, and a prophecy follows it. And he said, brother Colley, you did not read that. That does not have anything to do with the argument on Rom. 1:15. Brother Ketcherside thinks that Colley is all thunder and no lightning, for lightning hurts. He is going to get both. Yes, both! Hear the man that made the pretty little speech — Mary had a little lamb kind. Hear him!

Romans and Galatians are not part of the gospel! He said it. Romans and Galatians are not part of the gospel. He asked me if I believed these books were part of the gospel, I replied, Yes, sir; I still say yes. YES, SIR! Now, brother Ketcherside, tell us if Corinthians are part of the gospel. I answered your question, will you answer mine—will you? Brother Ketcherside believes the gospel is preached to the

sinner to make them Christians. The gospel according to him is not to be preached to the church. If Christians should come in where he is preaching the gospel, he should ask them to leave. That is according to his theory. When he is edifying the church, sinners should be requested to leave. Edify the church—not sinners?

He tells us Romans and Galatians are not part of the gospel. All right, let us see about that. In Romans we have faith, repentance, confession, and baptism. This makes a Christian. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17. That is in Romans but that is not part of the gospel? We continue, "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Romans 2:4. Is that part of the gospel? He teaches it is not. Confession, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Romans 10:9,10. Is that part of the gospel? But that is not all. Baptism, "Know you not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Romans 6:1-4. There is every step one must take in order to become a Christian. He says it is not part of the gospel! But that is not all: Romans and Galatians are the only two books in the whole Bible that tells us how we get INTO CHRIST. In Romans 6:3 and Galatians 3:27 we are baptized INTO Christ, He has selected these two books, and tells us they are not part of the gospel. Brother Ketcherside, when you are asked how sinners are brought into Christ, how do you tell them? Where do they learn? That speech he made was sure pretty, but when it gets down to debating—humph! And you talk about logic. We want to know about this. Please notice this and pay attention to it. That is not all. Romans 1:16,17 the next verses from the FIFTEENTH. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Hear me: Last night he said, "Brother Colley doesn't know about the new translation of Psalms 119:172. That does not mean righteousness there; that just means all of God's commands are right." NOT ALL OF GOD'S COMMANDS ARE RIGHTEOUS?—Humph. Every time brother Ketcherside tries

to answer an argument he tries to tell you what it means in the Greek. Every time. I have a good idea that the men who gave us the Bible, the forty-seven scholars of the King James, and the one hundred one of the American Standard Version, that's one hundred and forty-eight scholars KNEW MORE about it than brother Ketcherside. (Colley looking at brother Garrett,) or anybody else that is by his side. Yes, sir, I'll take them. If you can't prove it by the New Testament, with 148 scholars, you cannot prove it at all. I have an idea all of you believe this to be true. This man that came here from St. Louis, and talks about preachers being hirelings, has the only faction in the church of Christ that's practicing the pastor system. That is the faction that brother Ketcherside and his group are working with and for. Yes, sir. You are a factionist of the worst sort, They will tear up churches everywhere they can. They do it. They've done it in this city. My friends, I want to show you their tactics. They use members in the congregations to pass out their literature. Not only here, but they even pipe-line from Dallas to Brownsville, to the Rio Grande Valley, with their literature. Don't tell me—they are a faction of the worst sort. They have the only faction in the church of Christ that DOES HAVE the pastor system. Yes, he tells us we are going to have something about hirelings! We are going to talk about pastors, too!

Now let us get some more. We note his comments regarding the gospel, and the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith. All of the authorities say this is a peculiar expression, but they do not take RIGHTEOUSNESS out, They all say that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel. It is from faith to faith. Now watch: My friends, I'm going to tell you that were not here the past evenings, why I am doing this. He teaches that the gospel can't be preached to the church. He says Romans is not part of the gospel. He says Galatians is no part of the gospel. No, brother Colley, they are not part of the gospel. It has already been preached. That is the reason they are Christians. Already been preached to them. Paul said, in the *gospel* is the righteousness of God revealed, from faith to faith. Show me any other place the righteousness of God is revealed to the Christian. Yes, that which has to do with Jesus Christ, his life, his church, and

the things that members of the church should do. Show where any righteous acts that Christians are commanded to perform are found. I dare him to try it! Paul said they are in the gospel. The righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel. Last night brother Ketcherside said, Righteousness of God is revealed in order, from faith to faith. Well, the gospel reveals the righteousness. If Romans and Galatians, according to brother Ketcherside, are no part of the gospel, then out goes righteousness. These books, according to him, do not deal with righteousness, nor faith. Why? Because the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel. Paul said so, in one of the books. Now listen: Out goes righteousness. They are not books of faith? Why? Look at the chain—gospel, righteousness, faith. The just shall live by faith. That's it. He can make another pretty speech but he won't touch that. He has not touched it, and will not. I am going to keep on firing it at him.

Romans 1:16,17, Paul said, "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." The gospel reveals the commands that are right. All of the righteous commands for sinners and saints are revealed in the gospel from faith to faith. "The just shall live by faith." According to brother Ketcherside, Romans and Galatians are not letters that produce obedience. They are not of faith, for the gospel produced that faith. Righteousness, faith, the just live by it.

My friends, I introduced 1 Peter 1:22-25 in my first speech of this debate. Brother Ketcherside has spoken four times. In his last speech, last night, he finally did say 1 Peter 1:22-25 didn't have reference to anything that Colley said, because it is in the PAST TENSE. All right, brother Ketcherside, I don't care what tense you put that last verse in. "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Whether it is the glad tidings that WAS or IS preached. It makes no difference. Here is what he has to face, 1 Peter 1:22-25, "Seeing that you have purified your souls in obeying the truth." Now watch it. "Purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." Now wait a minute—"See that you love one another with a pure heart fervently." Love one another with a pure heart

fervently is not past tense. Now notice: You were born again. That is past tense. When one is born again he doesn't have to be born any more. Not again. When he is IN CHRIST he's born, now what! He has to love the brethren. Love one another. That's something that a member of the church must do. All right, "See that you love one another fervently, being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." What is the WORD BY THE GOSPEL PREACHED UNTO YOU? Brother Ketcherside doesn't want you think that the gospel can be preached to Christians. Now you are born again. You are Christians. What are you to do as Christians? Love one another. Love one another. Is that love one another? Yes. Peter said this is the word which by THE GOSPEL IS PREACHED UNTO YOU. The only answer he made to this was, it is in the past tense. Well, is it the past tense that Christians should continue to love one another? Where do they get that instruction? The WORD BY THE GOSPEL. He has not touched this for four speeches. Last night he waved at it by saying, It is past tense.

Some more, in 1 Corinthians 8:1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth." With that pretty speech, and it was pretty, Oh, boy! He was trying to lead up to the subject of edification. "Love edifies." Edifies. My brethren edify one another, He can't edify. Why? That which by the gospel is preached, is, that you love one another with a pure heart fervently. This is from the *word by the gospel*. He teaches that the gospel cannot be preached to the church—to Christians. He thinks hirelings cannot edify—Well, no. But in reality he is telling us about every male member, speaking according to his ability. He will get to that I am sure. I know what he's going to say. He can't get to that quick enough. I'm waiting for it. He didn't get near to what he's going to say about that, But I'll be there, when he gets there.

He can't teach edification. LOVE EDIFIETH. He can't



teach it, because that comes from the WORD WHICH BY THE GOSPEL IS PREACHED UNTO YOU. His hobby goes by the board before he gets it out on the board. He can't edify, edify, anybody. He says we can't preach the gospel to Christians. Peter said, "Love one another with a pure heart fervently." This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. Help him out over there. (Brother Garrett was talking to brother Ketcherside) brother Garrett, he needs it.

Did it ever occur to you that Peter said "love one another" —Love edifies. Love, this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. What? That you love one another with a pure heart fervently. There were two things mentioned in the apostle Peter's statement. Born again—those born again are taught to LOVE ONE ANOTHER. The word by the gospel teaches. Brother Ketcherside can't use anything that has love in it. He can't preach love, which Peter said was produced by the gospel. But Peter just did not know!!! He said Galatians wasn't part of the gospel. But love is. Now watch the argument; I don't want him to slip around this. He is the best dodger I ever saw. But he can't get around this—Watch it. Love is by the gospel. He says Galatians is not part of the gospel. But in Galatians 5:22, "The fruit of the Spirit is LOVE, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." Paul surely wasn't talking about the gospel. But Peter said that IS the gospel. That's the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. Brother Ketcherside says, now let me tell you, in our edification, in our mutual edification, we do not teach that, Peter. We don't teach THAT. Why Paul did not preach the gospel in the Galatian letter. No, he didn't do it! He didn't! How do you know? This little faction, that's built their faction around this hobby, is the one that said it. That's the one.

Here is another argument he has not touched since I nailed it down in my first speech. 2 Peter 1:3—I want him to say something about it. "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." The divine power called us to glory and virtue. Please tell us what else calls anybody to glory and to virtue, except the gospel. What else? It has granted unto us all things that pertain unto

LIFE and GODLINESS. Brother Ketcherside says that is not true. No, that's not true. If you preach the gospel to Christians, why, that's wrong. But all things that pertain to life and godliness are in the gospel. Romans and Galatians do not have anything in them that pertain to life and godliness. Why! His divine power, the gospel, has granted unto us ALL THINGS that pertain to LIFE AND GODLINESS. Brother Ketcherside says, No, no! No, no, no! That's not according to my hobby. That's not according to it. Now you little old hireling preachers don't know what you're talking about. You don't know what you are talking about, don't know a thing. No. The divine power hath granted unto us *all things* that pertain unto *life* and *godliness*. That's a little bit loud—that's a little thunder, but it has some lightning in it, too. Talk about me thundering, he said lightning would hurt. I want him to touch that, I gave that in my first speech, the first night, he has had four speeches. He has not said anything about it yet. Just touch it. I dare him to. Somebody said I shouldn't dare brother Ketcherside. If you can get him to do anything without daring him, I'd like to see von do it. I can't. Now this IS the little black book, boys. This is the little BLACK BOOK. I am not reading what David Lipscomb said, Alexander Campbell said, Allen said. This is what Paul and Peter said. It is a thousand times better than Ketcherside and all those notables that have lived, that are living, or will live. This is what Peter said. It's what Paul said. It is as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar, yes, stronger and you can't shake it because it's God's eternal truth. (Ten minutes.) Thank you.

Romans and Galatians not part of the gospel! Then they do not contain anything that pertains unto life and godliness. I ask him this question. I want him to write it down. Are Corinthians part of the gospel? He is going to get 1 Corinthians 14, I will be there when he gets there, but I want to know if it is part of the gospel. Now he must answer me.

He asked me last night to give him an argument against an "associate" and "assistant minister." He said he would use the same argument against the use of the word "minister." I don't want to help him any more than I have to, especially when he is fighting my brethren. But I'll try. You wanted it. Take

it down! Here it is, 1 Timothy 4:6, "If you put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ," I affirmed about A MINISTER for four speeches. And he wanted to KNOW. He will use this, will he? I don't find associate ministers. I do find A FAITHFUL MINISTER. I found that, The reason I do not like the use of the words "assistant minister," and "associate minister" is because these expressions are not in the Book. That's why. I want to see him use that. He said he would do it. I want to see him try it. Use it against "ministers."

Now some more: 1 Timothy 1:10,11, when Paul left Timothy he was talking about a preacher and not hirelings. If you will notice, brother Ketcherside, in verse three, Paul left Timothy in Ephesus. He told him to charge certain men regarding preaching "anything contrary to the sound doctrine; according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God". All sound doctrine is according to the gospel. He was to correct those in the church in Ephesus. The church had elders. Correct those in the church. What with? WITH THE GOSPEL. Leroy (Garrett) I am glad you told him that, but it won't do him any good. Just keep on tunneling, that will be all right. He needs help. I do not need anybody. Just Peter and Paul are good enough for me. Keep on helping, Leroy.

Once more: All sound doctrine. Brother Ketcherside says, You can't preach it to the church. You can't preach the gospel to the church. He was in a church, he was with a church. He was with a church that had elders. He was preaching to it. He was paid. How do you know, Colley, you can't prove it? I can prove it. Hear it: "They that proclaim the gospel shall live by the gospel". He was proclaiming the gospel, and if they were not paying him, they were not doing what God told them to do. God told the churches everywhere that those who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel. Timothy was in Ephesus, preaching the gospel and sound doctrine according to the gospel. Yes, sir, he was paid. He was a hireling according to this factionist. He's a hireling. Oh, yes. He's a hireling. He need not come up here and say I have used some bad words to describe a faction. I have the tape, and everything he has said about my preaching brethren—I am going to read it, too. Ev-

everything—I have it cataloged. He has said these things all along about my brethren. That is why I called him a factionist. He is, too. The church at Cockrell Hill suffered from it. We are going to have some more about this. I am going to take the lid off this thing. How much time? Thanks.

He calls us popes, hierarchy—Any congregation that has hirelings to preach, that's what they are! Brother Ketcherside, you have a lot to talk about! You have not only one preacher over one church, but you have one preacher over more than one. You affirmed it in St. Louis. I heard you do it. They have a preacher over churches without elders. When there are no elders, they put the preacher over the churches—They are the overseers. (Time.) Thank you.

## KETCHERSIDE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Swim, brothers and sisters in Christ, and friends:

Our brother said last night that when brother Ketcherside comes to the platform tomorrow evening and makes his affirmation, I am going to follow him. He accused me of not following him in his proposal, and said he was going to guarantee that when I set forth the things I had to say he was going to be right there to follow me. I remember that one time Peter followed our Lord, but the Book says he followed afar off. I think that our brother has patterned after Peter tonight in that respect.

I am perfectly content with the speech which I made last night, Those of you who were here and listened to the dissertations we gave relative to the various points have all the information that is necessary to weigh the evidence and to make your decision thereon. Our brother introduced MacKnight. I therefore had considerable to say last night about MacKnight and his contemporaries and co-laborers, Drs. George Campbell and Philip Doddridge. I have read all that these men had to say upon this subject, at least all that was obtainable by me, and I am certain that I have not misrepresented them in any way, shape or form. I am content to let that go to the judgment, and I am just as content to allow my audience to sit as a jury and weigh the evidence that has been offered to you.

Now, the only allusion that was made to my speech tonight by brother Colley was in the fact that seven times, according to actual count, he labeled it as being a pretty speech. But doing that does not necessarily answer a man's argument. If my good wife who is here, were to say to me, "Carl, are you going to get me that new hat this afternoon?" and I answer by saying, "My dear, you are really pretty," only to have her return an hour later and say, "I want to know now, are' you going to get me that hat this afternoon?" and I say again, "Honey, you are really pretty," what would be the outcome? I think she would say to me, "When are you going to answer my questions? Just calling me pretty doesn't meet the situation. I want to know if you are going to get me that hat." I think I have a right tonight to ask my brother to handle my speech instead of merely calling it pretty. Just answer it. I am cer-

tain that would be much more becoming to him as a debater and logician. My brother is considerably jittery tonight in his attempts to re-introduce matters which he said he introduced in his first speech. He told the truth about that. He did deliver that speech the first night, and he delivered it again the second night. This is really the fifth time he has delivered it. Someone said to me when he made his first speech, "That's about all that brother Colley will deliver." So far that is all he has given, and if he should have anything else, I would like to hear it. I would like to weigh it carefully.

I *know* that he is jittery, because a few minutes ago, brother Leroy Garrett wrote a note to me on which he asked, "What is the home address of brother Roy Harris?" I wrote down "Brixey, Missouri" and handed the note back to him. And the little exchange scared brother Colley. Did you hear the way he took on about it? But that's correct. Brother Harris' address is Brixey, Missouri, and brother Garrett got all of that wonderful information. That was the wonderful question he asked me which got brother Colley so nervous and distraught. A man certainly must be a little scared when he gets that jittery over a brother writing a question and getting such an answer in return.

Brother Colley, settle down, and let's keep this on a high plane tonight. Let us just debate the issue. I want to set forth for you a few of the things I have said. My brother accused me of not referring to the scriptures in my first speech. I am sure that is also an indication of his nervousness, for I alluded to the word of God as proof. You will recall that I began with the subject of priesthood, and I showed you that in the very beginning, to have a religion there were three components necessary and essential, that three vital factors were required to guarantee its perpetuity upon the earth. In the first place there had to be an altar. In the second place, there had to be a priest. In the third place there had to be a sacrifice. I pointed out to you that God first of all sent his people to a primary school, and this school is what we call the Patriarchal Dispensation. In it, He gave them the elementary teaching with reference to all three of these things. Then I pointed out to you that the God of heaven led his people out of the Egyptian bondage, and took them to the foot of the smoking mountain, and from that moun-

tain declared unto them that if they were obedient to His commands and would hearken unto all of His words, that He would make them a kingdom of priests.

I then pointed out to you that this people refused to be faithful unto God. They did not obey His covenant. In the two essentials for a kingdom of priests they miserably failed their God. In the first place, they called for an earthly mediator because they were afraid to listen to the voice of God personally. In the second place they went off after idolatry at the very time when God was giving them the law. They forfeited their right to become a kingdom *of* priests and they became a kingdom *with* priests. So for a period of fifteen hundred years more, God sent them to the elementary school which we call the Jewish Dispensation,

At the conclusion of that time, God, through the blood of His Son, purchased us and made us a kingdom of priests. I pointed out to you from Hebrews 10:21-25 that this imposed upon us a great responsibility as well as the privilege of ministering unto our God as priests. Then I went to 1 Peter 4:10,11 and pointed out that "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability that God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever. Amen."

My brother calls that factious teaching. He denies that the affirmation I made in my speech of the universality of the priesthood of all believers is a scriptural doctrine, and labels it as factious teaching. He said that my first speech was made by a factionist, and while it was a pretty speech, there was nothing to it, Thus brother Flavil Colley stands indicted before the court of Almighty God and before this intelligent audience present tonight, as designating a speech which sought to make only one application, and that is the application of God's eternal purpose as respects the universality of the priesthood, as nothing, folly and tripe! I would suffer my right arm to be severed from my body, and pray that, my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, before I would ever stand up, and motivated by ani-

mosity and malice toward a group of my brethren, affix such a label to a speech seeking to remain close to the Book. I set forth God's divine teaching, and did it with no thought of malice or animosity toward my brother, but in despair he labels it as foolish, empty and ridiculous. How far will men go in their attempts to justify their false doctrines and sectarian practices? To what depths will they stoop?

Will they seek to do away with those who oppose them by delving into personalities? Does my brother think that by threatening me with what he shall say about brother Garrett at Cockrell Hill, that he can keep me from setting forth the truth to this audience? Does he think that I would come from Saint Louis only to be daunted by his threats to dip down into the tar bucket and smear the characters of men? I tell you, my friends, I am made of a different kind of metal than that. Let him go just as deep as he wishes. I refuse to go with him, but standing upon the mountain heights of God's eternal truth, I will declare unto you the eternal priesthood of all believers as set forth in the word of God. Let him label it foolish and ridiculous. Let him stoop as low in personalities as he cares to go. I refuse to follow him in that either tonight or tomorrow night, I did not come for that. That is one of the tactics of a factionist. It is not the method of a man who loves his God. All the threats that brother Colley can make of what he is going to do to me, or to brother Garrett, will not daunt me from staying with the Book of God which he said I have refused to teach.

I pointed out to you next of all that I arraigned this system upon the basis that it creates a special professional caste and for a price places in their hands the accomplishing of the service of God on behalf of the church—that is the very work of priesthood. Therefore you have a hired priest, I pointed out again that it nullifies the use of the gifts of all by concentrating the right to serve publicly in the hands of the few. I showed you in the third place that it destroys the divine doctrine of equality as set forth in 2 Corinthians 8:13,14.

I again demonstrated that it elevates above his fellows one who is recognized as the minister of the church. Then I asserted unto you that my chief objection to this system thus far is its unwarranted arrogating of the rights and privileges of all the



ministers of Christ into the hands of the few. My brethren, I want you to know that in the church of the Living God, priesthood is just as wide as ministry and ministry is as wide as priesthood. Every man who is a child of God is a minister. Every one of God's ministers is God's priest. Now if it is right to hire a man to be the minister of the church, it is right to hire him to be the priest of the church. And if it is right to place his name out in front, whatever that may be, whether Flavil Colley or Homer Putnam Reeves; or if it is the name of Leonard Mullins on the church stationery as the minister, do you know what that amounts to?

These brethren are doing exactly the same thing for which they condemn the Christian Church which puts "Reverend" in front of the name, for when a man calls himself "Reverend John Doe, Minister" do you not realize that in his use of the first term he takes that which belongs exclusively to God and makes it inclusive of man: and when he uses the last term as a title, he takes what is inclusive of all the servants of God and makes it exclusively his own. So these men are falling into the very same practice which they condemn as sectarian.

My friends, if you are going to place on your signboards the names of the ministers of the congregation, you'll have to publish your church record, because they are all ministers of God. The whole truth is that the word "ministry" in the New Testament was never used as a designatory term for one specific kind of service to God, but it is a general term which applies to everything that is done to the glory of God and in acknowledgement of the sovereignty of the precious Lord who tonight sits upon His throne.

My brother does not like for me to read from men like David Lipscomb. Do you know why? It is because they are "factionists" on this issue, as he says I am. They taught the same doctrine, and according to him one who teaches it is a factionist. Therefore, David Lipscomb was a factionist. J. A. Harding was a factionist. James A. Allen is a factionist.

I want to read you a' little more from that factionist, David Lipscomb, as he wrote in *Gospel Advocate*, Volume 15, page 845: "The anxiety of the churches for able preachers, the manner in

which they deprive their members of all opportunity to develop their desire and talent for teaching, make it necessary to provide some outside and extraordinary means for making able, finished preachers, before they are permitted to offend the fastidious tastes or shock the sensitive nerves of the refined and delicate in the church or the world." Isn't that a good description of the reason why we have fallen into the modern pastor system which has now been embraced<sup>1</sup>?

David Lipscomb goes on to say: "The great work of the church is to do its whole work and engage every member in the performance of the work. The feeding of the hungry, the visiting of the sick, the clothing of the naked, are as much to be attended to as the preaching to the world. Instead of paying all the money to one individual in order to have him preach fancy and taking sermons to the church or the world, all must be encouraged to engage in the worship. All must personally participate in the work." And for that, my brother comes along tonight and announces to the world that David Lipscomb is a factionist,

Now I want to read to you from J. N. Armstrong. His article is titled, "What Makes the Church Strong?" It was first published in "Living Message" about 1924 and has been reproduced here in its exactitude in "The Truth" published by brother J. D. Phillips of Austin, Texas. He says: "I believe we are unwilling to build churches after the model of the New Testament. It is hardly worthwhile to plead with Christians to hold fast to the New Testament form of worship and organization. They cannot be content with it. It does not satisfy. There is to them something else better. There is hardly one Christian in ten that has the New Testament conception of the church. Nearly all of them have a sectarian conception."

Brother Armstrong continues: "I don't believe it would be possible to write a history of our present day churches, that is the strongest ones in the country and not reckon with the minister of that church. I mean there would be no history that did not encircle him. His leadership in that church would be an essential part of that history. He could not be passed over in silence. It would not be a faithful history if he were not made prominent. But in the history of the work of the New

Testament churches, no such minister was to be reckoned with. In every case where a preacher is mentioned at all in connection with the work of a church, that preacher has his plans to move on, and that church has no plans to secure another to fill his place or to take up his work. But with us in the very strongest churches, if the minister begins to plan to change places the church begins to look around for another minister. They cannot survive without our minister. If he resigns and vacates before the church finds one to take his place, a number of preachers are invited one at a time to preach for that ministerless church that the church may sample them and make a selection. Imagine if you can this chapter in the history of the New Testament church. It is useless, brethren, to oppose the pastor system, when we are fast developing it, yea, when we have largely embraced it already." And for that statement, J. N. Armstrong, once president of Harding College, is labeled a factionist by brother Colley. Yes, that will make brother Armstrong a factionist. But I'll pass on a little bit farther.

Here is the Apostolic Times, for June 1953. "The idea that each congregation needs a preacher in the pulpit continuously is a wrong idea. There is not an example in the New Testament where an inspired man stood in one pulpit from Sunday to Sunday and preached to the same people on much the same subject. Preachers went about preaching to those unsaved. The elders stayed at home and taught the congregation or developed it in gospel work. Though Paul or Timothy were stationed some time with a congregation, there is no evidence that either of them preached regularly for the congregation. I believe such a practice is unscriptural." That was written by E. C. Fuqua, Fort Worth, Texas, and so that makes brother Fuqua a factionist. We're getting a lot of factionists tonight, aren't we?—a lot of them! But advocating that doctrine makes a man a factionist. So David Lipscomb is a factionist. J. N. Armstrong is a factionist. James A. Harding is a factionist. James A. Allen is a factionist. E. C. Fuqua is a factionist. I'll challenge my brother to find a gospel preacher in the days of Lipscomb who wasn't a factionist according to his definition. But I want to say regarding the heresy with which he brands us, that "After the way which *he* calls heresy, so worship we the God of our fathers."

Now I would like to read from the Apostolic Times, January, 1951. Brother James A. Allen, apparently another factionist, says: "The body cannot import an outsider or artificial member to do all or most of its work for hire. To do this is for the body to commit suicide, retarding and dwarfing the growth of its own members until they are seized with paralysis and unable to function. To say that the minister is under the jurisdiction of the elders and that they have the power to hire and fire him does not change the fact that he is the one important man in the congregation and without him the congregation is impotent and helpless and cannot satisfactorily conduct its own services. He is the one man for whom the congregation provides a manse and whose maintenance requires much if not all of the money contributed. In no sense can the elders claim to be his equal in standing or influence, except in the power to hire and just sometimes in the power to fire. In many cases before the elders can dismiss him, he dismisses them." So brother Allen becomes a factionist. There are a lot of factionists in the world, are there not? As a matter of fact, I think about everyone is a factionist except brother Colley, and if he keeps on I would not be surprised if we should not entertain a sort of sneaking suspicion about his standing.

Now I want to resume my objections to the hireling ministry system as it is practiced by the churches of Christ in Dallas. My next objection to it is:

6. It steals from qualified men the right to edify the congregation of which they are members, shackles their thinking and muzzles their mouths. In a congregation of 800 believers only one man is allowed to parade across the platform and that is the man who is there because he gets paid for being there. The man who has contracted to be there because of the money he gets out of it. Our brother J. W. Garvey, writing in Apostolic Times, in 1873, uttered one of the most outstanding statements I have read outside of God's word, and I would like to have you listen to it.

"There is no doubt that in the ordinary Lord's Day meeting of the apostolic churches quite a number of brethren took part in the speaking and praying. This is clear to anyone who will read carefully the fourteenth chapter of First Corin-

thians." Brother Colley said when I got to that chapter he would be there. Brother McGarvey beat us both there. When he gets there I want him to tackle brother McGarvey on the subject. McGarvey continues: "It is true that the instructions contained in that chapter are mostly given to persons possessed with spiritual gifts. But if when men possessed with such gifts were in the church, it was not best that any one of them should ordinarily occupy the entire time, why should we think it best to reverse the rule in the absence of such gifts? Surely we have no right to make such a change unless there be something in the absence of spiritual gifts which demands it, a proposition that will hardly be affirmed. In the beginning of the Reformation the Scripture precedent just mentioned was recognized and the brethren generally undertook to restore it to practice."

Now they are called factionists if they undertake to restore it. That is the difference and it shows the sad state or condition into which we have fallen. We have drifted so far from the original position of the reformers and restorationists that the Scripture precedent is no longer recognized and a man becomes a factionist if he contends for the very thing those worthies were willing to die for. I thank my God that I can be branded a factionist by brother Colley for standing where J. W. McGarvey stood on this issue.

Now when he gets to 1 Corinthians 14 we will let him battle with brother McGarvey who wrote in 1873. But he may say brother McGarvey was prejudiced. I wonder if he would say Robert Young was prejudiced—Robert Young, author of Young's Analytical Concordance and Young's Translation of the Bible? On 1 Corinthians 14:26, he says: "From this and other passages it is clear that the upbuilding of the church was not confined then as now, to one, or at most two, of the congregation, but was the privilege of all the members. And though such a practice is liable to abuse (James 3:1), it is possible that its entire disuse has led to still greater evils obvious to all, that is the quenching of the Spirit," My friends, I urge then that this system which you employ in Dallas is an unscriptural system, because it steals from qualified men the right to edify the congregation of which they are members. It shackles their thinking and muzzles their mouths.

7. I now affirm that it is an unscriptural system because it robs God of much of the talent of which he has made the church the depository. I would that you follow me carefully in this reasoning.

In Matthew 25:14,15 (perhaps I should repeat the passages each time since my brother does not catch the Bible reference I make), Jesus delivered his goods into the hands of His servants, for the Bible says: "The kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every one according to his several ability, and straightway took his journey."

Anything which heaven entrusts to us must be improved upon by use. "Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury." (Matt. 25:27).

As stewards of God's grace all are obligated to minister to others according to the ability given by God. "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (1 Peter 4:10,11). We have been accorded the manifold grace of God. As good stewards we are to minister the gifts that have been given into our hands, one to another that is, *mutually*.

God never gave a useless gift. Every man who has the gift of teaching must use it. Every man who has the gift of exhortation must exhort (Rom. 12:4-8). In the primitive church the brethren were to earnestly desire the higher gifts (1 Cor. 12:31). One of these gifts to be earnestly sought after was prophesying. "Desire earnestly the best gifts, but rather that you may prophesy" (1 Cor. 14:39). He who prophesied edified the church (1 Cor. 14:14). This gift was utilized when the whole church came together into one place. "When the whole church be come together into one place" (1 Cor. 14:23).

Thus every man is instructed to earnestly desire the gift of speaking to the whole assembly for their edification. Since God never encourages us to desire something for which He has provided no use, it is evident that His plan provides for all who have the ability to speak to the assembly of which they are

members. That this is correct is evidenced by 1 Corinthians 14:31 which authorizes all to edify, exhort and comfort the assembly, one by one.

Now any system which suppresses the talents of the many does not call them forth and exercise them for the good of all, and robs God of the glory of all these lost talents. Friends, if the man who hid his lord's money in a napkin (Luke 19:20) was condemned because of his fear, what will be the fate of those who take the hireling system blanket and smother out all of the talents given to God's other servants?

Is not our *service* worth as much as our *money*? It is God who gives power to get wealth just as he gives us gifts. Do we not stress that every person should contribute of his money when the church meets on the Lord's Day? Does not brother Colley encourage everyone to give their money? Would it be scriptural to set up a system in which only the wealthiest man in the congregation could contribute? Could the rest of the church fulfill the command, "Let everyone of you lay by in store," merely by watching another contribute? Then how can we fulfill the command, "As every man hath received the gift even so minister the same one to another" merely by watching another man get up and always do the work, simply because he has more talent?

Is not the idea of always putting forward the man who has the greatest store of talent to the exclusion of all others, equivalent to allowing only the wealthiest man to contribute and forbidding all others, seeing that God is the giver of both wealth and talent? In view of Christ's evaluation of the two mites cast into the treasury by the poor widow, is it not possible that he might esteem a five minute talk from a consecrated humble brother, far greater than the professional orations of those who from their abundance of education contribute great gifts to the treasury of intellect?

Does not 1 Peter 4:10,11 teach that God can only be glorified in all things when every man who has received the gift ministers the same mutually to all others according to the ability which God gives? Then a system which operates for hire and gain and

provides special opportunities for one person to minister, and excludes others, does not glorify God.

The inventor of a machine is honored only when every part of the mechanism functions in proper relation to every other part, each contributing to the power of the whole without friction. A man's body is considered strong only so long as every member is able to serve in its created capacity. So long as a man cannot stand alone, but requires the support of another, he is a weakling regardless of size. And the bigger he gets the worse it is for him, because he is less able to walk, seeing that the addition of extra fat is just that much more blubber to carry around on emaciated pipe-stem legs. Yet, that is the condition of the church. Our brethren boast about the number of additions. They are merely adding blubber to a weakling. You make the church less able to walk all of the time, and more dependent upon an important crutch. It is only a slot machine that is so geared it delivers the goods when the money is dropped in and the handle pulled. The Lord's church was never intended to be made a spiritual slot machine.

8. My next objection to this ministry system as practiced by the churches in Dallas is that it usurps and infringes upon the work and prerogatives of God's eldership. In Acts 20:28 an apostolic injunction demands that the elders shepherd the flock of God among them: "Take heed unto yourselves and all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers; to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with the blood of his own." The word for feed is the Greek *poimaino*, which means to tend as a shepherd. It includes all that is required of a shepherd.

We learn the true work of a shepherd by reading Ezekiel 34:2-4, and I trust that those in this audience who are elders will listen, as we find the work of a shepherd described. "Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds. Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves. Should not the shepherds feed the flock? You eat the fat, you clothe you with the wool, and you kill them that are fed, but you feed not the flock. The diseased have you not strengthened, neither have you healed that which was sick, neither have you bound up that which was broken, neither have you brought again that which was driven



away, neither have you sought that which was lost, but with force and with cruelty you have ruled them."

Now this shows us that it is the duty of shepherds to strengthen the diseased members. It is the duty of the pastors or shepherds to heal that which is sick. It is the duty of the shepherds to bind up that which is broken. It is the duty of the shepherds to bring again that which was driven away. It is the duty of shepherds to seek that which is lost. It is the duty of shepherds to protect the sheep against the wolves. These are duties of the shepherds!

So, my friends, when you hire a man to come in and do these things you are just hiring a pastor. You can call him what you please. You can label him minister, evangelist, or anything you want to put down. When you hire a man to do the work of pastoring, that is, feeding or shepherding the flock, you have a pastor. And he is a hired pastor. The personal responsibilities of the shepherds cannot be transferred to a mercenary who rounds up sheep because he gets paid for it, and who will gallop off to another flock as soon as he gets a better offer. It is the personal duty of shepherds to seek out the sheep and to be among them. "As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered, so will I seek out my sheep and deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day" (Ezek. 34:12).

Brother J. D. Tant, who was apparently another factionist, said that a number of years ago a great many Mexicans in southern Texas were excellent shepherds, but he said that those Mexicans learned they could sit under the shade of a tree and could get a shepherd dog that was trained to run out and rescue the strays, bark at them and get them back into line. He said that the Mexicans began to practice that procedure and a lot of elders who watched those shepherds decided maybe they could train a shepherd dog to go out and round up their strays for them, while they sat in the shade or kept their feet propped up on the front porch. Now I do not think that when brother Tant referred to shepherd dogs, that he had any personal reference to brother "Colley" but at the same time I want to make this clear to you and do not want you to forget that

is the same system which brother Taut condemned, and I also condemn. So, bless your dear life, that makes brother Tant another factionist, How many factionists are we going to find before this thing is over ?

Now in 1 Peter 5:1-3 (perhaps I should repeat that, for that is a scripture reference, brother Colley)—in 1 Peter 5:1-3 I read. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not of constraint but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock."

Thus the elders have a definite work to perform, a definite task and obligation which they must fulfill. But you may say that your elders are not qualified to do that, Then they have no business being elders. Who put them in there in the first place? If they cannot shepherd the flock they should not be in the office. If they cannot shepherd they should get out, But the mere fact that they are incapable and inefficient in doing their duty does not guarantee us the right or privilege to go out and substitute something for God's plan any more than it would be right for us to go out and establish a lodge to care for the needy when the church will not do it. If the elders are not doing it, let us train them until they can do it, and not get a hired substitute to do it. Let us get back to God's plan. Let us get back to the New Testament church. Let us return to that plan where evangelists will teach, train and develop elders; then get out of the way and let those elders take care of the flock, and feed them, while they go on and reproduce the same work in another place, and thus carry the gospel to the entire world of humanity. I thank you, and may God bless you.

## COLLEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Ketcherside, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen:

That speech was not as "pretty" as the last one. Not quite. I want all of you people that heard me say that brother Tant was a factionist, to put it down in your mind, Colley said it!!! Oh, yes. Colley DID NOT say it. When a man says that a man said a thing, and he didn't say it, what does that make out of him? I did not call brother David Lipscomb a factionist. What do you people think about a man that said Colley did thus and so, when he did not? I didn't call brother James A. Allen a factionist. I didn't call him a factionist. What do you think of a man that said brother Colley called Allen a factionist, when I didn't. I didn't call brother David Lipscomb a factionist. You heard someone say that I did. I did not do it! What do you think about that? What do you think about that? I do not need to go any further. Some conclusions are not necessary. I did not say these men were factionists. A factionist is one that will tear up churches. I don't think brother Tant, nor Lipscomb, nor any of these brethren ever did. I am talking about these factionists that press their hobby, and press their teaching that is unauthorized by God's Book, to the disruption of the churches. When he says that I called them factionists, you be the judge. I do not have to tell you. No, sir.

Now I will answer his speech. He accepted my definition of terms. He did not like for me to answer the last speech he made last night. He used some passages, and arguments he had not used before. I told him I would answer, if he did. Well, he did. I answered it, and he did not even thank me. Now to some more answers. Oratory regarding religion: He went back to the Old Testament priesthood. I wonder if he is trying to run the priests of the Levitical order like that of the Christian priesthood. Is that your idea, brother Ketcherside? Are you trying to do that? Some of the brethren in Scotland that believe one blend of this teaching, start out with the synagogue worship. They use the priesthood and synagogue order of worship and try to transfer it over into the New Testament order of worship. Let him clarify his argument. We will let him tell us what he does believe about that. Again: Sought to change God's order of priesthood—All the people shall serve.

Well, did all the Israelites serve? Or was it just those of the tribe of Levi? All the priests served. All of them weren't high priests. Only one was. I do not get this idea of a man going to the Old Testament to try to prove a New Testament proposition. I can't understand it. Revelation: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us to be a kingdom, to be priests." Well, that is all right. I accept that. Brethren in the church are called priests. That's right: All are priests—All are ministers. That's right, I accept that. I told you that last night, There's no variance there. All are to minister with the ability they have. That's right, I accept that, too. You know why? Because the Lord said so. 1 Peter 4:10 every man receives a gift, minister one to another. That's right. I accept that, I believe it. I teach it. My brethren practice it,

Any congregation that has a hireling preacher, that hires a preacher, is about like a pope. Ah, he *is* a nice fellow. No, he would not stoop low, would he? Brother Campbell talked about hirelings. Brother Campbell preached for a church, didn't he? Huh? Dr. MacKnight did, too. Yes, you introduced Campbell on many things, he preached for a church. He did not use "preach" like you use it. If he will take the passages I gave him in the beginning of this debate he will not be bothered about what men teach. Yes, he has preachers as overseers over the churches without elders. He will get to that some more, and when he does I'll show you his pastor system. He has been talking about hirelings all along! I want to get all of his speech. One man nullifies the gift of all, and the church has only one teacher. That isn't so. All the churches of Christ take the ability of the members that compose the congregations and use their ability. Yes, sir. We do it. We all do. The members of the church of Christ present this evening know I tell the truth, when I say that anything that you can do, the elders find out about it, and you're worked in the church in keeping with your ability. Yes, sir. But that is not what is hurting him, we will get to that in a few minutes. He says when one man does all the preaching it is the doctrine of Rome! Oh, yes! Now to 2 Corinthians 8:13,14. Some eased, some distressed, but by equality. That is in giving, brother Ketcherside. In giving. Well, what for? He says it is to tax the

members to pay for the preachers home. Brother Ketcherside, I do not want to misrepresent you, but do you mean to tell us that people give only to relieve the poor? I understand that they also give to support the gospel. And those that preach the gospel shall live by the gospel. I understand that, Now tell me that they don't do it? The minister's home is not the minister's. He doesn't own it. The Church owns the home. And the preacher will not live in it long, either. Most preachers don't. If you want to know why, I'll tell you. I have been preaching long enough to know that they move. I am glad the brethren have provided homes for the preachers. I did not live in one until a few years ago. They now have homes. They should have them, for the preacher to preach the gospel. The churches should do what God appointed them to do. The man that preaches the gospel should live of the gospel. If a home is required, get one. No. brother Ketcherside doesn't go to preach for a church! He conducts meetings, and they pay him for it, He has a home furnished. He lives in somebody's home, or they put him in a hotel, unless he takes a wigwam along. What's the DIFFERENCE? HE can go and stay two weeks, and HE is paid. HE says they should pay well. Yes, sir. What is the DIFFERENCE. Brother Ketcherside says he will tell us. When these hirelings go to a church and stay a year, and they put them in a house—Why every member should have a house. Of course when he walked up to receive his pay check for the two weeks work, did all the members get paid? Why didn't they receive checks? All those ministering members that THEY have, why don't they pay them? Now it is just whose ox is gored, isn't it. If preachers of the gospel are paid, they are hirelings. If Ketcherside and his group are paid, What are they? Well, that's all right.

How long can a preacher stay? Two years, two weeks? He says a preacher becomes a part of the church if he stays very long. Yes, sir. I've been part of every church I have worked with. I intend to be. I am subject to the elders. When they said go, I went. I suppose I'll go again, too. (Laughter.) Most preachers know what I am talking about.

Yes, sir, brother Ketcherside is a nice fellow. Here is what he said about gospel preachers. Yes, those gospel preachers that preach the gospel and live by the gospel. He objects to

that, said you could not preach the gospel to the church: Therefore you are not gospel preachers, if you live with the church, and preach to the church. Here is his estimate of preachers of the gospel. This was taken from the tape, recording his speeches. You are little "hirelings," that's what you are. He is so nice he would not get down very low. No? not very. "Selling the church down the river." Yes, preachers and elders are "selling the church down the river." "Hireling system." "Professionals for gain. You are "mercenary." You're "grasping and squeeze the money" out of the hearts of members of the body of Christ, and put it in your pocket and roll in wealth. Not a word of truth in that, Gospel preachers are the best in the world. They have the greatest work on earth. God bless everyone of them regardless of the things that he says about them. You preachers are my brethren. I'm for you, because God's for you. These men say such nice things about you. "You're peddling the gospel across the pulpit like peddling prunes across the counter." He's a nice fellow. You gospel preachers should know that! "One man pastor system." I do not know of any preachers in the Church of Christ that are pastors. If they become "pastors" they shouldn't. But you preachers are not over churches. *Their* preachers are over churches that are unorganized. That's right. He says that Titus had all authority, and therefore *their* preachers have that authority. I will not get on that now. I'll just hold it for a while.

Now some more: "Hireling pastor system." "Worse than the Catholic Church." He sure is a good man. Oh, yes! Brother Colley called attention to his hobby. He sure is getting low. "Lutherans too honest to twist the scriptures," only gospel preachers of the church of Christ will do that! "Modern mercenary heretics." Who are? Gospel preachers. He's a good man. He wouldn't get down and be nasty like Colley. No. "Hireling clergy," you're hireling mercenaries! That's what it means. Number twelve: "Professional dispensers of the truth." Oh, yes. Professionals. You're like a soda clerk. You walk up and pull the handle and dispense the gospel. Push it up and you stop it. Oh, yes. Who said so? Brother Ketcherside. And he knows! "Selling and peddling the gospel." He's a good fellow. He would not say anything bad. Fourteen: "Im-

ported crutch." The church is leaning on you preachers, you imported crutches. Fifteen: "Large salaried fledglings." That's just fifteen, that's all. Probably have some more by tomorrow night. Yes, brother Colley is low down. Why low down? Brother Ketcherside, I said anybody was a heretic, or a hobbyist, or a factionist who divided churches over a doctrine that isn't in the Book. Now that's who I said was a factionist. I have an idea he knows who I mean.

He said I would not follow him. Also said I had arranged this system in these Dallas churches. Oh, yes, the churches have sold out. Now, all of the churches should get these fellows OUT. Watch for their teaching in the congregations. All of the elders—That's your business. Get them out of the churches. We note again: Hired hands, going back to the Dark Ages. Who sent the church through the Dark Ages? It wasn't the preachers of the gospel. It was the elders. When an elder had power enough to be bishop over a diocese, over two or three churches, that's what caused the Dark Ages. That is the thing that will cause it again, when a preacher is placed over churches. They can disorganize a church and take it over, too. I'm not mad at anybody, I just want to warn you.

Brother Ketcherside talked about his wife, going to buy a pretty hat. Why that does not have anything to do with this proposition. Not any of it does. Now to the history of the church, etc. Now to 1 Corinthians 14: I want the little black book. That's it, the LITTLE BLACK BOOK. That's all we need. Do you have one, young preachers? I told you to bring it. I wanted you to do it. Brother Ketcherside, will you take the same position on 1 Corinthians 14 that you did with brother Wallace? You said the order of worship began in 1 Corinthians 11:2. Do you do it now? Do you? Will you take the same position now? Do you want to take it back? It's in print right here. (Colley pointing to Wallace-Ketcherside debate). Brother Ketcherside speaking, page 30, "Let us turn to 1 Corinthians 14. Find it. First of all I'm sure that most of you recognize that beginning back with chapter eleven of 1 Corinthians, verse 2, the apostle says, "I praise you brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." Now that is his introduction to 1 Cor-

inthians 14. He said the thought began in 1 Corinthians 11:2. Do you know why he went back to 1 Corinthians 11:2 with brother Wallace. It is here in print, We know why, because he told us. Investigation will show that 1 Corinthians 11th chapter has to do with the Lord's Supper. You have your little black books? Paul is talking about the Lord's Supper. He concluded his lesson about the Lord's Supper with, "If any man is hungry let him eat at home; that your coming together be not unto judgment. And the rest will I set in order whensoever I come." (1 Cor. 11:34). THE REST WILL I SET IN ORDER WHENSOEVER I COME. He closed the thought about the Lord's Supper, and changes the subject to something else. Now look at it. Here's what it says in 1 Corinthians 12:1, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." He continues through the twelfth chapter talking about spiritual gifts. The whole chapter, spiritual gifts. At the close of the 12th chapter Paul said, "But desire earnestly the greater gifts. And moreover a most excellent way show I unto you." I'll show you a better WAY. Brother Ketcherside hasn't learned the better WAY. Now note the beginning of the thirteenth chapter, "If I speak with tongues of men and angels." In the ninth verse of this chapter Paul said these miraculous gifts were in PART. Now verse ten, "But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." Brother Ketcherside has not learned the better Way, nor that which was in PART.

Now the beginning of the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, "Follow after love; yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts." We continue in this chapter, now note the 23rd verse, "If therefore the whole church be assembled together and all speak with tongues, and there come in men unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say that ye are mad?" Unbelievers come in the church? Brother Ketcherside would have to take them OUT. He would have to take them out to preach the gospel to them. Can't preach the gospel to the church?—By the way, I asked brother Ketcherside if the Corinthian letters were part of the gospel, and he did not answer! Brother Ketcherside, write that down, and answer. He tells me, "Now I'm giving a passage of scripture," he gives so few he wants me to know for sure. I will. Now you listen: You did not answer, *Are 1st and 2nd Corin-*



*thians part of the gospel?* You said Romans and Galatians were not. I do not think it will make much difference, my friends, regarding his answer, I believe he will have to take the position, they are not part of the gospel. Now back to the thought: if unbelievers came into the services, even during miraculous days, they were not to speak so they couldn't understand.

Now to verse 26, 1 Corinthians 14, "What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." Do you have a *soloist*? Do you have a *soloist* in the church? If a man comes into the assembly that wanted to edify with a psalm can he sing a solo? Hey, I have a psalm. Let me sing it. Let me sing it according to my ability! Now to verse 31, "For ye all can prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be exhorted." This is the passage where he rides his hobby. You can hear it over and over. What is it? All may learn. All may be exhorted. Now some more.

Verso 34, "Let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also sayeth the law." Oh, yes, I have had the anti-class brethren use this passage in debate, too. They are a faction in the church. Many of them are friends of mine, in fact some of them are present tonight. Now in verse 37, "If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord." Commands of the Lord about what? Miraculous gifts. But watch again (verse 37) "But if any man is ignorant, let him be ignorant." Paul began the 12th chapter with, "I would not have you IGNORANT." IGNORANT of what? SPIRITUAL GIFTS. He is ready to close the fourteenth chapter, and he is talking about IGNORANCE. "But if any man is ignorant, let him be ignorant." Now notice how he closes the chapter, "Wherefore my brethren, desire earnestly to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues. But let all things be done decently and in order." That is the closing of the fourteenth chapter, the fifteenth chapter changes the subject, and thought, and discusses the resurrection. The

## TWELFTH, THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CHAPTERS ARE REGULATING SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

Brother Ketcherside, if 1 Corinthians the fourteenth chapter means what you say it does, you'll make infidels. That is right. That chapter (vs. 34) says let your women keep silence in the church. It is not permitted them to speak. Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16, "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." I want to know in keeping with your position, that this is regulating ordinary gifts, if that is the rule, I want you to tell us by what authority, a woman sings in the church. When she sings she is not silent. When she teaches in song, "Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs," she is not silent. Brother Ketcherside says this is the chapter, and chapters, that regulate the worship of the church. He says the rule for the regulation of ordinary gifts continues after the miraculous gifts cease. I deny it, It was a special letter for the regulation —Yes, special teaching for the regulation of miraculous gifts. That is what 1 Corinthians 12, 13, and 14 are for. He goes to this for the basis of all that he does. And the ministering members, the male members, speak one at a time in keeping with their ability. I want him in view of this fact, and if the rule remains, if it is in force now, to tell us how a woman sings in the church. Harmonize the two passages. I dare him to try it. I dare him to try it. Let your women keep silent in the churches. It is not permitted unto them to speak. If 1 Corinthians is not miraculous, if the rule remains, then show us how "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" can be obeyed by women. How can a woman do it? How can she do it? Yes, sir. I told you I'd be there. I will stay with it. And I want you to tell us how a woman can make the confession. How can she remain silent if the rule of 1 Corinthians 14 is still in force. He says the rule remains, but the miraculous gifts are gone. If the rule remains, a woman can't speak in the churches. She can't sing. She can't teach. She has to keep silent, if the rule is in force. Now I have debated this with my anti-class brethren, and I know where I stand. They did not do anything with it, and you will not, either. Yes, sir. Harmonize those passages. Oh, yes, he says 1 Corinthians is still in force. He

goes to it time after time. How much time do I have? Ten minutes. Thank you, brother Swim.

First Corinthians 14 is the basis of his whole system. That is the basis of all of it, It is regulating MIRACULOUS GIFTS. I challenge him tonight to harmonize these passages of scripture. If the rule is in force, the women can't teach in song. When she teaches in song, she's violating the regulation, of the very thing that Paul was talking about; if he was not regulating miraculous gifts. Now show us. Harmonize these passages of scripture. Harmonize them. Don't come up here and misrepresent me. I didn't say you were making infidels otherwise. I said if you sustain your position on this passage. You brethren DO hold this position, and you cannot harmonize these passages of scripture.

Furthermore, on Romans 12. Turn to Romans 12 (1 to 6) in your little black book, boys. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God which is your spiritual service. And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. For I say through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith. For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office; so we, who are many are one body in Christ and severally members one of another." Brother Ketcherside said in his debate with brother Wallace, these gifts were not miraculous. I do not care which position he takes. Suppose it wasn't miraculous. Now further: "For as we have many members in one body, all members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ." Brother Ketcherside, the body of Christ has many members. All members have not the same OFFICE. We are all OFFICERS in the church, aren't we? We are all officers. Brother Ketcherside, why not place the names of all the officers on a board in front of the church building? Why do you want to just place the names of the elders there? Why not use all the names of the officers? I

heard you use this in St. Louis—An officered congregation? What is an officered congregation I want to know about that. I want to know what it is. Yes, sir. "All members have not the same office." Once more: I am not going to wait until your last speech for you to say something about this. I am going to give you a chance at it now. Here it is: Romans 12: "Or ministry, let us give, ourselves to our ministry" (vs. 8.) "He that ruleth with diligence." Those that rule are the elders. We all believe that. Ministering could not be a' preacher though? Oh, no, no! "Ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry." What minister? Any minister. All of us are ministers. He said so. That is right; we are all officers, too. I want you to define that word. That 's what I am trying to make you do. We are all officers, too. Yes, sir. Now, brethren, when you call an officers meeting we will all go. We'll all go. Officers meeting. "As the body has many members and all members have not the same office." Yes, I know what it means. Have not the same office. Have not the same office. There WERE MINISTERS. There WERE ELDERS. Let those that rule do it with diligence. Here are two different gifts. Are they ordinary gifts. Probably were. Call them ordinary gifts. Many members in one body and all members have not the same office. ONE IS MINISTERING. Oh, it COULDN'T BE that, "If you put the brethren in mind of these things you shall be A GOOD MINISTER OF JESUS CHRIST." Of course, Timothy was a minister. But he COULDN'T PREACH to a church like that! Brother Ketcherside says you cannot preach the gospel to the church, yet Timothy was in the church in Ephesus that had ELDERS in it. He was to preach sound doctrine according to the gospel. COULDN'T DO THAT?

Hear me, my friends, with due respect to all, and regarding the things I have said, I have no ill will against anyone. Sometimes it is necessary, yes I feel that it is necessary to sharply rebuke. Paul said to Timothy, Reprove, rebuke, and exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." I trust that all the rebukes and all reproofs that I have offered, shall have been by the word of God and in the same spirit that Timothy was commanded to do it. I want you to believe that. If I know my heart, and I believe I do, that is what I have tried to do. May God bless and keep you.

### KETCHERSIDE'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Swim having been called away, brother A. G. Hobbs is acting as time-keeper for my respondent, brother Colley, tonight. So it is a privilege and pleasure to address brother Colley and brother Hobbs, and you my brothers and sisters in Christ, and friends.

This is the final night of a discussion between brother Colley and myself on the proposition which was signed, and which I hold here, and shall now read. "The securing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders, as generally practiced among the churches of Christ in Dallas, is contrary to the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures." That proposition I have affirmed. The denial as it has been said, will be made by our brother Colley.

The burden which I assume as an affirmant demands that I prove that the system of ministry commonly practiced among the Dallas churches is contrary to the New Testament Scriptures. It is a matter of divine testimony that "No man can serve two masters." It is equally a matter of human experience that one cannot be under two diverse and antagonistic laws at the same time. Likewise common logic sustains the view that we cannot labor at the same time under two conflicting and contradictory systems which attempt to attain unto the same end. It is true that if there be no incompatibility in the two systems, they may exist and be utilized harmoniously, but if they are irreconcilable, one must surely be overthrown, or the cause which they seek to establish will perish.

Our discussion is about two antithetical systems, that is, two systems which are opposed to each other. They could both be wrong, but they cannot both be scripturally right. I am obligated to prove that one of these exists in contravention to the sacred Scriptures. Before me then must lie two avenues of approach. I may use either or both of them. I may either directly attack the system which I believe is unscriptural, or on the other hand I may prove the other system is scriptural. If I produce reasoning to sustain either of these aspects I have fulfilled my obligation. If I show that the one under attack by me is unscriptural, or if on the other hand, I show that there is a scriptural

procedure laid down, and demonstrate that there is a conflict between that and the thing I oppose, it is quite evident I have sustained my position from that angle.

For instance now, and by way of example, if I want to prove the unscripturalness of sprinkling for baptism, I have recourse either to a direct attack upon sprinkling as such, showing that it is in opposition to God's revelation upon the subject of baptism; or I may demonstrate the scriptural teaching on baptism with such indisputable authority that the rational mind with reverence for God's law must instantaneously reject sprinkling or any other human device that is offered as a substitutionary measure. But tonight, lest there be any doubt in the minds of those who are present to listen and who may have previously held that this discussion is over a mere matter of expediency, I wish to employ both methods of attack.

Our God is a God of order. When he created the human body he made provision for its growth to maturity. He left out no process essential to the attainment of our physical well-being. Friends, is it reasonable to suppose that he who formed the physical body and made such wonderful arrangements for its continued sustenance and perpetuity, should bring into existence the spiritual body of His Son, according to an eternal purpose, but leave it without a revealed system of edification, and subject to blind experimentation by fallible men?

The Bible teaches that the church is to grow by the joint participation of every member in any sphere of spiritual activity for which they have the aptitude divinely given. In Romans 12:3-8, I read: "For I say through the grace given unto me, to *every man* that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think: but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to *every man* the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body and all members have not the same office (or function) so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace given unto us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth on teaching; he that exhorteth on exhortation; he that giveth let

him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth with diligence; he that showeth mercy with cheerfulness."

Now I have called to your attention that all the gifts given by the Lord are to be exercised. If in a congregation of 400 members there are fifty people who are competent and capable of exercising the gift of edification, they are all to be granted the privilege of doing so. Any system which is set up, which forbids a man who has that gift and ability, from standing before his fellows to edify them, which takes his rights and prerogatives by stealing them and hands them over to another, and especially to one who is a hireling for the purpose of receiving them, such a system is in contravention to God's divine truth and defeats the very purpose for which the church of God's Son was established.

Again, the members of the primitive church were to seek to excel to the edifying of the church. That was not said of one member but "I would that all of you would seek to excel to the edifying of the church" (1 Cor. 14:12). This record says, "Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, *seek* that ye may excel to the edifying of the church." Thus each member of the local church was to seek to excel only in the edifying of the body. This included speaking in and to the church. It also included teaching others as a part of that edification. "Yet *in the church* I had rather *speak* five words with my understanding that by my voice I might *teach others* also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. 14:19). Now please remember that in the primitive church every member was told to seek to excel to the edifying of the church, and that in the church it was his duty that he speak with his voice so that he might teach others also. Therefore, everyone was to seek to have the ability to speak to others.

Not all might have the ability. They could not all be prophets, but all who were prophets were to utilize their gift for the upbuilding, the edification, exhortation and comfort of the church. To exhort, means to stir up, to edify means to build up, to comfort means to cheer up. So every member was to seek to build up, stir up and cheer up *the* rest of the membership. In 1 Corinthians 14:3,4 we learn that this included speaking to men, and that such speaking was for edification of

the church. "But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself, but he that prophesieth edifieth the church."

Friends, listen, the inspired writers condemned those who ought to have been teachers, but through lack of exercise had not developed themselves and still had to be fed on first principles. In Hebrews 5:12-14, the record says: "For when for the time you ought to be teachers you have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat. For everyone that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who *by reason of use* (I want to emphasize that) have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Notice that you ought to be teachers! Who ought to be? Every member of the body of Christ ought to be a teacher.

Now I want to ask this question. What do you suppose the apostle Paul would say about the system at this time extant in Dallas which places the public edification of the church in the hands of a hired man and thus crucifies the hope of the brethren developing through exercise or use, by refusing to allow them the opportunity? This practice in the churches is about the equivalent of the ancient Chinese custom. When their little female babies were born the first thing they did was to bind their feet until they could not use them. The result was that for many years in China there were thousands of female cripples, because they were never allowed to exercise their feet properly. They were virtually crippled from birth because of this cruel custom.

Yet in the churches of the living God today, there has arisen a custom by which the church is kept in a crippled state because the members are not allowed to use and exercise their talents as they should. They are bound down, bound up and bound around in such a manner by a custom which operates for gain, a mercenary system in which men exchange the right of preaching the word of God for the ability to give a dollar or two to have someone else do this work for them. And instead of seek-



ing to excel to the edifying of the church as the Book teaches, it is an unknown thing for men to have such a desire. They know there is no use of seeking to that end for they would not get a chance to edify if they developed ever so much ability.

God's plan is that the church shall be self edifying, that its growth come not as the result of a work performed for it, or on it, but as the result of work performed by it, by itself, that is by its own membership, and not by an imported functionary. "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him all things which is the head, even Christ, from whom *the whole body* fitly joined together and compacted by that which *every joint* supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of *every part*, maketh increase of the body unto the *edifying of itself in love*" (Eph. 4:15, 16).

Then it follows that a congregation which is not able to stand alone and to build itself up, but has to hire or import someone to do that, either: (1) does not speak the truth in love; (2) does not hold to the head, even Christ; (3) is not fitly joined together; or (4) does not know how to effectively work in every part. But instead of having a hired functionary to stand before us and do that work we ought, my friends, to develop the church to the place where it is able to do that and then send these men out into the gospel fields where God expects them to be. This idea of calling men in is not a New Testament one. In the days of old the gospel was sounded out. Today the gospel is sounded in. In days of old, men were sent to carry the gospel to the world. Today they are called in to carry some things which they call the gospel to the church.

This system is contrary to God's word, to the very essence of it, and to the plan for which our Saviour gave his life. As a matter of fact, in the New Testament, those congregations were always commended in which the membership was self-edifying and self-sustaining. And those congregations which were not thus, were commanded to develop to the degree where they could stand alone. I would like to call your attention to a place or two.

Take for example the church at Rome. Now, we have heard a lot about Rome, and we've heard a lot about the Roman letter.

Our brother has spoken much about it in the three nights just past. But in Homans 15:14 is a passage he has certainly overlooked. Here the great apostle Paul says: "And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that you also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another." That was the church at Rome. The brethren were able to admonish one another. They did not need someone to preach to them in order to keep alive their spiritual zeal. They were able to carry on this work of ministration and service to God, and able also to admonish one another. Now the words "one another" here are from the Greek term for "mutual or reciprocal." Thus we learn that here was a congregation that was able to mutually admonish. And the apostle said, "Brethren, you are full of all goodness and all knowledge."

But this pastor system which we have in this age of the world keeps the people in ignorance until they are unable to exercise themselves to the degree that they can develop the necessary aptitude to stand alone. In the church at Corinth, about which we have also heard, the apostle says, "How is it then, brethren, when you come together everyone of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation? Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. 14:26). When they came together in those days each contributed something to the service.

Robert Young, that great translator who gave us Young's Translation, and also Young's Analytical Concordance, said concerning this very verse, 1 Corinthians 14:26, that "It is observable that the edification was not left in the hands of one man, or at the most of two; but that a great many individuals participated when the church came together."

My brother attempts to offset the teaching on mutual ministry by saying, "We believe that every man is a minister. We believe that every man is a priest. It is not true, this charge that brother Ketcherside makes that the system we have here in Dallas precludes the possibility of others doing the work which God expects them to do. We have employed a great many teachers. We use a great many men and a great many women, and we give them all a chance to develop their talents." Now, I am asking him this question. Does he do that when the whole

church comes together into one place? Last night he mentioned his talk with those brethren who do not believe in the Sunday School, and I think he referred to them as anti-Sunday School brethren. Now when he is debating those brethren he affirms that this teaching is not in the public assembly, that they get off to themselves and do it in private. But when he gets into it with me, and wants to try and prove that they use these teachers in the New Testament sense, he declares that they use a great many of the brethren in the public services. Does he use them when the whole church comes together in one place, or does he use them in private? Which one is he going to take? If they use them when all come together into one place then he loses the argument with the anti-Sunday School brethren. If he still holds to the argument that it is private when they get off in those little rooms he is going to lose the argument with me.

I contend tonight that every brother has a perfect right to stand before the whole assembly of the living God of which he is a member, that 1 Corinthians 14 grants him that right, and says that when you are all come together into one place that *all* may prophesy one by one, that *all* may be comforted, and *all* may be edified. I am not talking about getting off in Sunday School rooms and there teaching some little group or bunch. I am talking about edifying the whole body. I deny that his system allows that. That is done by a hireling.

He insisted last night that we are all officers. Whether he did that to becloud the issue, or for what other purpose, I do not know. But one thing I do know and that is that if one of these congregations has its minister, he is an officer. You remember the other night I read off a list of a few of them. Here is one: The Sunset Church of Christ, Hollywood and Wentworth Streets. Here are the elders, here are the deacons, here is the minister—Homer Putnam Beeves. Now just suppose that on next Lord's Day morning, one of these elders, arose and said, "Brother Reeves, please sit down. I am one of the shepherds of this flock, and I am going to feed this flock today. I am going to exercise my privilege and take my responsibility. You sit down and let me edify today." Do you know who would get fired? The elder! He would have to take out of there like a cat with its tail afire. The congregation and the

minister could not tolerate such action. Why not? Because they would say that elder was usurping the place of someone. Whose place? That of the hired minister. They would insist that he got paid for doing the edifying and they would not allow one of the elders to do it.

Talk to me about giving everyone an equal chance to edify the church. If one of the elders over where Homer Putnam Reeves is the minister tried to get lip next Lord's Day, take his Bible, and tell brother Reeves to sit down and listen to him edify and teach the congregation, the while the preacher sat there like any other member, there would be an explosion. If the elder said, "Brother Reeves, you say you are just a minister, and that everyone else is also a minister, so you just sit down with the ministers. I'm a shepherd and I intend to feed this flock," they would vote that elder out and vote brother Reeves in. Tell me that they all have an equal chance to edify.

But my brother does not like for me to refer to what is going on in Dallas. He signed a proposition with reference to the churches in Dallas. He said so himself. He signed the proposition to the effect that "The securing or employing of a preacher as a minister of a congregation having elders *as is generally practiced in Dallas*, is scriptural." When he got to his definition, I agreed with that definition, but I never did agree to his application of it. But tonight he is debating my proposition, and my friends, he is going to meet me on the terms that I lay down with reference to this. This is my affirmation. The thing I am opposing tonight is not the mere employment of the individual but the system which makes that employment possible, and that is what he is going to have to defend. He must defend the work he did at Pearl and Bryan Streets. He must defend the system which makes Homer Putnam Reeves the minister of the Sunset Church of Christ. He must defend the system that makes Charles Goodnight the minister and then lists him under the officers of Cockrell Hill Church of Christ in this city. He must defend the system that makes all of these men who are listed here in the back pages of the Skillman Avenue bulletin as the ministers of the congregations where they are hired feeders. That includes the minister of Ann Arbor, of Arcadia Park, of Bailey Heights, Beckley Heights,

Beverly Hills and Cedar Crest. That is the way the thing is generally practiced in Dallas. I oppose that. He defends it. Let him measure up to it. Let him meet it. Is this system the one which God authorizes?

His task is clear. I want him to come to this proposition tonight and meet it face to face. I want him to tell us if this system in Dallas is scriptural or not. Here is what he must do. If this is scriptural, brother Colley, when you step before these brethren tonight, put your finger on the scripture you refer to. Give us the scriptural peg that you hang the system on. since you say it is scriptural. Just tell this audience where in the New Testament any congregation ever hired a man to preach for them. Where did any congregation with elders ever hire a man to preach to them? Where is the scripture that authorizes that practice<sup>1</sup>? Where is it?

Where was the church? Who was the man who was hired? Do not say Timothy. The elders did not hire Timothy. You said the other night yourself that Timothy was in Ephesus to give the elders a genuine good going over because some of them were teaching a false doctrine. They did not hire him, and some of the elders would probably have been glad if Paul had not left him there, because you said the elders were the ones he was after.

Please put your finger on the passage that shows that the practice of employing a local minister at a stipulated price for a stipulated time is a New Testament doctrine. It is not in the Book. You good brethren, many of you, have been misled, deceived, and in many instances you have been exploited by a system that has gradually fastened itself, with tentacles like an octopus upon the churches, and is choking the spiritual life out of them. You have been the victims of an unscrupulous practice in which men, who act as professionals, get together in a clique or group, motivate themselves into positions of prominence and power in order that they might receive a due amount for the work they do in proclaiming the gospel across the pulpit.

Take the idea of such "preacher's meetings" as you have downtown in Dallas, where the professionals get together and determine the policy and decide what you are going to do. Some

members of the churches of Christ never know what goes on. Take the idea of swapping pulpits around to save money, just like the Methodists do, or the Christian Church, and then getting up on the radio and ridiculing and abusing the members of sectarian bodies, and demanding that they produce the Scripture for the things which they do.

You see that sort of thing commonly manifested. I was out at Skillman Avenue the other day. I went to see their huge building, and I saw something very interesting out there, so I shall just tell you about it, In the first place I did not know whether I was walking into a church of Christ building or a Roman Catholic cathedral. They have a cross on it just like the average Catholic church would have. The previous time when I was there they had a Catholic Christmas tree in the lobby. But worst of all, I think, is the Catholic clergy system which they and the rest of you have borrowed, and which operates in their pulpit. But the thing that, struck me was a tract lying on the table, which I picked up there in the Skillman Avenue house, in which the sectarians who attended there were challenged to find one thing which they practice for which there is no Scripture. I can tell you one thing! Hiring a man like brother Banister at a stipulated fee to be the minister is one thing for which he cannot put his finger on a text.

It isn't in the Book. And how has my brother answered that? How has he met it? He has not answered it. He said he was not obligated to defend the practices of the churches here. He said, "I'm not obligated to do that. I'm obligated to defend the practice of employing a man, but as soon as we get him hired, I'm not obligated to go any further than that, so don't say anything about the practice." Yes, you are obligated to do it. You are debating my proposition tonight, I am talking about the system in Dallas. You are not debating your proposition now. This is my affirmation, and I demand that you meet this affirmation and follow me. I say that your system is as unscriptural as sprinkling in the Methodist Church. It is as unscriptural as the rosary in the Catholic Church. You have just as much Scripture for one as for the other.

But what does my brother do on this matter? Can he put his finger on any New Testament church which ever contracted

with a preacher of the gospel for so much pay for so much preaching, and in which the preacher knew beforehand what he was to get? Is there any place in the New Testament where such a thing ever happened? Can brother Colley come to this platform tonight, and like the gentleman I know he wants to be, place his finger on the name of the preacher in the New Testament who ever contracted for a specific sum for a specific time and who knew beforehand just what his wages would be?

He gets up and talks about Paul receiving "wages." Imagine! Paul receiving wages, as if that apostle went about making contracts to be at the meeting house fifteen minutes prior to the Wednesday evening prayer meeting, to spend so many hours visiting the sick during each week, and so many hours studying the Bible each week. He mentions it as if Paul were guilty of such tomfoolery in arrangements. And he says the apostle Paul took wages!

Let us read it. Paul says, in 2 Corinthians 11:8, "I robbed other churches taking wages of them to do you service." Now this word "wages" is from the Greek *opsonion*, It means an allowance or sustenance. But what was the wage which Paul took? Look at verse 9, which says: "And when I was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to no man, for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied." Now the word for "lacking" comes from the Greek term which means "poverty, want, destitution." When he was destitute the brethren from Macedonia supplied him. If he was on a regular salary why did they have to come down and supply his needs? How did he happen to run so short if he got a regular salary every week? He said "And in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself."

Now if you want to know how these brethren supported Paul, I will go with you to the Philippian letter and we'll read how these congregations from Macedonia supplied his destitution. Turn to Philippians 4:15, "Now you Philippians know that in the beginning of the gospel when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but you *only*." He was not on a salary then, because no other church except this one communicated to

his needs. How did they do it? "For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto *my necessities*." Unto what? "Unto my necessities." And he calls that a regular salary.

Just how far will a man go in his desperate attempt to uphold and support a practice for which there is not one iota of authority anywhere within the pages of the New Testament? Brethren, listen, and I'll tell you what has happened. We have developed a system of professionalism in which men peddle the gospel of the Son of God for so much per week with expenses thrown in. Now there is no defence for this in the Bible, and the only thing you can do is to twist and wrest the word of God.

When the apostle Paul speaks about the question of support for preachers in 1 Corinthians 9, he says: "It is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen, or saith he this altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt this is written, that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thresheth should thresh in hope." Get that. The preacher is like a plowman. The plowman must plow in hope. If a man already knew what he was to get before he started plowing, he would not be hoping. He would know what he was going to get and would have a guarantee on it. Just suppose a man went out to break forty acres, and I ask him if he thinks he can afford to risk putting his seed into that forty acres. He asks me why I think there is any risk involved. I tell him that forty acres is a lot of ground, and there is always a risk of losing the seed with no return. But he declares he will not lose it, and when I ask him why, he says, "The government has signed a contract to give me fifty bushels to the acre regardless of conditions. I am guaranteed that much, and if I do not raise a thing, the government will return me that much." Well, he is not plowing in hope. There's no hope involved in that. He has it cinched, tied up, wrapped up and delivered to him before he even starts. He *knows!* It is not plowing in hope.

T go out to the field when he prepares to thresh. He is out cutting the grain and I ask him if he thinks he will get enough return to pay for his trouble. I say, "Do you hope for very much?" He replies, "Hope for nothing. Mr. Ketcherside, I know what I'm going to get, The government has guaranteed



me fifty bushels to the acre and if it does not thresh out I will get it anyway. They will make it up to me." "But how do you know they will do it?" I ask. "How do I know? Here's the little contract I signed with the Agricultural Administration. Just look at that. I've got their signatures right on this document. I don't have to hope for anything. I have the thing already tied up just as certainly as if the grain were in the bin. I'm not hoping, I'm collecting." Is that plowing in hope? Talk about Paul being on a salary. He wasn't plowing with a contract. He was plowing in hope that sometime he might reap and thresh in hope!

But the apostle goes on, and says, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless, we have not used this power, but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ." Brethren, gospel preachers ought to be supported. They ought to be supported just like the ox is allowed to be unmuzzled while treading out the grain. Gospel preachers should be supported and supported well when they go out into the field of God to labor. They should be supported. The Bible teaches that is true. But where is the authority for a man contracting to work for a church with elders and before that man ever goes to work at all, having it signed and sealed as to what is going to be turned over to him?

Here is what the record says: "Even so has the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel shall live of the gospel." Where did the Lord ordain that? He ordained it when he sent forth his first messengers. I want to turn and read that as it is found in Luke, chapter 10. I am anxious to know on what basis the Lord ordained it. I know that the Lord has ordained that as the ancient priests ate at the altar, so those who go forth to proclaim the gospel should live of that gospel. Now here it is. In Luke 10:7, as he sends the apostles forth to declare the gospel, he tells them, "In the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as *they give*." Why? The next verse answers, "For the laborer is worthy of his hire." What is the hire of the laborer who goes out to preach the gospel of the kingdom? Eating and drinking such things as they give.

That means trusting in God and trusting in the brethren to keep you.

Eating and drinking such things as they give, for the laborer is worthy of his reward. What is the wage of the gospel laborer! It is whatever his brethren see fit to bestow upon him freely, cheerfully and voluntarily. But you don't do it that way in Dallas. You have a budget made up. The members don't have anything to say about it, The "officers" get together somewhere in a *little* room and make up a *big* budget. Then they submit it to the church, but you just try and vote it down once and see what happens to you. Yes, it is submitted to the church, but you've got nothing to say about it except to come through with your pledge card. Where does the word of God say anything about signing up pledge cards ahead of time as it is done at Skillman Avenue and a lot of these other places, to pay some man's huge salary? Where is the Bible authority for creating a budget in the church, and spending your money (I mean, the other man's money) before you even get it collected? Where is it? I want to know. I'm interested in this.

I want brother Colley to meet this issue. I am interested in knowing how this system is going to measure up beside God's blessed and divine truth. My friends, you will not be able to find it, I am sure that brother Colley cannot do it, But I'll say this, that if brother Banister can do it, we will give him the chance to try. If brother Goodnight can do it, we will give him the chance. If Homer Putnam can do it, or thinks he can, we will give him the chance to try it. Or if they don't want to risk it, and if there is someone who will be recommended by the fifty-seven churches in Dallas to do it, I'll examine it with them, and give them a chance to find it, if brother Colley cannot do it—and he cannot!

If there is anyone else that these congregations will recommend to go to the Book and show that this practice is scriptural, we will give him an opportunity. I would not want to take an unfair advantage. I will meet them on this issue. I'll be glad to listen to their discussion and meet it with God's divine truth, or at least, with my conception of God's divine truth. If we are wrong about this matter, let's get right about it, Brethren, let's

not see the church go farther and farther and farther into sectarian practices. Let us stand upon the basis of God's eternal and divine truth.

Now mind you, I want you to remember this discussion tonight is relative to the difference between two systems. One system is that in which men voluntarily, freely, honestly, eagerly and zealously give their talent out of love for God, and a system which operates upon the basis of hiring a man at a stipulated sum. My good brother says he has been a member of every congregation with which he ever labored. Why did he unite with those congregations? Because he was hired by them. That is why he joined them. He was hired to do it. Before he was a member where he is now, he was a member of another church. Why? Because he was paid to be there. Before he was a member there he was in another one. Why? Because he was paid to be there. Certainly he has been a member of every one of these congregations. They have contracted with him, and he is a member of them because he is paid to be. That's why he is a member of them. That is why he sustains an integral relationship with them. That is exactly why all of these brethren are members of the congregations in which they labor. They have a contract to be in those congregations. They are paid to be there and they are the hired servants to do the feeding that God has given into the hands of his shepherds or pastors to do.

Let us put the work of pastoring back in the hands of the eldership where God wants it to be. Let us send these other men forth to do evangelistic work and to sound out the word to the weak places of the earth. Then we shall give all mankind an opportunity to hear. Let us support and support well those who go forth as evangelists. Then the ox will be treading out the grain. He should not be muzzled. He should be allowed to be free. Let us put pastoring in the hands of God's pastors; the work of evangelists in the hands of real evangelists, and keep the distinction between the two. I thank you.

### COLLEY'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Brother Ketcherside, brethren, moderators, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to assure you that I am grateful for continued opportunities and privileges that are mine. I am happy that I can come lief ore you as the respondent to the speech brother Ketcherside delivered. He did a little better tonight than he did last night, Yes, a little bit better, but the very passages that he has tried to rely upon are lacking in information to prove his proposition. Pie was supposed to find scripture to sustain his system. My affirmative arguments have not been touched. He hasn't answered them yet, I am going to continue to call your attention to them, for they are germane to this situation. If he had answered my arguments he would not be in as much trouble as he is in now. Oh, no. He said I was like the apostle Peter following afar off. Way off. I am not following FAR off.

Brother Ketcherside, will you please tell me, and I have asked you this over and over. Are first and second Corinthians any part of the gospel? Now, you write that down, and if you can't write it down, I'll write it and give it to you. I want to know. You asked me if Romans and Galatians were part of the gospel. I answered, YES, SIR. I did not bat an eye When I answered, YES, SIR! Then I asked him to tell us if Romans and Galatians were part of the gospel. He said, "No." They are not part of the gospel. Is the Corinthian letter part of the gospel? Brother Ketcherside, please say something. Yes or no. Or just anything! Brother Ketcherside, are the Corinthian letters part of the gospel? Do you want me to answer? Yes, sir. Now YOU answer some way. I'm begging you to do it.

The evidence you have submitted is from bulletins. You read from statements some preachers have made. He talks of the abuses and excesses my brethren have possibly been guilty of. I do not know about all of them, nor do I try to defend them.

Your proposition says, "Scriptural." That's what I am interested in. In the hiring, or securing of a preacher for a congregation as generally practiced by the churches of Christ,

that have elders—It is Scriptural. He said Colley is supposed to defend all that preachers do. I have never affirmed any such thing. I would not sign the negative of such a proposition, such as the proposition we are discussing now. No, I would not defend all that preachers do while they are with a church. Nobody will do that. There are preachers that will do things that are wrong. Just as he said in his debate with brother Wallace, regarding his own brethren. He said there were abuses practiced by his brethren. There are abuses among my brethren that I cannot defend either. And I didn't sign any proposition to do it. No, sir. But, brother Ketcherside, you are obligated to tell me, and this audience, whether Corinthians are part of the gospel. You said Romans wasn't part of the gospel. Some of your brethren thought you should not have said that. I'll tell you why. Yes, I'll tell you why he said it, men; he can't say anything else. If he says the Roman letter is part of the gospel, or the Galatian letter is part of the gospel, what do you have? A preacher can preach the gospel to the church. He says the gospel cannot be preached to a church. That's what he teaches. Do you want me to read the statement again? I must bring him out in the open. The brethren wondered what I was affirming. Those that did not know wondered what I was talking about. Here is what he said in the "Wallace-Ketcherside Debate," page 22: "My friends, there's a great difference between preaching and teaching. Our brother has repeatedly spoken about preaching to the church. I want you to know that you cannot preach the gospel to the church, and here is a good place for us to center this discussion. Let my good brother Wallace put his finger on that passage in the New Testament scriptures which indicates that anyone ever preached a gospel sermon to the church. Let him put his finger on the place. Let him bring just one passage of scripture and he can close this debate tonight if he Will do it." He wouldn't do that with me. He wouldn't do it. He said, "Put your finger on the New Testament scripture! where it indicates that anyone ever preached a gospel sermon to the church. Let him put his finger on the place. Let him bring just one passage of scripture, and he can close the debate tonight." I had that passage. I was afraid he WOULD close the debate. And to this passage you have not said "boo". You have not even said "howdy." You have not touched it, 2 Peter 1:3, "According as his divine power hath given unto us all

things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." That is the passage. You have not said anything about it. Yes, sir. Now please say something about it. ROMANS NO PART OF THE GOSPEL! No part of the gospel. He says you can't preach the gospel to anybody but sinners. You know why he had to take that position! He will have to take it on Corinthians, too. I dare him to say Corinthians, or any of the other epistles are not part of the gospel. They have to say it, They cannot keep away from it. Why? The reason: If it's the gospel, and it is preached to a church, a gospel preacher can preach it. If a gospel preacher can preach to the church, those that proclaim the gospel can live by the gospel. He is trying to get the preacher away from a church that has elders in it. That's the way it is. That's why he had to take that position.

Once more: Here's the plan of salvation in Romans. *Faith*: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10:17). *Repentance*: "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." (Rom. 2:4). *Confession*: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10:10). *Baptism*: "Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." (Rom. 6:3). These are all from Romans.

Now that is not all: There are only TWO BOOKS IN THE BIBLE, in the whole Bible, that tell us how we get INTO CHRIST: Gal. 3:27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Rom. 6:3, " Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" These ARE the two places. He selects the two books that tell us how we get into Christ. He says they are no part of the gospel. Talk about going to lengths to keep a preacher from preaching to the church. Yes, and to deny that it's part of the gospel!

Paul said in Romans 1:15, "So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Verse 16: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel." Verse 17: "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." What has he said about these passages? Just not much of any-

thing. Not much. No, sir. The gospel CAN be preached to the church. A gospel preacher can do it, "Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. 9:14). He wanted me to show him where a preacher ever did it. I showed him where it was done—Ephesus. I showed him, and begged him to answer it. I said, brother Ketcherside, show us, in the New Testament, where the elders had a meeting without a preacher. Oh, I know they can do it, But lei him find it. He should show us. He wants me to SHOW HIM some things. I'll try again, but he says, now brother Colley do not go to Timothy. Don't go to Ephesus. *I am going to Timothy.* 1 Timothy 1:3, Paul said, "As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus." What for? I want you to stay in Ephesus, and I want you to do some preaching. What do you want me to do, Paul, preach to the church? Yes. The church had elders. He has not touched this. I had it in my first affirmative speech. He left this alone. He is going to turn loose of 1 Corinthians 14, too. I am not going to let him turn loose of Romans 12 yet. It does not sustain his position. It does sustain my position.

Brother Ketcherside challenges me to show where a church hired a preacher. All right, Ephesus. Brother Ketcherside, you know that. Paul said, "I exhorted thee to tarry in Ephesus when I was going into Macedonia." What else? He continues by telling him what to preach to the church in Ephesus and then says, "If there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine; according to the gospel" Timothy preached to the church. Well, did they pay him? If they did not, they did not do what the Lord told them to do. If that church didn't pay Timothy, they did not do what the Lord ordained should be done. He was preaching the gospel to the church in Ephesus.

I am in a good humor—I am not mad at anybody. Once more, contrast his system of mutual edification. First of all, every passage that he introduces that teaches edification, my brethren teach and believe. We believe the church should be edified. Yes, I'll take every passage that teaches edification, and teach it, believe it and practice it. I will not take his construction of those passages. I believe we should edify one another. I believe all of that. It is his system that he insists the church must use, that I do not believe.

He introduces passages of scripture that teaches Christians should give. He did that last night. Yes, that some be not burdened. He says that's mutual—mutual edification. Every man must speak. According to him the church is all MOUTH. Yes, it is. In the church men can get up and speak one at a time. And you must do it, brethren. Not all of the gifts in Romans 12 have to do with teaching. The church is not ALL MOUTH. Not the church of the Lord. No, no. And here is something about his mutual edification: In Burlington, Iowa, let him tell us how many members the church had before his system was adopted. Let him tell us how many they have now. The churches brother Ketcherside and his brethren preach for, are built on the personality of men. First of all they are the overseers of the churches. They are the pastors. The largest churches they have are where men like brother Ketcherside and brother Garrett hold the fort. Men with good personalities. They are built upon the personalities of these men and not on the word of the Lord.

Brother Garrett preached for the Cockrell Hill church in this city—brother Ketcherside introduced this. They paid brother Garrett six hundred dollars, or paid him a hundred dollars a week for six weeks. He divided that church. He left that church bleeding. Divided it. The Roman soldier that pierced the side of the body of Christ on the cross, will have a better chance in the judgment than the man that divides the spiritual body of Christ over a thing that he can't sustain in the Book. And he'll meet the Lord over this very thing. I wonder if brother Garrett believes that Romans and Galatians are no part of the gospel? I want to know if he endorses brother Ketcherside's position on that?

Their preachers are overseers, over not one church, but more than one. Until elders are appointed in the churches they are the little bishops over these churches. They take over. I have their writings that state "they take over." Don't think I don't. The loyal churches that have elders, and said elders are doing their work, are building up all the members. They are edifying all of the body of Christ. They are working all of the time. The church is not ALL MOUTH either. I am not defending their abuses. I'm simply defending the truth.



2 Corinthians 8:12, is equality of giving, and not of teaching, brother Ketcherside. He said when he gets after "these fellows," they change. I want to say this to brother Ketcherside, and to all the brethren, that I'll meet him anywhere he has a representation of any kind. I am not the only preacher that will do it, I'll count it a happy privilege. I really thought he would be difficult to meet in debate, but he is not. All I need to do, is expose his sophistry. Now to some more of his speech: Heb. 5:12. For the time ye ought to be teachers, you have need that someone teach you again. They had not developed. He could not talk to them as experienced in the word—they needed milk. They should have been teachers. Why, certainly. Does he think all of them should get up and be the MOUTH OF THE CHURCH every Lord's day?

Brother O. K. Wallace attended services in the church, in St. Louis, where brother Ketcherside has his membership. They did not have but one speaker so far as I know. Brother Wallace said they did not, and you did not deny it. Brother Wallace told about the services in his debate with brother Ketcherside in St. Louis. He said they had cue speaker. I will not say they had one big mouth. But they were not all mouth that Lord's day. One of them did the speaking. He thinks the church is all mouth—He also thinks we have edification in the hands of hired hands. That is not true. If Timothy preached at Ephesus, and he did, and if he preached the gospel, and he did, if he lived by the gospel, and he did. The Lord ordained that he SHOULD live by the gospel. (1 Cor. 9:14). Was he a hired hand? Brother Ketcherside calls this a mercenary system, because the church pays a gospel preacher a living wage. We have a scriptural example for it. He need not say we do not. This church had elders and I proved it. He has not denied it. We note from his speech again: Ephesians 4:16, "Speaking the truth in love"—brother Ketcherside you can't do it. You can't do that in your edification system. Why? 1 Pet. 1:22,23, "Seeing you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently." What else? Peter continues on down the line, and said, "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." LOVE is one of the things the gospel teaches Christians to do. But he said that's PAST TENSE.

He has not said anything else about it. Brother Ketcherside, you cannot preach LOVE. No. Why? It is in the gospel of Christ. "This is the word which by the gospel is) preached." You can't preach it, No. You can't preach it. I told you, you would get into trouble. You can't get out. You will not meet me in debate again, either. No, I don't think you will. I hope you do. I'm ready for you any time. We will have the shield of faith, and sword of the Spirit ready for you. Just any time. Name the time and place and get set. Public edification in the hands of a hired man. A mercenary system. Church is self edifying. I have answered that.

He did not say anything about MINISTERS in Romans 12:7. I asked him about that last night, and he did not say anything. What kind of MINISTERS were they? I hope we get to that again. Ephesians 4:16, "Maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." He can't do that. He can't even speak the truth in LOVE to the church, because it comes from the gospel. He says the gospel cannot be preached to the church! He cannot edify the church by love. When he edifies the church he cannot preach the gospel. But Peter says love comes by the gospel. That's the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. He can't do it!

Church at Rome. He said Colley overlooked Romans 15:14, "Filled with all knowledge, and able to admonish," etc. Well, what does he care, it's not part of the gospel! How can you admonish one another? Filled with all KNOWLEDGE. Romans not part of the gospel anyway! No, Colley did not overlook that. I have known about that a long time. Sure, and I knew what you were going to say about it. It is not the gospel? It is not the gospel? Give it to him, brethren (brethren passing notes to brother Ketcherside) three of you pass three more. He needs it, (Laughter.) Give it to him. Let him have it.

Again to Romans 15:14 and 2 Peter 1:3. "Filled with all knowledge." Now wait a minute, brother Ketcherside, don't read that (note), listen to me. 2 Peter 1:3, "According as his divine power hath given unto all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the KNOWLEDGE of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." That KNOWLEDGE came through the GOSPEL. You can't do anything with Romans

15:14, because "with all knowledge" and that KNOWLEDGE comes from the gospel, and you said the Roman letter is not part of the gospel. NO; I knew you were in trouble when you did that. The Roman letter is not part of the gospel? Peter said that's where you get the knowledge, through the gospel.

Brother Ketcherside talks about preachers living in homes furnished by the brethren. He has meetings with churches that have elders, and they pay him. Oh, yes, they pay him. He says now preachers always have to go somewhere else. May I suggest this: When I was "going" and holding meetings it was easier than preaching to a church. This is the reason he takes this position, the brethren pay more for "meetings" than for preaching to the church. When a preacher goes from place to place he can use the same sermons over and over. This is not true of the preacher that instructs a church. The local evangelist has to continue to study. Yes, the local evangelists (write it down, brother Ketcherside) have to dig and study. Talk about getting MORE money. These preachers that go from place to place get more money. I KNOW.

He said I would take one position on 1 Cor. 14 with him and another position with the anti-class brethren. Brother Ketcherside, I did not call these brethren anti-Sunday school, I called them anti-class. I think you know the reason why. Anyway, I did not take one position with them and another position with brother Ketcherside. I took the same position on 1 Corinthians 14 with the anti-class brethren that I took last night with brother Ketcherside.

Regarding my position on 1 Corinthians 14, I would like for brother Ketcherside to notice what he said in the Wallace-Ketcherside Debate. I would like for him to say it, but he will not do it. I'll read it again, page 29, "In 1 Corinthians chapter fourteen is found the basis for the worship of the New Testament church. I want you to notice with me just how the church met for worship. Now I am glad the brother put this on his chart," That's to brother Wallace. Next paragraph, "Let us go to first Corinthians fourteen and find it, First of all, I am sure that most of you recognize that beginning with chapter 11, of first Corinthians, verse 2," and he gives the quotation. I asked the boys to get their little black books. I answered his argument on

this chapter. The whole eleventh chapter is not talking about the same things that are discussed in the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters. He says it's a basis of all Christian worship. I am taking the same position that I took with the anti-class brethren. I am taking the same position on 1 Corinthians 14 that I took with the "Apostolics." Those that believe in miracles.

In the eleventh chapter Paul discusses the Lord's supper, and closes the chapter with, "If any man is hungry let him eat at home, that your coming together be not unto judgment. And the rest will I set in order whensoever I come." What is Paul talking about? The Lord's Supper. Now here is the beginning of the 12th chapter, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." Paul starts the chapter by saying he did not want the brethren to be IGNORANT. No, he did not want YOU to be ignorant. Looks like you are bound to be, one way or the other. I don't want you to be IGNORANT. The 12th chapter closes with "Desire earnestly the greater gifts, and moreover a more excellent way show I unto you." Paul said he was going to show a MORE EXCELLENT WAY. Brother Ketcherside has not learned about it yet. He hasn't learned it. Paul said I will show you a more excellent way. In the thirteenth chapter he said, so far as these miraculous things are concerned, and he quotes part of them, THEY ARE IN PART. "But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." (vs. 10). That has to do with the miraculous gifts of chapters twelve and thirteen. In the fourteenth chapter, brother Ketcherside goes for a basis of his system of edification. He says all of these chapters are a basis of all Christian worship. I deny it, sir. It is not so. From the fourteenth chapter I showed, "Anyone have a hymn? Let him sing it." I asked him if they had soloists in their congregations? He hasn't answered—not yet. He is going to tell me whether Corinthians are part of the gospel, too, some of these days.

What then, brethren, when you come together, "Each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." (vs. 26). That's where he gets his system. That's where he gets it. Now watch: "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." (vs. 34). I asked him last night if 1 Corinthians 14 is a basis of New Testament worship, how can women sing? Let your women keep silent in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak. In Ephesians 5:19, "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." A woman is speaking when she is singing. Again: Colossians 3:16, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace." A woman is not silent when she is doing that, 1 Corinthians 14:34, "Let your women keep silence." Some of these women had miraculous gifts, too. Yes, sir. Ask your husband at home. (Five minutes.) Thank you.

I asked brother Ketcherside last night to harmonize these passages of scripture. I said you are making infidels if you take the position that 1 Corinthians 14 is now the basis of New Testament worship. He said it was the basis of New Testament worship in his debate with brother Wallace. He can't say anything else. Does the rule remain after the miraculous gifts are gone? No, sir. The whole 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters are regulating miraculous gifts. Paul said these are commandments of the Lord. About what? Regarding the regulation of spiritual gifts. He closes the fourteenth chapter by saying, "Wherefore, my brethren desire earnestly to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues. But let all things be done decently and in order." The fifteenth chapter is discussing an entirely different subject, the resurrection. No, I did not take a different position with the anti-class brethren. They could not harmonize these passages of scripture with their position on the fourteenth chapter. When brother Ketcherside takes the position that this chapter is the basis of New Testament worship it conflicts with other passages of scripture. The Bible does not conflict. His teaching does.

Again we go to Romans the 12th chapter. He said Colley said something about an officer. I asked him to give the definition of the word office. What is an officer? He talks about an "officered church." What is it? Does that word mean "func-

tion"? I believe in elders. I believe in bishops, I believe they are the overseers. I believe everything the Bible says about them. But he has been Greeking all along, and I thought he might answer my question. Paul said, "as the body"—That's Romans, that is his proof text, Romans 12. "As the body has many members, and all the members have not the same office." We are all officers. We are all officers. What does it mean? It means WORK. If a man desireth the office of a bishop he desireth a good work. The work makes the office. In 2 Timothy 4 he said to Timothy, Do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. Yes, sir. Work of an evangelist, work of an elder, and work of all the members. The word office means that, Work, yes, sir. And they have a different work. Now watch it, Here is his mutual edification, and he says it is all mouth. Let's see. "And having gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith." Some men have more faith than others. Oh, yes. "Ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry." And then, "He that ruleth, with diligence." Here is ministry. Paul said, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. Couldn't an evangelist be among the ministers that were to do the work that the Lord told them to do? He called it ministry. Now notice: Elders are to rule. That sets them apart to their work. It is different from other work. It is not all mouth! "He that giveth, let him do it with liberality." Does that mean that one man does all the giving? Oh, no. That is the principle and basis of his theory. That is the basis of it,

Again: "Wages." I don't have time to develop it, but we've had it. I simply call your attention to this, 1 Corinthians 9:7, "What soldier ever served at his own charges?" That is the question Paul asked. 1 Timothy 1:18, "This charge . . . thou mayest war the good warfare." Again: 2 Timothy 2:4, "No soldier on service entangleth himself in the affairs of this life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier." That has not been introduced. I want him to have a chance at it, Now, "Wages." The Greek word that he gave, *obsonion*, means pay wages, salary. Paul said in 2 Corinthians 11:18, "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them." Wages, well what does it mean? "Wages, salary, reward in general." That

is from Souter's Lexicon of the New Testament, page 185. Salary: "fixed compensation; regular pay, or stipulated to be paid for services as by the quarter, month or week." Webster Collegiate, page 877. Stipened: "Settled pay," page 979. And then again *obsonion*, Moulton and Milligan page 471 No. 2. The reference is particularly to a soldiers "pay." Paul said Timothy was to be like a soldier. He was paid, and the word "wages" was used in that connection. Paul said I want you to be a good soldier. Well, what about it, Paul? In being a good soldier, what soldier ever served at his own charges? 1 Corinthians 9:7. (Time.) Thank you.

## KETCHERSIDE'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Colley, brother Hobbs, brothers and sisters in Christ,  
and friends:

This will be my last time to appear before von in this discussion. In a matter of a very few minutes this part of the discussion will have become history and will be written in the annals and archives of that part of the brotherhood which here exists. What good has been accomplished depends altogether upon the spirit in which you have listened and the fairness with which you continue to weigh the testimony which has been offered. I have had no axe to grind in my presentation. I have wished that my brother were right in his contention, for it would be to my personal interest to accede to his position. I had hoped that he could offer convincing proof that it was right for a man to hire out as the local minister at a princely sum. Such a procedure would make it possible for me to be at home with my loved ones, instead of travelling continually as I must. It would solve my problems financial and otherwise. I have everything to gain and nothing to lose if he can prove that I am wrong.

It is true that I came with open heart hoping that my brother could show that he is right, and thus I could be justified in conscience to keep from going throughout the length and breadth of this land driven and compelled by my understanding of what our Master requires, taking the gospel where people are weak and humble, and wherever I have the opportunity to preach, whether it be on the courthouse square, under a tent, in a brush arbor, or wherever men congregate together. I have everything to lose from a fleshly standpoint if I hold to the concept that I now have. I have everything to gain if he convinces me that he is right. But he must do that by the word of God.

I must notice a few things my brother has said tonight. He is very jittery again. Every time someone passes me a note he thinks I am getting a tremendous amount of help. When he issued his challenge to debate, a brother from Oklahoma passed along this suggestion, "We are ready for the debate with brother Colley at Tulsa the moment his brethren will endorse



him." Since brother Colley seems to be anxious to repeat it here, I suggest that if "the ministers" here will endorse him for a repeat discussion in this city, I will be happy to meet him at any time.

He mentions what I asked brother Wallace, and it seems to me that my brother is much more adept in following the speeches that I made with brother Wallace in Paragould over a year ago, than he is the ones I am making to him now. He seems to want to debate the Paragould debate, and because I have not followed exactly the same course of procedure in outlining my arguments, he is lost and finds himself "cold trailing" all of the time. He is at least two nights behind now, and he is getting farther behind all of the time. It may be that he can arrange to have you come back on Saturday night and bring you up to date after he has had a' chance to listen to the tapes.

Be that as it may, he is still in the Paragould debate, and would do a fair job on it, except for the fact that he does not even understand that debate. I would like to say that I asked brother Wallace in that debate to find one passage that said that a preacher ever preached to the church. My brother Rays he has found it in 2 Peter 1:3, but he did nothing of the sort, for 2 Peter 1:3 says nothing about any man preaching to any church. But that is the passage he used. He said that I asked for a Scripture that said a man preached for a church, and declared that he was going to find one. Now you turn to 2 Peter 1:3 and if that says anything about a man preaching to the church, then Alexander Campbell, David Lipscomb, myself, and a' great many other men will have to take down our shingle and give up.

You will recall that I read to you from Alexander Campbell where he declared that there is no case in the New Testament which even hints at or intimates that any man ever preached the gospel to a church. And 2 Peter 1:3 does not say it! Now brother Wallace knew that was in there, but he also knew enough not to use it. He knew what I had asked for, and he knew that passage was not a reply and that it would not satisfy the demand. Of course, this brother is merely attempting to mislead you into believing that the passage says

someone preached to the church. It does not say it. He did not find the place and he will not find the place.

Now the next thing. I call to your attention that I asked the question if he could find in the Bible where any congregation with elders ever hired a man to preach for them, or to them? Do you know what he found? He found Timothy. Yes, he found Timothy, in 1 Timothy 1:4. Now I ask again tonight, did the elders at Ephesus hire Timothy? If they did hire him, could they have fired him? Could they have sent him back? Was Timothy operating upon the same basis upon which these brethren are operating? Did Timothy go there and preach a trial sermon? Our brother says he has preached a few of them. He said he did not like some of them, they were not very good. He intimated that some of the congregations did not like them either, as he did not land the job. But is that the way Timothy got himself hired? That's the way they do it in Dallas. Is that the way Timothy secured his position? Let my brother come before this audience tonight and tell us if Timothy got that job at Ephesus and was hired like they hire preachers here in Dallas. That is the question.

I did not ask you to find a place where Timothy labored with, a church. I asked you to find a place where a congregation with elders hired a man to preach for the church. He has not found it and he will not find it, The apostle Paul told Timothy that he was the one who besought him to stay there. Paul besought Timothy to stay for a definite reason and he tells us what that reason was.

My friend cannot find anywhere in the New Testament where a man who professed to be a gospel preacher ever stooped to the degree that he went around preaching little peanut stand sermons sent up like trial balloons, to get a job at sixty, seventy, eighty, or a hundred dollars per week, depending on the highest bidder. It is not in the Bible, and I deny that the apostle Paul or Timothy, ever subjected themselves to the debasing, degrading procedure that is a part of the common practice of the churches of Christ in Dallas with their hireling clerical system.

Again, my brother goes to Homans 12, and when he gets

there and reads it, he intimates that I said the church was all mouth. Oh, no, I did not say anything of the sort, I'll tell you exactly what I did do. I quoted the passage and here is what I found: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace which is given unto us, whether prophecy let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering." Does not my brother know that this is the very word from which we actually get the word service, or the work of a deacon. Does he not realize it is *diakoma*? It is the same term that is translated "the office of a deacon." He wants me to define ministering for him. Well, I have defined it now! That is the word, and what is he going to do with it now? The word simply means "serving." He that serveth, let him wait upon his serving!

Paul continues: "He that teacheth on teaching; he that exhorteth on exhortation; he that giveth let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth with diligence; he that sheweth mercy with cheerfulness." Certainly I did not say the church was all mouth, but here is what I do contend, that every person in that congregation who had the gift to teach had the right to exercise the gift, Does he deny that? I contended that every person who had the gift of prophecy had the right to exercise that gift before the brethren. Will he deny that? If he does. I will call his attention to 1 Corinthians 14, written in the same era', where I find with regard to the gift of prophecy, "You may all prophesy one by one, that all may be comforted and all may learn."

No, I did not say that the gift of giving was mouthing. I did not say that the gift of ruling was mouthing. I did not say that the gift of those who showed mercy was mouthing. But I did say that every person who had a gift had the right to exercise it. And any *system* which takes away from God's children the right to use those gifts that they do possess is a system that is not authorized by his blessed Book.. It is contrary to God's eternal truth. That is all I contended for.

I contend today that every man who has the ability to teach must have the right to exercise that gift, and he has an equal right with every other who possesses the same gift, if he is faithful. He has the right to stand before the entire group of brethren.

ren and edify them. My brother makes a great play on 1 Corinthians 14 and says I contend that spiritual gifts and natural gifts are all the same. I contend that they are the same in one respect—they all came from a divine source. And the law that governs the usage of those gifts is the same. When God gave spiritual gifts to men he expected *all of those gifts* to be used. When God grants natural gifts to men he expects all of those gifts to be used. When he gave spiritual gifts he laid down a law by which all those spiritual gifts could be exercised in the church. Is it reasonable to conclude that the God of heaven will give natural gifts, and lay down a law by which they *cannot be used* in the church? Yet that is the position of my brother! That is the very thing which he argues.

But what does he do to offset this teaching, this reasoning, this logic? He merely asks what brother Ketcherside will do with Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16? Bless your heart, those passages were written by the same one who wrote 1 Corinthians and in the same days. What is brother Colley going to do with them? At the very same time when the apostle said, "Let your women keep silence in the church" was the very time he told them to sing. Now, does my brother contend that they did not sing at that time? It is his baby to spank and not mine. I am neither interested in nor concerned about this.

All I want to know is just this, when the record says you all prophesy one by one, does that mean just one is allowed to do it? Beloved friends, I want you to get this point, that, if the God of heaven had wanted a one-man ministry system in the church, the very best time for him to demonstrate it was when he was dispensing spiritual gifts. That was the time for him to give all of the gifts to one man and thus put him forward. And the fact that God, when he was divinely dispensing those spiritual gifts, did not give them to one man, but gave them to all, is proof that God wants more than one man to do the edifying.

He had a chance to dispense them to one man. That was his opportunity but he would not do it. He gave the gifts to many. If God had wanted one man to do the ministering, why did he not give the gifts to but one? Why do these brethren today attempt to subject and sublimate all of the gifts, and

put all of the service in the hands of one man? One man who has the gift to teach has just as much right to teach as anyone else who has the gift. He who has the gift to speak has just as much right to speak as any other who has the gift. The idea that you can hire a man for \$100 a week to do the speaking and keep everyone else from using the gift of speaking is ridiculous and absurd upon the face of it. Furthermore, it is unscriptural in heaven's sight!

Then my brother makes a play on the word "officers." He says we are all officers. But we are not all officers in the sense that brother Goodnight is an officer, I'll tell you that! Because here it is, right in the front of this church directory. OFFICERS—and there are just three classes of officers in that congregation—Elders, Deacons, Evangelist. We are not all officers in that sense. We are not all officers like they are in the churches in Dallas. Indeed we are not.

There are three sets of officers mentioned in the church directory of Cockrell Hill. Just three classes of officers—Elders, Deacons, Evangelist. All officers in the local church. The apostle Paul was unfortunate. He didn't know there were three. Of course, Paul just had the Holy Spirit to guide him. He didn't have brother Colley. And because he just had the Holy Spirit, when he wrote to the church at Philippi, he just wrote to the saints and bishops and deacons. He did not know that you could have any other officer. Too bad Paul could not have learned the wisdom of some of these later brethren—these latter day saints! Too bad he could not have absorbed some of their wisdom. Too bad he could not sit at the feet of brother Colley and thus learn that there could be three classes of officers. Then he could have addressed his letter "To the saints, and bishops and deacons, *and the local minister*, in Philippi."

Would it not have been wonderful if Paul had written that just once? What brother Colley would give for a passage like that! How much good it would do his soul if Paul had made just one slip like that. O how grand if Paul would just have used the term one time in all of his writings. But he did not use it, not even once. That is why it is so difficult for brother Colley. He did not use it any time and brother

Colley uses it every time, and that is the difference between brother Paul and brother Colley. Wouldn't it have been wonderful if Paul had just slipped once in his language, like these brethren slip so often? Would it not have been grand if just once in one of his letters he had slipped as they so frequently do in their bulletins? Brother Colley says those are all mistakes and he would oppose them. How he wishes the Holy Spirit had made just one mistake so he could find the passage he needs. But the Holy Spirit didn't do it!

Now I am amazed at my brother. I'll tell you that I have heard a great many debates and have participated in but a very few of them, but my brother pulls a new one. He gets up tonight and takes the word "wages" in the New Testament and goes for his definition of it to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. In order to get the term "regular pay, a stipulated amount by day, week, or month" he resorts to Webster's Dictionary. Bless his dear life, he said to me that I needed only to bring my little black book along. He said he was going to stay inside that book and never go out of it. He said that when a man gets out of the Bible in a debate that is a sign that he is getting whipped in the discussion.

And now he is out of it. He went to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary which defines terms, not even in the sense of the original, but according to their common, current usage. And the churches today have departed so far from the original, that such is the common, current usage of the term, but that was not the usage Paul made of it. Again, my dear friends, I am forced to read you another statement dealing with this word "wages" as Paul employed the term. A man certainly must be in the middle of a fix, when in order to get his idea of a regular salary, he has to take a word out of its setting, and then go to a modern dictionary to sustain his position.

Here is what was said by Edwin Hatch, M. A., Vice Principal of St. Mary's Hall, and Grinfield Lecturer in the Septuagint, Oxford, in his book, "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches." This is on page 52 of the book: "The funds of the primitive communities consisted entirely of voluntary offerings. Of these offerings the office bearers whose circumstances required it were entitled to a share. They re-

ceived such a share only on account of their poverty. They were so far in the position of the widows and orphans or helpless poor. Like soldiers in the Roman army, or like slaves in a Roman household, they were entitled to a monthly allowance, but the amount of that allowance was variable. When the Montanists proposed to pay their clergy a fixed salary, the proposal was condemned as an heretical innovation, alien to Catholic practice." Men like Edwin Hatch of the Church of England are more honest in their approach to these questions than the clergy in the churches of Christ.

Again I must quote what R. C. H. Lenski has said about it. He declares: "Paul caused this truth to smart, 'Other churches I robbed taking support for my ministry unto you.' The Corinthians deserved this mortification in order to drive out their ingratitude. For what is meaner than to slander a benefactor for bestowing his benefaction gratis? But note Paul said he 'robbed other churches.' He took from them what he really should not have taken, namely, *opsonion*, sustenance. Wages is too liable to be misunderstood as regular pay, which Paul never took from any church."

Now the Lutheran church has a salaried clergy. But this man in the Lutheran church, R. C. H. Lenski, a Lutheran commentator, would not take the position brother Colley has taken tonight. R. C. H. Lenski could have read Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, but he would not do it, because he knew it did not define the term as used in the New Testament. I am ashamed of brother Colley on that score. He just simply had to get a fixed salary somewhere. He just had to get this idea of weekly and monthly pay. And because he had to get it, he went out of the Bible to find it.

I wish to read from Thomas M. Lindsay, D. D., Principal of Glasgow College for the United Free Church of Scotland, in his book "The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries." On pages 201 and 203, he says, "It must be remembered that in those early days, the ministry was not paid as we understand payment, and that money for church buildings was not needed. The idea that when men are once set apart for the function of office bearers in the Christian church, that it becomes the duty of the church to provide them with the necessi-

ties of life, does not belong to the time of primitive Christianity." That is true, it does not belong to the time of primitive Christianity. It belongs to 1953 and the time of Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. That is where it belongs, so it is from that our brother read.

What will these men do in their attempt to saddle their wage system upon the churches? Brethren, the apostle Paul never took a regular salary from any congregation and I proved that a few minutes ago by the Scriptures which I read. The very passage my brother introduced is proof beyond any shadow of a doubt that Paul was not on a regular salaried basis. Listen! "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service. And when I was present with you and wanted I was chargeable to no man, for that which was lacking to me, the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied." That which was lacking. The word "lacking" is from the word which means "poverty, want, destitution." How did it come that Paul was in poverty? How did he happen to be destitute if he was on a regular salary basis? How did he happen to run out of anything? He said he was lacking. He ran out of support. He didn't have anything. He was destitute. How did he run out if he was on a regular basis and paid so much every week or every month? That argument will not hold water, and the people in this audience are smart enough to see that. They know that brother Colley has an axe to grind.

I tell you tonight that the big trouble in this discussion and every other discussion of this type is that it hits people in their pocketbooks and when you kick a man in his pocketbook you kick him in the heart, whether he has his purse in his hip pocket or his vest pocket. It does not make any difference where he has it. Pierce the purse and you hit the heart! That is the basis of this difficulty. Take the money out of it and we'll settle it soon. Just let everyone agree to work for a solid year without any support at all. Nobody get paid for anything, janitor work, preparing the emblems, mowing the lawn, or preaching and teaching. That will get rid of this system. That will put the quietus to it,

My friends, I tell you that if you take the money element out of this thing, there will be nothing left to debate. You'll



kill the clerical system when you eliminate the "greenbacks." That is all you have to do. This kind of system operates on the essence of greenbacks. In order to keep from having friction it must have the oil of currency to keep its gears properly oiled. That is why you have to *preach to the church* and lambaste the congregation to bring their money. Poor widows are paying to support homes for men who make double or three times the salary which they receive, and some of them are homeless. That is why I charge this system has destroyed the equality of God's word.

Now I want to recapitulate for a few minutes. I want all of you to listen very sincerely and earnestly. My brother has gone to a great length to talk about the Corinthian letter, the Galatian letter and the Homan letter. And he has introduced a great deal of matter that is foreign to this discussion. Do you know why he wanted to get me in Rome and in Romans? It is because he wanted to keep me out of Dallas. That is what he wanted. Pie wanted to get me into Corinth and out of Dallas, He has tried to keep me out of Dallas all along. He doesn't want me to get in Dallas, but my proposition calls for me discussing conditions as they exist in Dallas. And I am going to stay here, and just as long as I am here, I am going to keep burning him with the fact that he has not produced anywhere in God's book, the authority for this system that he has here in Dallas. That is what I want to find. Where is the system that is practiced here in Dallas? Where is it duplicated in the Bible?

Here is what I have repeatedly asked him to do, to find the scriptural authority for a congregation with elders hiring a man to preach to the church. Where is the Scripture that authorizes a congregation with elders hiring a man to preach to them; Where is it? Do not go to Timothy. They did not hire Timothy and they could not fire him. They could not have sent him out of there for if they had they would have gone contrary to an apostle, and would have been guilty of rebellion against an apostolic arrangement. They did not hire Timothy. So do not go to Timothy, but just find the place in the Bible which authorizes a congregation with elders hiring a man to preach to them.

Now next, find that place in God's Book which authorizes the system so current in Dallas of arranging for trial sermons on the part of prospective candidates for clerical vacancies. Where is it?

Please find the Scripture that justifies the practice of offering a contract to bind a preacher for a specific work for a specific time to a congregation.

Please find the Scripture that obligates a church to pay a guaranteed sum to a preacher for proclamation of heaven's truth. And do not go to Paul. Paul did not preach because he got paid to do so. He preached in spite of it. He said, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel of Jesus Christ," This brother has not yet found where Paul ever took a dime from any church in a locality where he was preaching at that time. Not one. He has not found where Paul ever took a dime from any congregation with which he was laboring at the time. He will not find it either. He cannot find it. He cannot go to Corinth, because Paul said he would not take any money from them. He cannot go to Philippi, because Philippi did not give him anything until he got down to Thessalonica. He cannot find the place where Paul ever took a penny from a congregation with which he was working at the time, yet our brother is taking a regular salary from the congregation with which he is working now. That is the thing we want him to find. We want him to locate this system in the Bible as he practices it in Dallas. Let him find it in God's blessed Book. That will settle the discussion. You will not have to go through Corinthians and Romans and deal with a lot of matters that are not germane to the issue. Put your finger on the Scripture that endorses this system and that will settle it now and forever.

I asked my brother to find that place in the word of God where it suggested the elevating of the name of a hired hand to special prominence on church signs as a regular official fixture of the church. I can take you throughout this entire city, point out to you certain buildings that are designated as meeting places of the churches of Christ, and where only one name appears in front of them. Just one name, and that the name of the hired man in that congregation. He is the

hired man, and he is there because he is hired to be there. His is the only name that is exalted to prominence.

Here is the letterhead of the "Church of Christ, Edgefield at Seventh Streets, Dallas, Texas—Leonard Mullins, Minister." Just one name on the entire letterhead. Whose is it? The name of the hired hand at Edgefield Church. Where in the New Testament do you ever find such a thing as that? I presume there are elders in the Edgefield Church. Their names do not appear. I presume there are deacons. Their names do not appear. Leonard Mullins would insist to high heaven that he is not an officer in that congregation, and yet his name is here, and following it the word "Minister." That term belongs to all of God's people. It has been stolen from them and made the property of one man. It has been made a special title. I tell you good brethren, that the people who are guilty of this are guilty of the one-man pastor system. They are guilty of the same things they fought in the Christian Church.

I say this night from this platform that not only brother Mullins, but every other man who is guilty of this practice, is guilty of upholding and fostering and foisting upon the churches, the same one-man hireling pastor system that we fought for fifty years in the Christian Church. They turned around and adopted it and since that time they have kept very mum and quiet about it. Our brethren still get up and fight the Christian Church over instrumental music. They still get up and fight the Christian Church over their special days. I venture to say they will quit that before long. They have swallowed Christmas now and adopted it. It will not be very long until they will be celebrating Easter. You can have little Easter bunnies in your meetinghouse just as easily as you can have a Christmas tree. It will not be long until the little bunnies will move in, and you will have Easter eggs scattered all over the place. You have one day, and it will not be long until you take on the other.

I have gone through sonic of these meeting houses and seen little statuettes of the *three* wise men, and I think perhaps they were the wisest ones there, these statuettes, for if the brethren had been as wise as they ought to be they would not have that kind of stuff about. Yet that is the thing that is practiced here

in Dallas. That is the sectarianism that is creeping in upon you. You people are sitting back supporting that kind of thing, giving your money to it and upholding it, and backing these men who stand up and defend a thing which God's Book never hinted at. These brethren will go on the radio and challenge the Christian Church. They insult the sectarian world and call upon them to present scriptural authority for sprinkling, for transubstantiation, and for the rosary. On the same basis I call upon my brother tonight to find scriptural authority for the one-man hireling pastor system as it exists in Dallas. I call upon him to do that tonight. Let my brother no longer accuse the sectarian world until he gets off the sectarian side of the fence. Let him desist from going on the radio and challenging others to find the scriptures for their practice, until he is able to find the same for his practice.

Let him march up like a man and put his finger on the little black book, and I do not mean Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Let him just show us in his little black book where he gets the authority for the thing he is doing. That is what these people want to see. That is what the brethren are demanding and they have a right to demand it. There are a number of you good people here tonight who have been victimized by this system. You are involved in a system where all you can do is pay, pay, pay! That is all. That's all you can do. It is money, money, money! All you can do is sit back while someone else dishes it out to you. In the olden days you know, when brethren came together each one had a psalm, a doctrine, and a lesson or teaching prepared. Now everyone of you has a dollar, two dollars or five. That is the difference, and that is all you are allowed to contribute to the service. You have to throw the money in. It feeds right into the coffers and it feeds right out, but you do not have anything to say about the way it feeds. Oh, no, you just give it, and after that it will be taken care of all right. Aren't you getting tired of this? Aren't you getting tired of "taxation without representation"?

You know they once had a Boston Tea Party on that same basis. I think it is about time to have a Dallas Tea' Party, and smash the tea casks and throw them in Trinity River if there

is enough water in it to float them. I believe it is about time for you in Dallas to rise up in spiritual arms against this thing. You have no voice in congregational government. All you can do is pay in the cash. When every one of you cometh together he hath a quarter, a half dollar or a dollar. Let all things be done unto edifying! How the times have changed.

My beloved brethren, I want to say to you that it may be I shall never see you again on this earth. We may never meet again. There are a great many of you who undoubtedly think that I am a radical. Perhaps you say that I am a fanatic' and a crackpot. I do not resent the fact that you feel thus. I think I can understand your attitude, for you see, I was reared in sectarianism myself. I grew up in the Lutheran Church, and I know how you feel being under a sectarian influence. I know exactly your attitude toward the truth. But when I got big enough to know better I left the Lutheran Church. I came out of it in protest against its unscripturality. I suggest to you that if you are going to save the church of the living God from apostasy, if you are going to keep it from going to Rome, if you are going to keep it from once more becoming eclipsed by the humanisms and innovations of men, you are going to have to have the courage to rise up and demand that men defend their practices, or relinquish them. If they will not give them up, you will have to give the men up!

You have no other alternative and remain as honest men in the sight of your God. I want you to go to these men and say to them, "We have been under your tutelage and governorship, we have been under your teaching and doctrine, and now we want the scriptural authority for this thing you are doing." Demand that they show it is right and proper according to the word of God for them to occupy the position and office which they occupy with you. Make them prove it is right to do that. Tell them that you'll not support them one more week until they show they are entitled to that support. That will stop it. In two weeks you will have the condition whipped. That will take care of the situation, but have you the courage to do it?

Will it be now as it was in the days of Jeremiah? "The prophets prophesy falsely, the priests bear rule by their means,

and my people love to have it so." Then like the prophet I ask "What will you do in the end thereof?" Have you the courage of your convictions tonight, humble brother; have you the courage of your convictions tonight, sincere sister; to lift up your voice in unison with ours in a protest against this system which threatens the churches.

We do not hate these brethren. We do not despise them. They are wrong, so sinfully wrong. They have saddled upon the churches a practice which has been borrowed from sectarianism and for which there is no scripture. They may in some instances be ignorant of the consequences of what they have done to the cause, and unaware of the fact that they are crucifying the talent of the One Body. That may all be true, but beloved friends, have you the courage tonight to enlist as a real soldier in this conflict, or will you shut your mouth, bridle your tongue and saddle your consciences, and go back to your homes no different than when you came. Will you return to swallow this same practice over and over again?

Will you trust as leaders, those men whose only answer to argument is "Pay no attention to these men. They are just a little group of cranks and fanatics." I thank God that though I may be a crank, it takes a crank to start things, whether it be a cream separator or an old Ford. And I may be able to get you started tonight, started to thinking along New Testament lines. If that be the case, I shall thank my God for the fact that I may be branded a crank.

You will be told by these clerics to pay no attention to what we say and to go right along in the same old rut which you have been pursuing. They will insist that you not listen to what you have been told and not to believe anyone who tells you that you should not hire a man to preach to you. They will tell you to go along and not trouble the church, just believe it because they tell you to believe it and because it has been the practice. Thus traditionalism fastens its venomous sting in the church of the living God and that church is becoming weaker and decimated. No, not in numbers. It is growing numerically. It is growing financially. The budgets are larger. The meeting houses are bigger, but as all of these increase spirituality is growing less. And the members grow weaker through lack

of exercise. The body is becoming more helpless because there are those who sap its strength, who take advantage of it to sell the gospel of Christ,

Men will sell anything they can get their hands on. Judas sold the Lord for thirty pieces of silver. Men will sell the gospel of that Lord for a hundred dollars per week. Will you dare take your stand tonight with these gospel mercenaries, or will you have the courage to stand out, if it must needs be alone, against this insidious evil that lifts its head like a haunting specter amidst the churches of the living God, that seeks to engulf and enthrall them in slavery and serfdom? God help us. God give us strength. God give us courage. And may God grant that we shall quit ourselves like men and that in this battle we shall not fail, but that we may hand to our children and to our children's children the church as pure as when He gave it to the world. I thank you .'

## COLLEY'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen:

I sure would like to know if Corinthians are part of the gospel. I sure would. I've asked him that over and over. Are they part of the gospel? Now he closed with almost a cry. Said somebody called him a crank. I did not call him a crank. Maybe he is. Maybe he makes ice cream, I don't know. If he does I'd like to eat some of it, but I haven't called him a crank. He wants somebody to say something to him so he can cry about it, I didn't call him a crank. Brother Garrett in one of his articles in "Bible Talk" called brother Ketcherside a Goliath. Mighty Goliath. Yes, sir; well you can be assured that any time these Goliaths walk out in front of God's Israel, God's Israel today, the church, like these mem did asking for a discussion, that there will always be a David armed with the sling of God's eternal truth to take care of them. They can be sure of it,

He. said we might think he was a radical. No, I don't think he's a radical. I just don't think he knows much about what he is doing. He wants somebody to call him a restorer or a reformer. I am not going to give him that much honor. If I were a reformer and a restorer, as he wants to be, and a man asked me a question, I would try to answer it. He has not asked me a direct question yet, that I would not answer. But he won't answer. If you ask me a Bible question on a proposition I'm debating, do you think I would refuse to answer? Do you think I would refuse to answer? Do you think I would refuse to answer regarding the Corinthian letters being part of the gospel? He has. You people know he has. Do you want me to tell you what brother Ketcherside and his group are? They're factionists. I told you that last night, They're factionists. They talk about going out and establishing churches—in the main they're church wreckers. They wrecked the Cockrell Hill Church of Christ. They will do it in every church they get into. They try to get a member into a congregation so that member can give out their literature. They will do that everywhere. Don't tell me—they are factionists.

He said, "Now how about fixing out your budget?" The churches he works with do not need to make out a budget. Brother Ketcherside has a three-year plan they adopt, His three-year



plan, yes, he fixed it and they adopted it. In place of his plan, the Dallas churches make out their own budget. Yes, each congregation as a unit makes its own budget. But the churches he is associated with unite on his plan. They, as congregations, adopt the bishop's plan—the head bishop in St. Louis. That is brother Ketcherside. That is not the first time I have heard him accused of that. I have heard him receive the honor of being the bishop of the diocese—he is. His three-year plan! He accuses the churches of making out a budget! Certainly. I read to you what God said in the Roman letter (Rom. 12:11). "Not slothful in business." That includes the church, too. Churches should make out their budget. Keep on doing it. Brother Ketcherside cannot set the course for the churches he is not over! He sets the courses for the churches over which he is the "overseer" and some that he is not supposed to be over—some that have elders. Yeah, some of them have said, "We adopted it"—the Three-Year Plan that came out of St. Louis. Brother Carl Ketcherside is the proprietor of the plan.

If my Tulsa, Oklahoma, brethren want me for a debate—I do not know that they do, but if they do I will be there. About another discussion in Dallas—your brethren were supposed to secure the place for this discussion, but you did not. We want them to get the place next time. I will be ready. He said, Oh, get the preachers to endorse you. Well, I am quite sure that some of the preachers would not endorse any kind of a debate. Now some of them wouldn't. I am sure of that. I have very little respect for a preacher of that stripe. Many of them are living on the very fat of the land. That land is the ground that was made sacred by debates of the past, Debates are not new. When there is a man who has any kind of a following and who marches out in front of God's Israel, with a challenge, as long as I live, I am going to accept the challenge. If I can't do it I will get somebody else to do it. I have nothing to hide. As far as being a hired hand — My father (A. O. Colley) and I have preached in this city over thirty-five years. When we first moved to Dallas there were not many members of the church—not many congregations. About three. Now there are over sixty. My father has gone to his reward. I am sure if he were alive today and a challenge was sent to the churches, he would say, "Son, that must be accepted." While my father is in

his heavenly home, resting from his labors, I make this pledge, that so long as I am upon this earth there will never be one Goliath or anybody else that will challenge God's people to defend what they believe without having that challenge accepted. If I do not do the debating I will see that some qualified man does. That is what I think about these factionists, or any of their kind.

Again he wants brother Colley to put his finger on the passage of scripture that teaches us to preach the gospel to the church. I gave him the passage, but he got it wrong. He said I gave him 2 Peter 1:3. I did not. I gave him 1 Timothy 1:3. Paul left Timothy at Ephesus and told him that he was to preach and reprove some people in the church, and if there was anything else contrary to sound doctrine according TO THE GOSPEL, (verses 10, 11). He was preaching to the church in Ephesus. I said that in my first speech. What DID I say about 2 Peter 1:2. This is the first time he has mentioned it. That's' right. I put it in my opening affirmative, "According as his divine power"—That's the gospel, Romans 1:16—"His divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that called us to glory and to virtue." His divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain to LIFE AND GODLINESS. If the gospel can't be preached to the church then nothing that pertains to LIFE AND GODLINESS can be preached, for he hath granted unto us all things in, the gospel. Don't tell me you cannot preach to the church. If you cannot you cannot EDIFY. You can't do anything. He said, Now you find the place where the elders at Ephesus could fire Timothy. No, I guess not. Paul was an inspired man, and during the days of inspiration, all of the churches, all of them, were under the apostles who were inspired. Timothy and the church in Ephesus, and Titus and the church in Crete, were under the direction of the Holy Spirit, We have the New Testament now. The elders of the church do not have miraculous gifts now, but they are elders. Preachers are not miraculously directed, but they are preachers. They are men that must preach the gospel.

Again he talks about trial sermons. He thinks that is bad. Could the church hire a preacher that preached a trial sermon? Hear me: elders should keep on trying the preachers they get to preach. Yes, they might get a preacher like Leroy Garrett

that would divide the church. Yes, have them preach a trial sermon. Do not have him preach a trial sermon only, but investigate his background. Keep on doing that. Yes, sir, we believe in trial sermons. We believe in trying the man that preaches, too. He will divide the church if he is a man like Leroy Garrett. He'll do it! Yes, sir; we have trial sermons. Keep on doing it, brethren.

I just wonder if the church at Manchester Avenue, in St. Louis, hired brother Ketcherside? He went there. He preached. He said he did. He had a class, and he taught there. Did they pay him? Who hired him? Could they fire him? Could they fire him? Now he asked some funny questions, didn't he. All right.

Romans 12, he tells us that everyone had the gift and should use it. Just a moment before I let my time slip away, I want to notice this. Brother Ketcherside said, brother Colley, Paul wrote to the church in Philippi. He addressed the elders and deacons, and therefore they were the officers of the church. All right, brother Ketcherside, Second John was addressed: "The elder unto the elect lady and her children." Were they officers in the church? Huh?

Brother Ketcherside, I think that when you were looking at your notes, you missed something. Yes, you missed something! Hear me, 2 Corinthians 11:7,8: "Obsonion: pay, wages, salary, reward in general"—Souter Lexicon to the New Testament, page 185. I read that. He said, Oh, Colley went to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. No, sir, I gave the Greek definition from Souter of the word for "wages". Here is the definition from the Greek: "pay, wages, salary, reward in general." Then I went to Webster to get an English definition of these words. Brother Ketcherside thinks I can't do any better than to go to Webster. Now, brother Ketcherside, if you were not through so far as this debate is concerned, I would make you retract that. No, I suppose I wouldn't, either, because I can't get him to tell us whether Corinthians are part of the gospel. But he knew that. If he didn't he was listening to those men that were trying to funnel him. And he needs it! I read from Souter Lexicon to the New Testament, page 185. I read from Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, page 877 to define the word salary that was

defined in the Greek Lexicon. And he heard half of it. He got up here and said, Brother Colley went to Webster to define "wages." I went to a Greek Lexicon. But that is the way he has done all through this debate. He does not care what I say. It makes no difference to him. He has misrepresented me more than once in this debate. He did it then.

Romans 12, Note: everyone has the gift and should use it. Then he went to I Corinthians 14. All right, let us get the chapters in order. Spiritual gifts and natural gifts. He says the laws regulating them are the same. Good people, now I'm talking to his brethren. If my opponent should tell me I was making infidels because I couldn't harmonize two passages of scripture, and if I answered like he did, I believe I would quit. He tells us 1 Corinthians 14, and Ephesians 5:19 were written about the same time. Well, what about it? Now open your little black books. 1 Corinthians 12:1 "concerning spiritual gifts." Thirteenth chapter, spiritual gifts. Fourteenth chapter, spiritual gifts. He told us the fourteenth chapter is the basis of all Christian worship. He said, Colley went back to Wallace debate. I had to do it. I had to get you to say the gospel couldn't be preached to the church. These brethren wondered what in the world I was talking about when I was trying to show that the gospel was preached to the church. You would not come out on it. I had to take the Wallace-Ketcherside debate and read what you said. I read what Leroy Garrett said, and then the brethren began to understand what I was doing. You would not take a position on it and I KNEW WHY. He tells us that 1 Corinthians fourteen is the basis of Christian worship—In reality he believes the eleventh chapter is included, too. I asked him if he believed it last night. He hasn't answered. He said it did in the Wallace-Ketcherside debate.

I want to show you the kind of Bible teacher he is. His best is the reading from Skillman Avenue Directory. And he read about Cockrell Hill from their Directory. I do not doubt that they have officers listed in their Directory. Do you know who compiled that Directory? It was compiled by *Leroy Garrett*. (Laughter.) He got the names for it, He left an old stink in the Cockrell Hill church. I'll tell those brethren, and I am sure they will do better. I think they will change the next Directory. Nearly everything Leroy does is wrong. (Laughter).

Leroy was preaching for that church when he said, "Get your names on the list, we want to put your names in the Lamb's Book of Life." One of the elders told me about it, (Laughter). He told me some other things I'd like to tell, but don't have the time.

Now back to 1 Corinthians fourteen and Ephesians 5:19. Brother Ketcherside said they were written about the same time. Brother Ketcherside, listen to me, the only thing you need to do to get away from this hobby, is to get a little honesty and a little more Bible information. Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16 are not discussing MIRACULOUS GIFTS. 1 Corinthians 14 was, and does, discuss miraculous gifts. 1 Corinthians 14 is not the basis of Christian worship. It is regulating MIRACULOUS GIFTS. I asked him to show how a woman could speak today if 1 Corinthians is in force. Could she speak in singing? If 1 Corinthians 14:34 forbids her to speak, she has to keep silent. He says that is in the church, *now*. He says that's the church. All right, if that's the church, how can a woman be silent when she's speaking in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs? How did he answer that? He said, "they were written about the same time. Colley you answer it." All right, I'll do it. Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16 were not talking about miraculous gifts. 1 Corinthians 14 was given to regulate spiritual gifts. The 12th chapter of 1 Corinthians starts with, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." I would not have you IGNORANT concerning spiritual gifts, Paul did not do you any good. (Colley looking at Ketcherside). You still remain that way. Then in closing the fourteenth chapter Paul said, "If any be ignorant let him be ignorant still." All right, go ahead, just be ignorant, I can't help it. There are some things in 1 Corinthians 14 that we can not practice today. Why? Because it was given to regulate spiritual gifts, that's why.

Oh, yes, he talked about the officers. That is when he read Philippians first chapter and first verse. Well, I answered that with 2 John. I am trying to get all of his speech. And now, pay, pay, pay. Of course HE does not get any pay! No, HE has his own home. Brother Ketcherside is doing pretty good along that line. Brother Wallace wanted to read his Dunn and

Bradstreet rating if he would not sue him. Brother Ketcherside did not promise, so brother Wallace did not read it.

Now let us take another: "Borrowed from the pastor system." THESE MEN have preachers over congregations! They are pastors over them! That was borrowed from Rome, yes, Rome itself. That's right.

I have shown you that the gospel of Christ could be preached and that it not only can, but it must be preached to the church. Why does it make any difference whether the gospel can be preached to the church? I'll show you why. Those that preach the gospel shall live by the gospel. God ordained that. 1 Corinthians 9:14. God has ordained that. Number two, those that preach the gospel are to live by the gospel, and if the gospel is preached to the church it destroys their hobby. That's right. It destroys their hobby. Furthermore, I pressed him so hard on this that finally he said, "Do you believe Romans and Galatians are part of the gospel?" I answered, Yes, sir! In return I asked him if he believed Galatians and Romans were part of the gospel. The answer was, NO. I can't get him to tell me if 1st and 2nd Corinthians are part of the gospel. Do you know *why*? He *mashed his fingers*. But he gave up his proposition when he did. That's right. That's right. He gave up his proposition when he did. Why? "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth: to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." Where is the righteousness of God made known? In the Gospel. Here is the next link of the chain, FAITH. Note: gospel, righteousness, faith, and the just that live by faith. Where does it come from? The GOSPEL. The gospel is to the sinner and to the saint. And to the saint as well as the sinner. He hasn't touched it. This argument was in the first speech I made in, this debate. He hasn't touched it. He won't touch it the next time we meet in a debate. I wonder if we will? I will be ready. I do not think he will meet me again. I hope he does.

Again: we have noticed that the gospel that REVEALS is something that he says is not part of the gospel. NO PART OF THE GOSPEL. Now once more: 1 Peter 1:22-25, "Seeing

you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Number one: born again. Number two, "unto unfeigned love of the brethren—love one another." He tried to answer this argument—just a little bit. He said it was past tense. I showed him it did not make any difference in the tense. When you are born again, that's one thing. We are never born twice, not the spiritual birth. But born again, and then love one another with a pure heart fervently. We have to do this. This is part of the gospel. THIS IS THE WORD WHICH BY THE GOSPEL IS PREACHED UNTO YOU. He has not touched the argument. He will not either. He will not touch it if he studies till we have another debate. He will not touch it. Why? His doctrine will not let him. His hobby will not let him. No, sir. I do not need to spend my time defending my brethren, and those that preach the gospel. No, I will spend my time using the word of the Lord. That is what Peter and Paul said.

Galatians and Romans no part of the gospel? Who said so? Brother Ketcherside did. The apostle Paul said there were those in Galatia that preached a perverted gospel. I said in my opening address, "Brother Ketcherside, you are guilty." Why? Here is why, "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Galatians 1:9. Paul said that which was preached, which was not another gospel, but a perverted gospel. Brother Ketcherside says the gospel is to sinners only. Paul said the gospel is not to sinners only but to Christians, too. Brother Ketcherside preaches a perverted gospel. He can't preach the gospel to Christians.

My friends, if he carries his doctrine into effect, he has to segregate those who are sinners from those who are Christians. He can not preach the gospel to the church. He has to preach the gospel to sinners. If sinners come into the church he cannot

preach the gospel to them. ROMANS AND GALATIANS ARE NOT PART OF THE GOSPEL! When we preach to sinners we have to tell them how to come INTO CHRIST. We have to go to these two books. We have to go to these two passages of scripture, Romans 6:3 and Galatians 3:27 to learn how to get INTO CHRIST. These two passages are the only passages in the Bible that tells how to get INTO CHRIST. Brother Ketcherside says they are not part of the GOSPEL.

Good people, in the name of common sense, and all that is right and reasonable, if you love God's eternal truth at all, you know these passages have been completely ignored night after night. My friends, any man who sustains false doctrine, I do not care if he's a member of the church, or whether he's an apostate from the church, or if he is in the denominational world, must dodge the truth. They have to do it. They can't help it. They have to use every means at their command. They have to say every thing mean about their opponent, and their opponent's brethren. They will do every thing on God's green earth, but they do not want to be hit with the Word of the Lord. They do not want to be hit with the gospel of Christ. Don't do that. Don't. No, they do not believe part of the gospel, anyway. You can ask them questions, you can rag them about these questions, like I have him about Corinthians being part of the gospel. They will not answer. Brother Ketcherside will not answer. I've asked him to please say something about some of these proof texts.

Brother A. G. Hobbs: Fifteen minutes, brother Colley.

Thank you, brother Hobbs. Brother Ketcherside has not said anything about these proof texts. He has been very quiet concerning them. Just kept them to himself.

He asks me to put my finger on the passage of Scripture that shows where a man was hired by the elders to preach. I think I could answer that by giving many instances as examples to such questions. Here is one. Jesus said to the apostles, "Teach — baptizing into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." I asked brother Ketcherside, according to his reasoning did he ever read in the New Testament



where anybody ever baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost (Spirit)? Did you ever read where they did it? According to your way of reasoning no man ever baptized in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit! I believe they did! Brother Ketcherside asked where the church hired a preacher. What do we find? What have I established? That there was a man by the name of Timothy that was left in Ephesus. He was a preacher of the gospel. He was left in Ephesus. God ordained that they that preach the gospel should live by the gospel. All right, what did Paul tell him to do? He told him to charge certain men that were teaching things contrary to sound doctrine. What else did he tell him? He summed up a number of things and then said, "If there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God." (1 Timothy 1:10,11). He asked me to put my finger on the passage. I did that in my first speech of this debate! I gave that and he did not answer it. He has not answered it yet, He has not told us if Timothy preached the gospel to the church. Timothy was in Ephesus. The church had elders in it. But he says, "The elders could not fire him." The elders and the whole church were under the supervision of the apostles, who were inspired. Paul told Timothy to go there. That is about like some arguments the Baptists make. When you ask them if they would baptize a man under the circumstances and conditions under which Philip baptized the eunuch, most of them answer, "If the Lord told me to I would." Brother Ketcherside uses the same tactics. They all do. That is sectarianism. It's denominationalism. It is a fear to meet God's word. They had rather run around and wade through something that some men have said. He had rather smear gospel preachers. He had rather do that. They do not want me to get after them with the word of the Lord.

Hear me, my friends, once more, all of the elders, all of the members of the church, all of you, hear me: Don't be afraid of God's plan. This plan has been outlined. It is workable. That's the reason we have sixty churches of Christ in Dallas. And also I called your attention to the church in Burlington, Iowa. This church had about three hundred members and one of the best houses in the state of Iowa. They got brother Ketcherside's system in that church. Now they have around twenty

members. That is what this system does. They have to have a man with a good personality, like brother Ketcherside, or brother Garrett or the church will die. Some individuals are hobbyists anyway. They will stay with them regardless.

I am saying again, my friends, these men are factionists. They'll tear up the churches where they can. They'll do everything possible. They will slur, they'll brag in their papers. They will say everything they can against gospel preachers. They frequently say, "Oh, our columns are open to preachers." No telling what they will say about this debate. I want all of you to go away from here knowing that I will tag them with cowardice if they say that I am afraid to meet them in another debate. We will meet them anywhere they have a representation, and believe me, we are not going to meet them with the idea that we'll give them notoriety enough for them to raise their head in respectability. They can't raise their head in respectability when they dodge the word of the Lord and do everything that's possible to tear up churches. We hear them say, "Now, brethren, we are pleading for unity." Not a word of truth in it, my friends.

"I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I aim ready now to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Timothy 4:1-8).

These things given to Timothy by Paul are always before me. They shall continue to shape my life as long as I live. When it shall be mine to throw off this earthly coil of clay, it will be

to hang up my armor on the evergreen shores of God's after-while to receive the victor's reward that He has promised to those that fight for Him here. I will fight and contend for the faith as long as I live. Every child of God should do that. Those who come as these men have, as factionists, should be fought with the sword of the Spirit. Love them as much as you can, but at the same time take the Word of the Lord and use it against them. Because you can do it. They do not have a leg to stand on.

Once more, may God bless you and keep you is my humble prayer. (Time.)