

The
Ketcherside-Porter
Debate

The Ketcherside-Porter Debate

A DISCUSSION:

Church Support of Orphans Homes, Schools, and Colleges

Held in Community Hall, Ozark, Missouri

March 23-26, 1937.

Between
W. CARL KETCHERSIDE, Nevada, Mo.
and
RUE PORTER, Neosho, Mo.

—1937—

Printed by:
RUSH PRINTING CO.
BARNARD, MISSOURI

PROPOSITIONS

The erection and maintenance of orphans homes, such as Tipton Orphans Home, Southern Christian Home, and others of like character, for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphan children, is authorized by the New Testament scriptures.

Rue Porter affirms

W. Carl Ketcherside denies.

The erection and maintenance of schools or colleges, such as Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb College, and others of like character, for purpose of teaching the Bible and other branches of learning in connection, is contrary to the New Testament, and should be opposed as an innovation in the church.

W. Carl Ketcherside affirms.

Rue Porter denies.

MODERATORS

For Mr. Ketcherside: W. G. ROBERTS

For Mr. Porter: JOE BLUE

FOREWORD

It was my pleasure to attend the Ketcherside-Porter debate held at Ozark, Missouri. Large crowds greeted the speakers upon every occasion, and perhaps there were never less than a thousand people present.

Since there is one congregation in Ozark and three in Springfield, near there, which favor the so-called "Christian Colleges" this was an ideal place for the debate. I'm informed the college brethren in Springfield opposed a debate of that nature there, and Ozark was the next best place for it.

Rue Porter, of Neosho, Mo., was considered one of their ablest debaters, having held twenty-five public, oral discussions. W. Carl Ketcherside, had participated in one or two little skirmishes, but this was his first debate. He was a young man only twenty eight years old at the time of the debate, hence quite young to be put up against a man forty seven years old, and experienced as a debater. These facts need to be known before reading the book, so that the reader will be more able to appreciate the ability of the young man, who so successfully, masterfully and courageously met and discussed the issues between himself and the experienced debater in whom his brethren had so much confidence before the debate began. That confidence melted away as the discussion continued, and when Ketcherside during the progress of the discussion, and again at the close, challenged for another debate to be held in Springfield, St. Louis, or Kansas City, or all three places; Porter's brethren seemed perfectly willing to blush under the challenge and let it go by without accepting it.

But, be it remembered, we are not trying to lower the ability of Rue Porter, for he is a strong debater. He possesses great power, and had he the truth, no man in error, religiously, could stand before him and successfully defend such error, for Porter would as certainly defeat him as badly as most people think Ketcherside defeated Porter. However, I am not deciding the debate, or who won it. You may do that after reading it. It will most certainly interest you.

Porter is a good debater, though not the logician and orator Ketcherside is. He is far from being the equal of Ketcherside in several respects. We very much admire the courage and zeal of Porter in stepping out, and trying to defend his position. That was manly in him and we compliment him for his bravery. I think they have no one who could have done better than Porter. I gladly give

Mr. Porter credit for being one of the fairest men in this respect, for most of their preachers refuse to meet anyone of representation in a debate, on these questions. I congratulate him in this. Here, Porter, is my hand, let us shake.

Brethren at Neosho challenged Porter to meet me on these issues, and I laid my hand on Porter's shoulder and told him I would meet him anywhere in the United States or Canada, where a debate was wanted or needed, but he refused. Later he signed with Ketcherside and stuck his head into a "hornet's nest" by so doing. I think you will agree with me after reading this wonderfully interesting discussion, that I am not exaggerating this statement. I am willing to leave it all with the readers.

Brother Ketcherside began preaching when a mere boy, thirteen years old, and despite the fact that he was still in school did a great deal of successful preaching. I had him read and offer prayer for me in the days when he was still wearing knee pants. All through those years he studied the Bible diligently, and being possessed of a brilliant mind, retained most of what he learned. I mention these things in the foreword, that the readers may be better prepared to understand the differences in age, experience, and shall I say—ability of these men, both of whom may be classed among the intellectual giants of the polomic world. I can gladly recomend W. Carl Ketcherside as a worthy opponent to meet anyone who wishes to discuss with him.

W. G. Roberts, Mattoon, Illinois

INTRODUCTION

Approximately two years ago, the congregation at Ozark, Missouri, became divided over the so-called "Bible College issue," and a group consisting of those who endorsed human organizations to do a part of the work of the church, left the church building, and forming a faction began to meet in the Klepper Funeral Home. Shortly after the division, I conducted a meeting for the faithful brethren, and during the progress of the work challenged for a discussion on these issues. The challenge was not accepted.

Later, Elton Abernathy, who is a graduate of Abilene Christian College, and is at present associated with the Speech Department of Iowa University, suggested that we discuss these matters at Springfield, Missouri, during the holiday season of December, 1936, to which I agreed. Shortly before the date set I received a letter from my opponent, stating that his "college brethren" positively refused to permit a debate, as they "did not want these things brought to light in the Springfield territory."

Then certain of my brethren informed that Rue Porter, of Neosho, Mo., had declared that we did not have a man who would meet him on these issues, so I immediately wrote to him, and submitted propositions on the college question. He insisted that we debate the Orphans Home issue also, and I signed his proposal, thus arranging for the Ozark debate.

We were much gratified to note the interest in the debate, and also in the day meetings held in conjunction therewith, at Springfield, Ozark and Nixa. It was my idea to hold a series of debates with Porter, in communities where the church was divided over these matters. I suggested as much to him several times before the debate, and challenged him during the discussion. Although he agreed during the heat of the argument, to accede to this, when the propositions were handed him after the discussion, he did not sign them. I further agreed to meet anyone whom his brethren might choose, and endorse, and ask them to select a man, but to date not a word has been uttered by the opposition.

For the benefit of the reader who did not have the privilege of attending the discussion, certain facts should be stated. I personally took upon myself the enormous expense of arranging for the publication of the debate, but sent all manuscripts to Brother Porter for perusal and correction. I regret that he saw fit to make changes in the wording and argument. Those who were present recall his constant use of the term "the boy", in referring to his respondent. In

his manuscript he has dropped that in many instances. I am sorry for that, since I want to remain a boy as long as possible. Some of us wonder if Brother Porter decided it was "just too bad" to permit the reader to know it was a boy who overcame his arguments.

I ask Brother Porter if Paul or any of his contemporaries ever made of themselves traveling beggars, working on a commission and robbing the treasury of the church to support an orphans home. The stenotypist recorded his answer thus, "Where did any of the apostles ever tell us we SHOULD NOT do it this way." My notes also show that he said exactly that, and later I made a reply showing that was the Christian church argument for instrumental music, etc. But, in his revised manuscript, Porter changed that argument to say, "Where did any of the apostles ever tell us HOW to do it?" I protested such changes, believing it to be unfair to the purchaser and reader, but publish the manuscript as amended by my opponent, realizing that truth has nothing to fear.

I want to commend my respondent for his gentlemanly conduct during the discussion, which I believe was carried out in the spirit of Christ in most instances.

It is my hope that the public will enjoy reading this book, that it may lead you closer to Christ; and above all, kind reader, it is my prayer that you shall be led to stand for the Church Supreme.

W. Carl Ketcherside.

March 23, 1937 7:30 'p.m.

MODERATOR BLUE: We have met here tonight for the purpose of having a religious discussion; not a political pow-pow, but a religious discussion. I am quite sure these brethren do not want to engage in anything without first going to the Lord and asking him to view them in their discussion. Now we are going to have a word of prayer. We are going to stand while we pray and will be led by Brother Diestlekamp of this state.

Prayer by H. H. Diestlekamp of Rolla, Missouri.

MODERATOR BLUE: Now, these brethren are not enemies; they are friends. I am quite sure that both of them want to conduct themselves as Christian gentlemen in this debate. We will not expect anything else of them, but let us remember that they are the disputants and we the audience. We will let them do the debating, and we will do the listening, and be benefitted by it. If you render a decision now it won't do you any good—you might as well go home. You want to render a decision after the discussion is over. You want to listen to the evidence on both sides and be benefitted by the discussion. I believe it was Brother Campbell who said there is more to be learned in a four-day discussion than a month's preaching; that is if you come listening, and weigh the evidence on both sides.

Now the discussion will last four nights; two propositions, two nights to each proposition, two hours to each session, divided into half-hour speeches. Brother Porter is the affirmative tonight and tomorrow night, and then Brother Ketcherside will be in the affirmative the next two nights. I will now read the propositions we are to discuss tonight.

The erection and maintenance of Orphan Homes, such as Tipton Orphans Home, Southern Christian Home, and others of like character, for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphan children, is authorized by the New Testament scriptures. Rue Porter affirms, and W. Carl Ketcherside denies.

That is the proposition for tonight. Brother Porter will now address you.

MR. PORTER'S FIRST SPEECH

Brother Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, and you my Christian brethren and friends: This is an hour of vast importance to each of us, and an occasion each of us should enter into with prayers in our hearts and with the desire above all things else, to learn the will of the Lord, and to have the courage to discharge our duties. I come before you at this time with a kind of mixed feeling of emotion. I have been a preacher of the gospel for 25 years, and have engaged in some 24 or 25 public debates, and have always enjoyed them, and have profited by each of them; but never in my life before this, have I been called upon to meet and discuss with one of my own brethren a matter of difference.

There is a difference between Brother Ketcherside and myself; and between that great group of brethren with whom I stand, and those with whom he stands. There is a difference between the positions we occupy with reference to the proposition read in your hearing a while ago. It is that difference we are here to discuss. Our differences are not personal,—there is no room for personal animosities, between us, for I had never seen him until I met him here this evening. As far as his standing is concerned, it is recognized all over the land, and I have nothing at all to say against that. We are not here to discuss men, but principles, and the principle to which your attention is invited tonight is that concerning the manner or method of taking care of unfortunate children in the land,—those who are dependent upon someone else for what-ever care they may receive,—orphaned children.

The proposition says that the erection and maintenance of an orphans home, such as Tipton Orphans Home at Tipton, Oklahoma, and the Arkansas Christian Home, at Morrilton, Arkansas, and others of like character, for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children is authorized by the word of God. One of the rules of honorable controversy demands that the speaker who introduces the argument shall so clearly define the terms under discussion, that there may be no doubt as to the meaning of those terms. This is fair and right, and I want each of you to follow me closely as I define the terms, that each of you may understand what I mean by them. We sometimes have different ideas as to the use of words, and might not understand each other because we did not understand the sense in which the word is used. Some words have many senses. For instance, the English word 'bark' as an illustration. I might mean the outer covering of a tree; the yelp of a dog; or a

kind of a boat. There is no way of telling what the speaker means when he uses that word except by the context,—the connection in which he places it in a sentence. Hence, it is certainly proper, fitting, and right that we so explain ourselves that all those concerned and those anxious to hear the truth may know what we mean by the words we use.

By the words "erection and maintenance," I simply mean the bringing into existence, and the keeping up of a home such as the Arkansas Christian Home at Morrilton. The word "home" is defined by the dictionary as a family residence, a place to stay; and this is the sense in which we use the word tonight. The erection or bringing into existence of such a place as that, "for the purpose of caring for,—housing and caring for— orphaned children." There is no explanation to be made for those words that would make their meaning clearer. It is for the purpose of protecting them from the heat and cold, as you would protect your own children.

We have built and are maintaining and keeping up such places, known as Arkansas Christian Home, and the Tipton Orphan Home, at Tipton, Oklahoma, FOR THE PURPOSE of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children; that is, for children who have been deprived of their parents,—one or both parents. Well, I think that ought to be clear enough for that part. Another expression, "is authorized by the New Testament scriptures." The proposition does not say that the New Testament SAYS this in so many words. My friend knows that if that were the case, it would not be a debatable question. I am not an infidel, denying the plain statements of the word of the Lord, and I am quite sure he has no notion of doing any such thing.

Well, now having made the terms clear enough, I should like to go a little bit further. I have a most peculiar feeling tonight in this respect. In all my experience as a debater and public speaker, I have never come before an audience to speak upon a proposition and have the assurance that so nearly every religious person on earth are here standing with me. This is the first time I have had such a majority on my side. I say to you now however, that I do not claim this as proving my proposition, far be it from me to do that. My proposition says "the word of God" authorizes it. But the fact is so peculiar, so odd and out of the ordinary that I could hardly pass it by without making mention of it.

Now then, to the proposition and argument itself,—the support of its truth. I want to call your attention, my brethren and friends, to this fact as the opening statement of this debate. This question is not, and we are not here to debate, whether or not it is right

to take care of orphaned children. Certainly my respondent will not say it is wrong to "house and otherwise care for orphans." It is not a question of "what," but it is a question of "how!" It is a question of whether or not God has made and laid down for us to follow, a law which is specific in its nature,—a law which points out the manner in which and the method by which we are to house the orphans and take care of them. That is the question! That is the issue in reality, and every one of us will be able to see it long before this night's discussion comes to a close.

You will see that we are discussing a method, or whether or not God has prescribed; whether God has declared, revealed and made known to us a method. Facts in the matter are, I would be willing to risk the whole issue upon this question or inquiry. If I had the least idea that my brother could find such a rule in the scriptures,—could find a law from the first of Matthew to the last of Revelations, even a single verse—God does not have to say it forty times to make it so—one time, one place where God has specified a means—a method, I mean to say, by which we must care for and house orphaned children—if he could find that ONE PLACE and let me see it, that will end the debate. You don't have to argue with me about it; if it is in God's word it is settled so far as I am concerned. There will be no hesitancy on my part. I surrender immediately when he finds it in God's word. I want my friend to remember that, and to say something about it when he comes to the floor tonight. If there is a place in God's Book that points out to us the method that should be followed in caring for orphan children, let him cite it. I will believe it. I pledge you my honor as a Christian gentleman that the debate will stop immediately.

On the other hand, I will call your attention to this. The moment my friend admits that he cannot find such a passage, then the debate closes on the proposition for want of an issue! Because THAT is the issue. You watch him—you who are keeping notes—I beg you and insist upon it now, see whether or not he makes an effort to show that God has pointed out a method that must be followed. I want you to remember that, Brother Carl! You are a fine boy I am sure, and come to us recommended as one of the ablest of men, and I am sure it is true. He is said to be among the finest of speakers—filled with eloquence and ability and all of that. If there is a man living that can show this proposition is wrong, that boy will be able to show it. Mark it down, and I am driving a peg right here as we start this! He will not be able to do it, however, because I know it is not there.

I should like to call attention to other things as we go along, in order that all of us may keep the matter straight in our minds. First,

I invite your attention to James 1:27, which will be the rallying ground and the center of controversy, as the place around which every argument I shall make will be built. I propose to make but one argument on this entire proposition. One argument! Four speeches are mine to make, but every thing I shall offer will be in the form of explanation and elaboration of this one argument. All right, I state it to you just here. The apostle writes it down as plainly as the English language can express it;

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and keep himself unspotted from the world."

Mark this down my brethren, the Lord lays down upon every man in the land, a duty. God is not a respecter of persons, hence makes it necessary that every man practice a religion that is pure and uncontaminated, and that religion consists of activity. That religion consists, among other things, of visiting the fatherless and widows in their afflictions. I read another translation for the sake of making it simple to all. "Pure, unsoiled religion in the judgment of God the Father means this: To care for the orphans and widows in their trouble, and to keep oneself from the stain of the world."—Moffat. I offer this for the sole sake of simplifying. Any translation, as far as I am concerned, expresses the thought fully and completely enough for us to see our duty in looking after the widows and orphans in their trouble, and keeping himself unspotted from the world.

I want to call attention to the word "visit" as used in this verse. It doesn't mean merely to go and see them. If I should find a widow a few blocks from my home, and should take Nancy (my wife) and go to that widow's home and say; "Poor old widow, we have come to see you and stay for three or four days, and eat up your bread and bacon, perhaps the last you have," that would not be complying with James 1:27 where it says "visit the fatherless." The word visit does not mean that I am sure! Every man in the church has always preached that it means to visit them in a substantial way. Go, and provide for their needs—furnish them the things necessary for their welfare, and I insist upon this as a fact, and I want my friend to grapple with it when he comes to speak.

The word is not specific. The thing to be done is visit, but the manner of the visit is to do it in a substantial way. Visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and make provision for their welfare. But my friends, how?

God does not make any more definite method of doing this, than when he told the disciples; "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel." Do what? Go! In what manner were they to

go? There are many ways of going. I have traveled about 2,000 miles since last Wednesday night in order to reach this place. I have ridden four railroads, and three or four bus lines. I have ridden a mule; I have ridden in a wagon, a boat, a buggy, and all that sort of thing. "Go" is generic and not specific, and the word "visit" as we find it in this passage is also generic and not specific. I challenge my friend to say whether it is generic, or specific. If he says it is not specific, he fails to uphold his position, and the debate ends for want of an issue; for all that I claim for it,—all that my brethren claim for it is, that Christians must visit them in some substantial way, and provide for their needs.

I want to introduce at this point one other thing and keep it before your minds tonight. Ephesians 2:10, at which the apostle says; "*For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath ordained that we should walk in them.*" I ask you to note the fact that the apostle declares that there are certain things which God classes as "good works," and that they were "before ordained," and includes that we should "walk therein." I turn to my respondent and ask; "Is the housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children a good work?" I will give you a dime's worth of doughnut holes if you will answer that, or undertake to prove that it is not a good work. I want my friend to remember it. I quicken your interest in this discussion by inviting you to remember that God has ordained that we should WALK IN these good works. What does our proposition say? "Build a house for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children." I challenge my friend to come before this audience of friends and neighbors and say it is not good. Will he take God Almighty's book in his hand and say, "Huh-uh, it isn't good to do that." If it is good I challenge my friend to say we should not walk in it. His position forces him to say we should not do it!

I read another thought from Galatians 4:18, where it says; "*It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing.*" All right, "always in a good thing." I want my friend to tell us when he comes before you, if it is a "good thing" to house and otherwise care for orphaned children? Is it good or not good? It either is or isn't. It is either that kind of thing which God commands us to walk in, or that about which God has not spoken. But in James 1:27 God has spoken about it. God made mention of it in plain terms. God says "visit them." Put it down I am asking you to remember it is good work, and God says do it. Paul says it is good to be zealous always in a good thing.

I advance a bit further. Hebrews 13:16. Listen! "But to do good, and communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is

well pleased." Now we sometimes make sacrifices in caring for orphaned children. A number of us have done that. We give to them the thing we might use with satisfaction for some other purpose, but the apostle says for us to "do good" and not forget to communicate. To whom shall we do good? Is any one exempt from that? I should treat every one right. My neighbor, my enemy, and every one else. The book says; "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are the household of faith," Gal. 6:10. Remember he says for us to do good unto ALL MEN. My friend, I am sure will not make the technical distinction that the apostle here mentions "men" rather than orphans. He certainly will not contend that because the word is "men" that children are not to be treated good also. God says DO that thing. God says it in his word, and puts it so plainly that every one can see, and nobody in the world ever dreamed of objecting to, until my brethren—some of them—came along and decided that something else could be done rather than that.

Now I maintain in this discussion tonight, and shall throughout, that when we built, erected and maintained an orphans home, a place FOR THE PURPOSE of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children, we are doing exactly what God calls for when he says "Remember the poor." We are doing just what God had in mind when he said for us to "visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions." Just as sure as we are to visit them in a substantial way, just that sure we are doing it. There are hundreds of such orphans in the homes we have built and are maintaining. Fatherless, Motherless,—the riff-raff of the world, taken into these homes where they are protected from the heat and cold, where they are clothed and fed, and nursed when they are sick. where they are taught the way of the Lord by capable men and women. IT IS A GOOD WORK, and I read from Ephesians 2:10 where inspiration says "WALK IN IT."

I advance a bit further. There is another thing I want you to hear. Romans 13:11, where the apostle shows us this is a matter of business. Hear him: "Be not slothful in business." Slothfulness should not be found among the Christians of this land. What are we to do about the fatherless and the widows? The book says we should take care of them and not be slothful about it. But HOW shall we do it? Haphazardly? When you see a poor widow right before you, and you can hardly dodge away, do you say; "I have a quarter, but I need it to go to the show or the circus?" Shall we treat them this way?

I should like to know what my friend is doing with the orphans and widows anyway, or what he proposes to do about it. We

propose to do something about it, and ARE DOING it. We get results that show, too, in the hundreds and hundreds of children that are being cared for and looked after,—we have given them a HOME where they are being kept and developed into something worthwhile.

I remember the story of one young man who was found some twelve years ago in an alley in an Oklahoma town. He was wild, and ran when he saw them coming. He was dressed in a man's coat that almost dragged the ground, and living off the refuse found in garbage cans. He was taken in hand by the County Judge and sent to one of these orphan homes. He cursed and fought and bit and clawed until it took most of the nurses and men around the place to get him in the bath tub for the first time. That young man to-day is among the ablest and best of gospel preachers in all Texas. As clean as the proverbial hound's tooth, and no man can bring any just accusation of any sort against him. This is what we are doing in these homes. We take children who would otherwise be outlaws, and develop them into men and women of worth. This is what God had in mind when he gave orders to "visit the fatherless."

This is what God's Book teaches, sir, and I want you to remember it, and my friend is going to come up here tonight and deny my proposition! He signed his name to it, and it simply says that "The erection and maintenance of such a home FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOUSING AND OTHERWISE CARING FOR orphaned children is authorized by the word of God." How under heaven can a man say that such a thing is wrong? How can they say; "I don't believe that?"

Well, sirs, every great fraternal institution in the world is builded upon the principle that it is good to do good. I am not depending upon that to prove that we are right, because the proposition says the word of the Lord authorizes it, and I call nothing else proof. I am simply showing you that no one in all the land ever raised an objection to any such work as this. It is simply a systematic and business like way of doing what God commanded us to do. Let my friend say it is wrong if he dare say it. I insist that God put in his book the order to visit the fatherless and widows, and we are doing that! I want my friend to answer this; Is it right to do what God has said? Is it wrong to do right? I shall be glad to have him grapple with it.

I read Romans 12:13. "Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality." I want to insist, my friends, that it is the business of Christian people to be hospitable. I should like to know if there is any better way under the sun to show hospitality,—or to more effectively show it than looking after those who are in un-

fortunate circumstances? God put it in his Book for us to do these things, and we are doing it. What is the opposition going to do about it? He can stop this debate in a minute if he will but point to the place where God tells us HOW this work is to be done. There need not be an argument about it. This command to visit the fatherless needs to be obeyed. There is no exception to the rule.

I want to call attention to another phase of this argument in the closing three minutes left for me. I want you to make a note of this. There are two things God has called upon his people to do. Put this down, **TWO THINGS!** Others might be brought in, but these two stand out. There is **WORK** to be done, and there is **WORSHIP** to be rendered. We are to worship God, certainly. Worship God in spirit and in truth; even as he has directed us. Certainly this is true. But I am asking my friend a question. Is the **WORSHIP** of God any more important than the **WORK** which the same God calls upon us to perform? I want to know, sir! My friend comes along and says we ought not build a house in which to carry on the **WORK** of the Lord, and I know he is bound to admit that caring for the orphan child is a work of the Lord. He is not skeptical enough to dispute the truth of that, surely not. Well then, if God demands that we care for them, God intends that we shall provide the means necessary. We build houses in which to worship God, which is right; but my friend can read nothing about that in the word of the Lord. There isn't a shadow or a hint in the New Testament scriptures about Christians building a house, or buying one that is already built for the purpose of worshiping God. We do it as a matter of necessity. God commanded that we assemble together, and we **MUST** have some place at which such assembly can be called. We **PROVIDE A HOUSE** in which to worship God and there is no specific command to do it. Ladies and gentlemen of Missouri, you are not a bunch of fools,—you can see that! (Time called).

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Gentleman Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: I too stand before you this evening with mixed emotions, realizing as I do that the blood-bought body of Jesus Christ in Ozark is split in twain, bleeding and broken, a spectacle of shame and disgrace to the entire world. As I approach you tonight with the realization of the fact that the church is partly split over the issue being discussed on this occasion, I expect to bring to light certain facts, which will enable you to determine exactly who is responsible for that division. I expect to prove before this discussion is over that those who have endeavored to introduce into the body of Christ, an institution not ordained by the gospel record, are guilty of causing division, and thus we must consider them even as the Word says, "Mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine, and avoid them."

I am thankful above all things tonight, that I stand before this audience of intelligent men and women, in defense of the greatest institution in all the world, the church that nineteen hundred years ago was purchased with the blood of my Lord. I am thankful that I do not appear before you to uphold the teachings of some individuals who are not satisfied with that organization, or to defend those who would organize institutions that are contrary to His truth.

We have just heard a dissertation by my respondent, that is evidently the best that could be done by those on his side of the issue. For a number of years I have heard of Brother Porter. He is a wonderful spokesman, a good orator, and a reasonable thinker. Some of his brethren came to me (I have a lot of friends among his brethren) and said, "Carl, when you meet Rue Porter, you will meet the best man we have." I am thankful for that, because after I take away every thing he has introduced tonight, and every thing he will introduce, you folk can't get another man. There will be only one thing you can do—get another doctrine, or come to the doctrine of Christ.

Now I say to you, I am happy for several things tonight. I am particularly thankful that I have the opportunity of coming to Ozark to the present side of the issue. Shortly after the congregation divided over the orphans home and Bible Colleges, it was my privilege to hold a meeting, for those who opposed the addition of other institutions to the body of Jesus Christ. After those who had left the faithful body began to meet elsewhere because the Church of Christ refused to endorse the things which the New Testament did

not mention, Brother Porter was called to assist them in the work of establishing their faction. Tonight it is your privilege to listen to the two men who have held the meetings here in the past. I am glad to enter into this investigation with you.

Brother Porter is laboring under some misapprehension and misconception of the proposition. I don't know but what, if Brother Blue had not read the proposition for him, I would have requested his copy to see if he had the right proposition. He seems to be under the impression that we are debating whether or not the doing of good works is authorized by the New Testament. He is sadly mistaken! That is not the issue at all. In the first place he makes the statement, "We are here tonight investigating or debating the manner or method of taking care of orphans." My friends there is just one thing we are debating, and that is the erection and maintenance of an orphans home, whether it is right and proper and in accordance with God's divine truth to establish another institution than the church, to take care of part of God's work. Let the importance of that statement sink into your heart.

We are not here tonight investigating method! The proposition says, "The erection and maintenance of orphan homes SUCH AS TIPTON Orphans Home, Southern Christian Orphan Home and others of like character is authorized by the New Testament." I insist tonight that the gentleman who stood before you never once put his finger on a single passage of Holy Writ calling for the erection and maintenance of such homes as that, not once did he locate a precept or command justifying him to erect a separate institution, elect a superintendent, appoint a matron and a treasurer to do a part of the Lord's work in assisting the destitute. Not one single time did he go to the word of the Lord and show where our Heavenly Father said for the fatherless to be taken into a great institution, and we should constantly beg and plead for more money to keep that going.

Now he said we are debating a method. I want to read to you just what one of his own brethren said on this question. I refer to Foy E. Wallace, a man to whom my respondent will give his whole hearted endorsement. Listen to what he says: "The organization argument has been concisely stated in one sentence, which is eminently true, and is a safe rule of action, namely: Any organization larger than the local church is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work of the church. Indeed, there are methods of doing what is commanded, but they must be the church's methods and within the scope of the thing commanded. The church has no right to do anything as a church, that God has not commanded the church to do. Nor does a Christian have the right to do through

another organization that which God has commanded the church as such, to do. Organizations are NOT METHODS! not methods," get that!—"The Missionary Society is not a method; it is an institution. A Sunday School, a class or classes on Sunday, may be a very effective method of teaching, but they often extend into organizations. It seems that nothing can be done these days without being overdone. It is not infrequent these days that we find classes in the church organized: children's classes, young people's classes, women's classes, men's classes—all operating as organized groups in performing the precise functions of the church, with their presidents, secretary's, treasurers, etc. This prevents the very purpose,—perverts the very purpose," get that!—"of a class from a method of teaching to a financial auxiliary, a miniature organization. It becomes an infringement on the Divine arrangement."

That is right Brother Wallace! That is right, Brother Porter, and there is no denying it. *That completely and absolutely* takes away from my friend every thing he said tonight. We are not discussing methods, but institutions! I am to follow him, so I go on.

I was listening anxiously and carefully for my brother, while defining his proposition to get down to the word "authorize." He told what the Tipton Home was and then he came to the word "authorize" and told what it wasn't, and said something about "bark" but never did tell what "authorize" meant. Why? I'll tell you why. If he had defined it correctly, it would have taken away from him everything he had to say and I will prove it to you. Here it is: "authorize: to clothe with authority or legal power, to give right to act, to commission. To give authoritative permission to or for, to empower, warrant, to establish by authority."

What does he say? He says the *Tipton Orphans Home* is authorized, by what? The New Testament! He means the New Testament scriptures commissioned Christians to establish homes like that. No wonder he didn't define it. He positively cannot show where God legalized such homes! He knows as well as I know that *this proposition is not what the Bible does not teach, but what the Bible does teach.* You let him go to the Word of God and point out the clause which states the erection and maintenance of orphan homes is authorized by the New Testament scriptures. Let him show that he has the legal power to act in such work, that the gospel has empowered him to build such institutions. Will he do it? Well you have another speech tonight, Brother Porter, and we will be waiting!

He says on this matter he has a majority on his side of the question. That may be true. He didn't offer that as argument. The majority of the people were outside of the ark, and were

destroyed in the flood. I would be worried about it greatly, especially if I had the majority of the denominational world on my side tonight. He said, "I have a majority of the religious organizations tonight on my side." I presume he offered that as a wonderful point, but a wonderful point for what?

I told you we are not discussing methods but an organization to do a part of the Lord's work—a human organization. He will dig and bury and try to cover up, try to hide it from you, try to keep you from seeing that, but listen now, mark this down in your mind, that every time I get up in this pulpit I am going to keep before you that his proposition is that the New Testament scripture authorizes the establishment of an organization. We are not debating methods, we are debating whether or not that thing is scriptural. He states, "If he can find a single verse where God has specified a means or method for taking care of orphans that will be the end of the debate." Brother Porter says he has held some 25 debates. I don't know very much except what I read in the word of God, and haven't held many debates, but that makes not a particle of difference. I know I am here in the negative just now! I am not here to find things in the Bible. He is here to show where God legalized orphan homes like Tipton. I am here to deny that he can do it! That is the issue. He says it is authorized. He is affirming and I am not under obligation to do anything but deny what the gentleman says, to prove him wrong. If I choose to bring forth methods for him to investigate and examine, I do so voluntarily, not because of compulsion or obligation. I am here at this time to make this issue plain and keep it clear. There is only one thing I am called upon to do tonight and that is to answer my respondent. I say it is not authorized, he says that it is. It is up to him tonight to find it in the scripture. I am still waiting for him to do it. He contends that if God does not specify a method the debate ends for want of an issue. But again I state, I am not called upon to find anything, for this reason, that even if I did not produce a single method, that still would not justify the erection of another institution that is primarily to do the work delegated to the church..

His proof should not take long to present, because he told you people he just had one scripture, when he first stood up here. I am no prophet, but I predict he has given about all he knows on the subject. He had one verse and would center his whole argument around that. I admire Brother Porter and respect him for his courage, and I admire him because of his ability and power but I say to you that if he has presented all the argument he has for the establishment of Orphan Homes the debate is already over, because he hasn't shown a single passage of authority.

Let's read further. He quoted James 1:27 as his "rallying ground." Please note that this is the apostle James speaking, and he speaks after this fashion, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." To sustain his proposition he would have to make this say, "To hire a secretary, matron, superintendent, treasurer, take \$250,000 to erect a big building, send trucks to beg from the poor, and keep yourself unspotted from the world." If I know anything about the verse it doesn't read that way. You heard him say awhile ago that "visit" doesn't mean to go see them personally. I am going to contradict that. I have turned to Thayer's Lexicon, the standard Greek-English Lexicon in use today. He would quote from it if he were debating on instrumental music. The Greek word is translated "look out" once, and "visit" ten times. It is defined, "To look upon, to inspect, first in order to see how it is. To go see one. Porter says it doesn't mean to go see one, and Thayer says it does mean that! It must be a personal inspection, but Brother Porter says it doesn't mean that, but gives you the liberty to go hire somebody to do it for you. Then you can hire somebody to keep himself unspotted from the world for you too. You can hire a secretary to do that for you. That would be nice, wouldn't it. The record says here that we are to visit the fatherless and widows, and Thayer in translating that says "to go and see one."

The original word is also used in Acts 7:23; 15:36. Brother Porter's argument is that "visit" includes an orphan's home, and if it does not, his argument has fallen by the wayside. Here is the same word in the original Greek, where the inspired recorder Luke talking, says about Moses; "And when he was full forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren, the children of Israel." My brother says the word "visit" means to establish an orphan home. That would make this read, "It came into his heart to establish an orphan home for the children of Israel." The very phraseology here shows however that it means to go personally and see someone. Thayer says it is the same word in Acts 15:36, "And some days after Paul said to Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached." According to Brother Porter's idea now the word visit might include the establishment of an orphan home. Let us read "Some days after Paul said to Barnabas, Let us go again and build an orphan home in every city."

The word "visit" means to go and see how they do. Chances are that my friend doesn't visit the orphan's home once in every two years. That is why he will not like this definition. It con-

demands him the same as it does anyone else. He made a pitiful plea for the way his brethren take care of orphans. He knows they don't go visit them. When the truck comes around, he sends them a quarter's worth of sugar, and 15 cents worth of beans and forgets about them, but the word of God says to VISIT them in their affliction. I tell you it is an individual matter and you can't get away from it.

I shall notice the verse (James 1:27) further, and I want to get the context. I like that for I think it is the only way you can properly interpret the scripture. "For if any man be a hearer, but not a doer" - speaking of an individual, you see - "he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass, for he beholdeth himself" - still talking about an individual - "and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was" - no organization there - "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but doer of the word" - Who? This man - "if any man" - now that is not an organization—"seem to be religious and bridleth not his tongue"—no organization yet—"that man's religion is in vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit" - who is to do it? The man, the individual - "the fatherless and the widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." To keep HIMSELF, not a matter of institutions or organizations, not a matter for a great society. You have lost your argument according to God's divine truth, for you say this is your only "rallying ground" to prove authority for an orphan home.

Let us note some of the scriptures he used. First, Eph. 2:10. He asked if the orphans home was doing a good work. Bless your soul, Bro. Porter, I am not denying that. We are not discussing that. We are discussing whether the orphans home is authorized by the New Testament as a means for doing that work. It is up to him to find the scripture and show that that is God's authorized method. That was his proposition, but he hasn't found it yet. Did Eph. 2:10 say anything about the orphan home? See if he finds the AUTHORITY for an orphans home in there.

He asks if a man can do a good work and be lost? I do not deny that the orphan home may do a good work, and Brother Porter will admit the Missionary society may do some good in the earth, but simply because the missionary society does a good work, shall I endorse it? No indeed! He would organize a society to care for orphans because it is a good work. The Christian church preacher says the Missionary society does a good work, so it must be all right! The Missionary society to preach, the orphan homes to care

for the needy! You will be preaching for the Christian church the first thing you know, because that kind of reasoning will take you head over heels into that group.

He said something about a dime's worth of doughnut holes. He proposes to bring me a dime's worth of doughnut holes if I will find a passage stating how God wants orphans cared for! Bring the holes and I will find it for you.

Galatians 3:18. It says to love your enemies, but it doesn't say to go out and build them an orphan home. That is what we are discussing. I do not deny that the scriptures say to love your enemies; but you find where it says to build an orphan home. I believe in loving my enemies as much as he does, but I don't think I need to establish an institution in which to do it.

"We are not to be slothful in business, not to do it in a haphazard way." All right, Brother Porter comes before you and says, "Unless you build an orphan home and take hundreds and thousands of dollars to maintain it, and care for the orphans and destitute, he says you are not doing the Lord's business in a business-like way. He cannot go back into history 50 years and find an orphan home like Tipton, so for nineteen hundred years, the Church of Jesus Christ took care of orphans but not in a business-like way. It was hap-hazard. For 19 hundred years the Church of Christ did this in the wrong manner, but he and a few of his brethren came along and found the right way to do it.

He would say, "Now listen Paul, you are all wrong. You didn't know how to take care of orphans. Yours is not a business-like way of doing it. Nosiree, but you must do it through the orphan home society." You stick to that, because we are going to have a debate on this thing before it is over with. Don't worry about that part of it.

He asks, "what is my friend doing?" Suppose I didn't do anything? Does that make his institution right even if I wasn't doing anything through the church? Sometimes the church does not do missionary work, but does that authorize establishment of a missionary society? My Christian Church friends say that I do not do enough missionary work, and that gives them the right to establish a missionary society. Let us carry that a little bit further. "Brother Ketcherside, listen, your singing doesn't sound very good. You are in discord, and that is the reason we have a piano." What proves too much doesn't prove anything at all, does it?

He talked about a young man found in the alley, etc. I haven't time to tell you about all the things the church alone has done, but I do wish to say now we are not here to appeal to sympathy or prejudice, but to discuss whether or not an orphan home is a

scriptural institution.

In order to get this question before you firmly tonight, I am going to read certain questions which I want my friend to answer. May I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, that during Christ's personal ministry, he asked a query like this. "The baptism of John, is it from Heaven, or among men?" Do you know what the Pharisees said? They reasoned, if we say it is from heaven, he will say, why then did you not obey it? If we say it is from men, the people will kill us because they think John is a prophet. So they were speechless, could not answer. I am going to ask this question:

1. Is the Tipton Home a divine or human institution?

I am going to get you any way you go. Just take your choice. You can take either position, say it is divine or human or keep still, whichever one you do I am going to get you. You are here defending something that the scriptures don't authorize.

2. If it is a humanly devised arrangement for taking care of a part of the work of the Church, will you go down on record as endorsing the establishment and maintenance of human organizations, institutions and societies to do the work of the Church?

3. If divinely authorized, will you kindly answer the following queries:—

a. What chapter and verse of the New Testament expressly mentions God's authorization of such a home?

b. Which of the apostles, or their contemporaries, was ever a field agent for such a home, working on a commission and making of himself a traveling beggar to solicit money for such homes?

c. Does the New Testament furnish us with the name of a single disciple who was designated as superintendent, matron, or Secretary of an orphan home in apostolic times?

d. Where did Jesus or the apostles ever authorize the congregations to send special CHRISTMAS offerings, thus giving recognition to this day which was originally one of pagan festival and riot?

e. Did Christ or the apostles ever refer to the church as Santa Claus in order to extract money from the treasury by a plea for sympathy?

f. God gave detailed instructions for the building of the ark, for the construction of the tabernacle, and for the erection and perpetuation of the church. Where would you cite us for instructions as to the building and maintaining of an orphan home, since you say it is authorized by the Word of God?

Since the same scripture which authorizes the caring for orphans also authorizes the caring for widows, and if building an orphan home is the SCRIPTURAL way of taking care of orphans,

why would not the scripture authorize creation and maintenance of WIDOW'S HOMES? Will you please tell us where there is a Southern Christian Widow's Home, and how much your congregation has contributed to such an institution? If you have no such Widow's Home, then will you please tell us on what grounds you stress one part of this verse to the neglect of the rest? But if you take care of the widow's without an extra organization, doing it as individuals and through the church ALONE, why cannot you do the same for orphans.

h. If such orphan homes as the proposition mentions are divinely authorized, will you tell us when the first one of this type was started, at what place and by whom?

i. Will you please point to the scripture which says it is right for the church to sign a pledge, specifying an amount payable monthly to the orphan home?

Now I think I have just a few moments left. I want to notice one more thing. My friend made a statement like this: "I want to know just exactly what my respondent's people are doing." There are several reasons why I don't have to answer that tonight, but the elders of my congregation endorsed this statement to you:

"To whom it may concern: Realizing that the advocates of unscriptural organizations often times seek to justify themselves, by pleading that those churches which stand for the New Testament church as the only institution which is to function in the work of the Lord, are slack in taking care of the needy and assisting the poor; we wish to offer the following statements relative to the church in Nevada, of which Brother Ketcherside is a member.

First, the congregation at this place has never contributed a cent to any institution except the blood-bought body of Christ. We believe that the church was established as a self-maintaining, self-perpetuating institution.

The members of our congregation have opened their homes to care for twelve orphan children, besides making it possible for several others to receive an education. We say this, not boastingly, but believing we have only done our simple duty as Christians. Those whose names are here affixed have been elders of the Church since its inception in Nevada, and have personally taken at various times five orphan children which have been reared to maturity, most of them now being members of the church.

Brother Ketcherside has been a member of the congregation at Nevada for approximately eight years, and has been an elder of the church for about two years. During his entire association with the body in Nevada, he has not only given freely of his means to assist those who were in distress, but has sacrificed in these matters.

"We are glad to be able thus to keep the record straight for those who may doubt the ability of the church to take care of its work, without a human organization tacked onto it." This statement is endorsed by my fellow-elders at Nevada, F. E. Journey and John Kryselmier, who have been ever forward in the work of helping those in the church less fortunate than themselves, And that is the answer to your question, my dear brother.

As far as what I am personally doing for the orphans, I am not going to answer that for this reason: the proposition does not demand that I do it, and second, my Savior forbids me to do it. He forbids me to boast and brag and bluster about what I do in his service. The Saviour says in Matt. 6:1,2, "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men to be seen of them, otherwise you have no reward of your Father which is in Heaven. Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do, that they may have the glory of men."

I am not going to come here tonight and brag about the poor that I have picked from the alleys who were kicking and biting like wild-cats. My Saviour says, "Don't do that." He forbids me to do it. Even had he not forbidden it, I want you to know I would not go about publishing my deeds of charity, I want you to know that we do it for the glory of God and not for men to see.

I have covered completely and beyond a reasonable shadow of doubt, every argument made by my respondent, and have definitely proven that nowhere in the scripture does God authorize the maintenance of orphans home for the purpose of caring and otherwise providing for — — (Time called)

MR. PORTER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, Ladies and Gentlemen; I am quite sure you appreciate the splendid speech to which you have just listened, and especially the manner in which my questions were answered! I am also sure we appreciate the scriptures he read which told us **HOW** we should go about caring for orphaned children! I am by no means disappointed in his ability, for he is living up to his reputation as a speaker, and the fact that he has failed to answer the argument offered is not due to his weakness, but to the fact that he could not find the answers.

You will please note that it takes evidence of some sort to make a point stand out. Do you recall anything he read in the Book showing that what I said was not so? It is a bit surprising, almost amazing, to hear him say some of the things he said. Of course I was not expecting him to resort to trickery of any kind, but I did expect him to give attention to the argument I offered, and instead of doing that he uses his time telling how I should have read, and how I said things wrong! He says I didn't read the proposition right, and that I failed to tell what certain words meant. Now he has just forgotten for my notes show the very words I used in defining "authority," I said it meant "The Word of God teaches." It authorizes the visiting of orphans in their afflictions as a work of God. Scripture authorizes that. I did read it, certainly I did. His forgetter is working better than his rememberer about the things I said.

Next he says the word visit must mean, "to go see to see with the eyes." Now I didn't say it did not mean visit people, and nobody so understood me. I must correct him here. I said it meant in the passage under dispute, to visit in a substantial way. I said that plainly, and Carl is the only man in the audience that misunderstood me. The rest of you heard me say. Sure you did.

Next he introduces Thayer. Thayer is a good witness, and it is all right to introduce him. I have his work, also Liddell and Scott, but I didn't bring them along, as I had no idea he would want to bring in technical terms. I was sure he would have the fairness to turn to the Bible and read that Book, and say whether or not he believes it is so. He comes on down and reads about the "perfect law of liberty," and says this is an "individual matter," this visiting of orphans. He might as well have saved that part of his speech, for he was only repeating mine. I made the argument in the first five minutes of my opening speech that the scriptures command **EVERY** man to visit the fatherless, and that God did

not bind this upon one man to the exclusion of others and he should have remembered it.

But listen, I am driving another peg here ladies and gentlemen, driving it square down. He has now gone on record as saying this is an individual matter. If it is right for one man to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, then I insist that it is right for every man everywhere to do it. He says the orphans should be taken into private homes. Then they should be taken into EVERY private home. He need not talk to us however about that being the ONLY way! Carl, I will bring in those doughnut holes ahead of time if you will only read in the Bible the passage which tells us it is right to take them in our private homes! Why brother, he can't find in all the Book any such statement. I have ask him to find it and pledge myself to give up the debate if he will do it. What did he say about it? He said; "I am not called upon to do that." But he is called upon, and I surrender the minute he does it. He will not do it however, for the passage is not there. He will not bring it Saturday, Monday or next July!

He comes to Ephesians 2:10, and says: "Brother Porter thinks we are debating good works - of course I know that orphan homes are doing a good work." Put that down neighbor! He has gone on record saying "it is a good work," and to offset the effect of his admission he says, "Do not the missionary societies and others do a good work?" Yes sir, the WORK is good. Now answer this one, Will any man be punished for anything he ever did! No sir, NOT ONE! Men may be lost after doing good things but NOT on account of the good thing done. God does not punish folk for doing good. Again I challenge my brother to come before you and say that "housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children" is not a good thing.

He refers to my saying "we are doing it," and says; "We are not discussing that," but we are discussing that. He needs not argue about it. There is the proposition. I think I have the wording copied here. Give me the proposition Joe (Moderator Blue) I want to be sure of it. Listen! "The erection and maintenance of orphan homes, such as Tipton Orphans Home, Southern Christian Home, and others of like character, FOR THE PURPOSE of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children is authorized by the New Testament Scriptures." That is what the proposition says, and in plain words. He has had it since last fall, and it has said it all the time. This IS the issue, and he need not hide behind something else.

Another thing he wants me to bring the passage that expressly mentions an orphans home. I might turn again and ask him to

bring the passage that mentions a house of worship? He wants the passage that mentions a superintendent or a matron. I might ask him for one that mentions a building committee, or a janitor. Some of those helpers of Paul's may have been janitors. Maybe he will find this in his Greek somewhere. If so I want to know it. These things are not named expressly or specifically, else this would not be a debatable matter. He is not an infidel, to deny it if the book SAID it in so many words.

The proposition does not say that the scripture SAYS this, but that the scripture TEACHES it. He will not make capital of this statement either. The scriptures authorize, or teach that this is right. Listen, when God commands that we do a thing, and does not specify the method or manner of doing that thing, human judgment must be employed as to HOW it is done. We are talking about a thing that God has commanded us to do - visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction. That, ladies and gentlemen of Missouri, is the thing to be done, and we are talking about HOW to do it! God has not described the HOW. He does not say for us to take them into our private homes. If he did that would settle it. I said as much in my first speech, but God does not specify that.

I have never contended that scripture specifically mentions an orphans home. None of my brethren have said such a thing. We do say that God demands that we care for them, and that is what we are doing. We have a meeting house over here. My brother thinks it right, but where in the Bible can he find the passage specifically demanding that we build a house for the people of God to assemble in? It is not to be found in the New Testament, and he knows it. Yet all admit that it is right.

There are many things in which we engage, and for which we pray, that are not specifically mentioned, and yet no one questions such things because the law of necessity demands some such thing. God has never said with reference to the Lord's supper, for instance, whether the bread shall be baked round or square, thick or thin. He simply said 'bread.' We attend to the details as we see fit. We are compelled to use our own judgment in such matters. The difference between things mentioned in a general way, and things specifically mentioned is clear. My brother brought up Noah's ark, and told us much about it. But God's word doesn't tell ALL about it. There are things of which no mention what ever is made.

It is true that God told Noah to make the ark of gopher wood, and the dimensions of it are given - he told that, but my brother cannot tell HOW he did the work. Did he use a rip saw, or a buck saw? was he a left handed or a right handed workman? There are many other items of which no mention is made.

We do not know whether the weather was hot or cold when Noah and the animals went in. My friend is simply guessing when he says this is all specified.

Let me say this to you my friends, with the kindest feelings in my heart, this man sets himself up as an authorized interpreter of God's sacred silence. He would have you believe that he is the official explainer of those things God never said! HE tells us we must NOT do this thing as we are doing it, for it is all wrong! God however, has laid down no such law. Tell me that God would send his Son into the world and make our admission into heaven depend upon our helping those in distress, and then condemn us for doing the very things he commanded us to do?

I read Matthew 25:31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all those holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepard divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." I am making an argument here that he will never answer because he can't. Listen to the Lord say, "I was hungry and you fed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, etc." They answer him, "When saw we thee sick and did visit thee, or in prison and came unto thee, etc." The Lord says; "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." My admission into heaven depends upon my doing good in his name, and especially to those who are destitute. This is what we are doing sir! We believe it right, and even Carl says it is a good work.

My friend says; "I am not called upon to affirm anything." That is true. He can choose his own course. I have only asked these things to clarify the issue.

He asks me if the Tipton Orphans Home is a divine or human institution? He cites the conversation of Jesus and the Pharisees as an example of asking questions, and I use it as an example of answering them by asking others. I ask now, is a building committee, or a group of trustees, a divine or human institution? Answer it sir, and your own question is answered. Here is a parallel for him to grapple with. Let him tell us where he gets his authority for having a building committee, or a board of trustees to hold property for the church?

He hands me this written question, "What verse expressly mentions God's authorization of such a home?" Not a one! Put it down that I said it. If there were even one verse that had the very words in it would he deny it? It is not "specifically" or "expressly" mentioned. That is why we are debating it — to

determine whether or not it is TAUGHT. We agree that it does not say so in so many words. Neither does it specify ANY way of doing the work.

Which apostle was ever a field agent for such a home, making himself a traveling beggar to solicit money for such homes?" Brother Carl, which of the apostles ever went up and down the land telling churches HOW to perform such works? Which of them ever divided congregations over the WAY to do such things as you brethren do? My friends he is trying to raise a false issue rather than discuss the true one. He wants to build a man of straw, because he cannot do anything with the real one.

"Where did Jesus or the apostles authorize the congregations to send special Christmas offerings, thus giving recognition to this day which was originally a pagan festival and riot?" Does he know, or not know, that our proposition says the scriptures authorize "the establishment of houses or homes for the care of orphan children?" We are not debating Christmas trees. Why does he want to get off onto that?

Next he wants to know why we shouldn't build a widow's home? Bless your soul my friend, we can. There is such a home in Nashville, and I understand that several widows are being cared for there. I do not know the particulars of it, and am not familiar with all its workings, but I do know this one thing, whether there is one or forty it is right to care for them, and IT IS NEVER WRONG TO DO RIGHT. Just as sure as God is true, it is right to house and otherwise care for the fatherless and widows, and we are doing it. I asked him about how to do this, and asked it for the sake of eliciting information. I had hope that he would come forward with some plan based upon a plain statement of the Book and say, "Here is what God says about it." Had he done so I would have raised from my seat and said, "Here is my hand Carl, I agree with you, and I pledge you I will walk as this verse teaches." I will make that pledge good the very minute he finds the place where God said it. He has not produced it yet, and he says he is under no obligations to do so.

Now he wants to know "If the orphan homes as the proposition mentions are divinely authorized, will you tell us when the first one of this type was started, at what place, and by whom?" I am not informed as to that. The scriptures say "visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions," and that verse carries with it, and he knows it, authority from heaven to provide the means through which that care can be given unto them. There is on old rule of interpretation going back to the earliest writings, that when God gives a commandment to men and does not specify the manner in which it

is to be carried out, then they to whom the command was given **MUST** furnish that part of it. My friend simply laughs at such a rule, and pays no attention to it otherwise.

God said "Go preach." It is not specified **HOW** we must go. We may walk, ride a horse, a boat or an airplane, and still be doing exactly what God commanded, that is, **GO**. Get to the place where the preaching is to be done. God said to Phillip, "Go near and join yourself to this chariot," and Philip **RAN!** R-a-n. ran. I challenge my friend to say we must **RUN** in order to **GO**. I shall be glad to have him tell me of one way of going that is commanded. Our judgment must be used in determining such matters.

I hasten to introduce two or three other thoughts, although I might if I were disposed to do so, rest my case right here. My proposition stands proven, and my friend absolutely failed to offer proof to the contrary. He talked about this thing and that; and told how sorry he is that there is a division in the church at Ozark, and ladies and gentlemen while I have the deepest sorrow in my heart over the matter, I turn to him and say he is the man who is responsible for it! That is the charge I bring, sir! Here are men in this audience tonight who have preached for the Church of Christ in Ozark before the division came. Men who stand with me on this proposition, and I challenge him to name the man who ever even mentioned this matter while they were preaching here. Take Diestlekamp, Tillman Prince, Preston Fields, or any others of them. They held successful meetings and **NEVER CAUSED ANY TROUBLE**. There was no dissension or discord until my friend came into the country and began to preach this doctrine and put himself up as a dictator, and tell people what they must not do. Before God, and my friends, **HE DID IT**.

He came and preached his position and insisted upon it until brethren would stand it not! They refused to accept him as a dictator, and would not have him to rule over them. I do not accuse him of dishonesty, but he made a mistake. He made a law where God made none. He insists upon the enforcement of a law which God did not make.

I believe the scriptures authorize the building of an orphans home, for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children. Scripture says take care of them, and it **MUST** be done some way. My friend says this way is wrong, but he brings us **NO WAY** to do it.

He says the church is acting unscripturally when it provides this means of doing the work, and he is dividing the churches over that idea. Why does he do it? We are ready to do the work in the way God wants it done, and if he finds the passage that says it must

not be done thus, or if he finds the one that says is must be done in **ANY OTHER WAY**, we accept it at once and the debate is all over. He says it must be done by express mention or plain commandment. All right, you bring us the "express mention" or the plain commandment and I pledge you we will accept it at once.

I want to be understood. I hear that there are reporters here this evening from newspapers over the country, and I certainly want them to understand when they make a report of this discussion, that I am simply contending for the work of visiting the orphans to be **DONE**, and that since God gave no specific commandment as to how to do it we **MUST** choose the method, and that the truth and righteousness of my position has not been touched by the rejoinders of my friend.

I repeat again that since God has commanded us to take care of orphans, and has not specified the way we do it, that we **MUST** make a choice of some nature. We chose this method,—build a house to cover their heads, furnish them with food and such medical attention as needed, and provide for their moral and spiritual instruction. My friend says it is wrong! Why in the name of all that is decent and good will a man fly into the face of the mandates of decency, and of every student of morals, and of the scholars and philanthropists of the world! All testify that it is the best way human ingenuity can devise for the work. Certainly it is. In the beginning, I did not lay this down as the **ONLY** way the work can be done. My brethren have never made a **LAW** of it and said you must abide by it. They cannot point to the instance where we came to them and said "You **MUST** do it this way." He hasn't charged it, and he won't.

We have never made a law of that kind. We tell them that orphans must be cared for in **SOME WAY**, and if he wants to care for one or more in his private home, that is all right, and we will not object. There are some who have done that, and we honor them for it. But when one says that all orphans must be cared for in this way **ONLY**, we object. He is mistaken when he decides that "I take them into **MY** home and care for them thus, and because that method of doing what God commanded suits **ME**, **YOU MUST DO IT THAT WAY OR I WILL DISFELLOWSHIP YOU,**" I say when he decides thus he is wrong, and that is just what he is contending for tonight.

He talks about authority! Where is his authority for such an assumption? God never made him a lawgiver! God has made neither of us to be legislators. I do not pretend to have power either to enact or enforce the law of God. I am simply a servant of God, and proclaim his gospel and try to do what he commands

me. It is not our business to enact legislation by which the people of God shall be governed, or to set up rules by which they must be measured. No sir!

I turn to Romans 12:2, "And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." God wants us to prove what his will is,—do it ourselves—by what we do. He tells us that "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith," that is, the standard by which our faith shall be measured. This standard includes the statement, "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." We do that by visiting them in a substantial way. Visit in a way that is worth something when we go. I do not make personal visits often, it is true, but my pittance goes as often as I can send it, and the substantial thing is thus done.

The small sacrifice which I make, together with that of thousands of others, goes to feed hungry mouths of those who have no father to take care of them, or mother's loving hands to minister to them. They are cared for there, and my friend comes and says it is a sin and an innovation that should be opposed. What does he offer as proof of his charge? His own assumption! Does he bring anything in God's Book? Will he? I insist he will not, because it isn't there.

God says visit them. I dare my friend to say God has specified the method. (Of course I use the word 'dare' in the sense of a stressed challenge.) Does he presume or assume the authority to tell me how I shall do it? He has presumed,—spoken where God did not speak. Moses said in Deuteronomy 18:20, "the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, **** he hath spoken presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him."

I have called attention already to Matthew 25, where Jesus said that those who minister to the sick, the hungry, and the naked, were ministering unto him. What a thought! "Inasmuch as you have done these things unto the least of these, you did it unto me!" When we minister to the poor of the Lord, we are ministering to the Lord himself.

My friend has something to say about doing our alms before men. Now I am making no such plea, and he knows it. Paul said it was not wrong for him to boast a little. (2 Cor. 12:11), and he asked the brethren to remember that he was a man of some importance himself. I make no such claim for myself, but I do believe the apostle told the truth.

Our God does not consider us a bunch of senseless and idiotic folk! God knows that we have sense enough to go out and arrange

for the care of those who are in distress. God knows that we have ability to clothe those who are naked and cold. God knew we could do it in a decent and orderly manner, because he made us with sufficient mind to understand such things.

The sisters that make dresses or shirts, or whatever garments they make are doing the work of the Lord. (Time called).

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: I heartily agree with my friend in his statement, that it is not talk but facts which stand the rest. "The erection and maintenance of orphan homes such as Tipton Orphans Home and Southern Christian Home is authorized by the New Testament Scriptures." That is the proposition, and he says it is evidence that counts. I accept that.

I submit to this audience tonight, that not one single argument has Brother Porter produced, tending to show that the scriptures endorse an orphan home institution to do the work of the church. I kept him pretty busy. But at the same time, let it be understood that I am not taking the lead in this proposition. That is what my brother would like to have me do. He has tried to make me assume the affirmative on this question. My affirmation begins Thursday night I cease to follow and take the lead then, and I believe we will really take a position and stay with it. I will ask you to take the negative and I promise to meet you on every point and not evade as you have tonight.

Right now I am going to back-track on the gentleman a little bit. He said, "we never once said you **MUST** do it this way. We have erected orphans homes, but never once said you **MUST** work through them." He said I would not charge them with that. I do charge them with it! My respondent said something that was untrue. They have done that! I want to read you this clipping from the Firm Foundation. Brother Porter writes for that paper and endorses it. "Will W. Slater, Fort Smith, Arkansas, December 31: Today brings to a close one of the busiest and most successful year's work of my life. I have assisted in seven revival meetings, and have baptized seventy-two people. What time I was not in meetings I have been serving as field agent for the Arkansas Christian Home, or Orphan Home at Fort Smith. I have preached three hundred and fifty-six times, visited two hundred and twenty-one churches, and have traveled in five states. Churches have been wonderfully good to me, and with very few exceptions, I have been asked to return again. Only four congregations refused to allow me to speak. I am sure that some day they will **REPENT** and send for some of our representatives. I have met a number of the preaching brethren, and they, God bless them, have been most wonderful to me. I shall never forget their kindness. Only three preachers with whom I came in contact, turned a "cold shoulder" to me. One refused to announce for me. They too will repent some day. We have a few preachers, I am sorry to say, who are not in sympathy with

Orphan Home work. They have not foresight enough to see it *but I am telling them now that their days are numbered*, so far as their **WORK AND INFLUENCE WITH THE CHURCH IS CONCERNED**. The saddest and most pitiful sight on earth to me is a homeless, helpless orphan child, made such through no fault of its own, and a preacher who will not endorse the work of caring for such, through which the church can, and is being builded up, I say a preacher who will not endorse such work, had just as well 'fold his tent and fade away,' join the anti-Sunday school crowd where he will be forgotten, so far as the great brotherhood of the Church of Christ is concerned. Our brethren, God bless them, are going forward, and are 'doing things' and have no time to listen to a 'knocker'."

I charge tonight, as you said I would not do, that your brethren have said, "You **MUST** do it this way, or you might as well fold your tents and drift away." There is a statement presented from one of his own brethren, and when this gentleman steps up here and tells you something that positively is untrue, it is necessary that I call him on it. I am not going to charge him with dishonesty. I believe he was ignorant of that. I feel sorry for him! He made a statement that they had never said you must do it this way, and I read from one of their field agents, that you must either work through the Orphans Homes, or you had better fold your tents and fade away, we will not have anything to do with you.

In the first part of his speech, he said, "I am going to drive another peg right here. If it is right for one individual to do it, it is right for every individual" Then he remarked something about *bringing doughnut holes ahead of time*. Relative to such statements let me say this: My old Book says "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men; teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." I have to accept it that way. The apostle Paul speaking in the Ephesian letter instructs us that we are not to indulge in foolish talking and jesting. For that reason I hesitate to notice such statements which have no point in them! If he brings up an argument, I will answer it. However, he has offered some doughnut holes, and you make him bring them. I will be looking for them. But I don't want the doughnuts around them; I want the holes and that is all!

Again, he said that I made the statement that I was not called upon to show a method by which orphans must be cared for. I insist that I am not obligated to do that by this proposition, and I am not called on to do it, because the thing we are arguing tonight, and the thing we are discussing and disputing, and I want you to see

it, is "the erection and maintenance of Orphans Homes, such as Tipton Orphans Home, and Southern Christian Home, is authorized by the New Testament Scriptures."

He referred to the word "authorize" and said he had defined it. I have not heard him define it. He cleverly evaded it again. All he did was to fight shy of the logical definition which I gave of the word. Why? Because that man realizes and knows that he can't go to God's divine truth, and find an Orphans Home institution authorized there. He knows he cannot cite us to the law. He knows he hasn't the legal authority! All he has is inference. He reasons, "We can infer from that, etc." I must have misunderstood the proposition. My understanding was that it says "authorized." He must think it reads like this: "The erection of Orphans Homes such as Tipton Orphans Home is authorized by our INFERENCE." I surely must have misunderstood him on the proposition which he signed. The proposition says it is authorized by the New Testament Scripture.

I pass on and find he mentions Ephesians 2:10 and says, "No man will be punished for any good work he ever did, no not one!" He wants me to point to a single individual who did a good work and was punished for that. He said you couldn't do it. I am going to point to one. You put this down, because I am going to pull up both of those pegs and put a big one down in their place. I remember that one time a man by the name of Moses had instructions from God to speak to a rock and bring forth water, that the children of Israel might drink. Because of their bickering and mumuring, he became exasperated, drew back his rod, and smote the rock twice saying, "Ye rebels, must we again bring forth water that ye may drink?" What happened? The rock opened up, the water poured forth, and gushed out so copiously that it preserved the life of every person there, saved all the cattle and stock. Wasn't that a good work? Yes, but the Lord said, "You are not going to enter the promised land, because you have failed to sanctify me this day in the sight of the people." Was it because he didn't do a good work, Brother Porter? Certainly not, but he didn't give the glory to God, and I say to you tonight, that when you do this work you claim to do, and you do it through another institution, you are not sanctifying God. You are not setting him apart. You are not working through his Body and you know that is a fact.

My friend brought up the subject of a house of worship. Then he reasons, because we build church houses, of course, it will be all right to build an institution to do the work of the Lord in. Doesn't he realize the difference between a mere piece of church property, and an organization with a superintendent, field agent,

secretary and matron? Can he not distinguish between a house of worship in which to assemble and praise God, and setting up a foreign body to do the Lord's work, necessitating the bleeding of the churches in order to keep it alive, and paying a man \$275 a month to run it? Can't he see what we are talking about in this proposition? What he will say next, I don't know. I am like Brother Porter in that I am not going to charge my opponent with dishonesty. But what is the matter with a man that talks that way? A man who has held 25 debates, a man who should know how to stay with a subject, and then offers a substitute like that.

He had something to say about the bread on the table, and that the record did not say anything about its shape or size. Is that like an Orphans Home? The scriptures do not tell us whether to bake the loaf thick or thin, therefore the scriptures authorize the erection of an Orphans Home. That is his position. Wonderful reasoning, isn't it?

Oh, he took up the question of Noah building the ark, and said the Lord didn't tell him about how to build it. I read in Genesis 6:22, Noah did according to ALL that God commanded him, so did he. Suppose he was told to build an ark and the pattern was provided by the Lord, but Noah says, "this pattern God gave is not satisfactory, it is not the right way to handle the work. I am going to put on an extra room, a pigeon roost for the pigeons, and elect my wife a matron, and appoint one of the boys an agent to secure enough funds to take care of the extra organization, and pay the salaries." That is what you've done! So don't find what the Lord authorized and bring it up and say it is equivalent, or in other words parallel to this thing which you advocate, and which God did not command.

I introduced the "ark question" for this reason; to prove that everything which God has authorized, he has given specific instructions for taking care of the command. When God authorized the building of the tabernacle, or the establishment of the church, he told how to conduct them, and how to carry out the work. He left nothing out. He included every department necessary to perpetuate and maintain them. I want you to listen to this. Does the Book say that we are to work in such a manner that God shall receive glory through an Orphans Home? No! but that he must receive the glory in the church. Any organization or institution that tends to take the glory away from the church is contrary to the system of divine revelation, and I am going to make that point stick a little later on.

Notice some other things my friend says: "The Lord did not say how this work should be done." Why then did they choose the the Orphans home as the way to do it? Listen to him! "We have

chosen this method because it is the best." I want to turn with him and read a brief passage from a statement made by one of his own men, and show how he has denied that it is the best method of taking care of orphans. Here is the Gospel Advocate of June 7, 1928, page 542, from which I read concerning the Orphans Home system. My respondent endorses this journal, has probably contributed to it, and knows something about this. Here is what John W. Fry, president of the Tennessee Orphan Home says about it: "Children admitted to the Tennessee Orphan Home continue under its supervision until they reach their majority, or returned to parent or relative, placed in another institution." You see the Orphan Home is an institution, and he says they remain in that institution until they are placed in another institution. Again he says, "We realize that the best treatment any institution gives to children does not benefit the child to the extent it is benefited in a good Christian family home. The policy of the Tennessee Orphan Home is to place children in family homes as fast as good homes can be found. It has been truly said: 'Beyond question, family home life is the highest and finest product of civilization'. We encourage temporary visits to the family homes."

That is what the president of one of your Orphan Homes has to say. He says a good, Christian family home is the best way to do it, and the institution is a poor substitute. Brother Porter said that there was not a man or woman on earth, in the face of common decency would deny that the Orphan Home system was the best and most economical way of carrying on that work, but this man did, and you fellows should get together, before you have a "cat and dog fight" among yourselves.

President Fry further says concerning the issue, "The natural ties of children are parents and near relatives, which we feel is the logical home"—my friend said something about common sense and moral logic would justify the existence of Tipton Orphans Home. But the superintendent says, "parents and near relatives offer the logical home; but we require such relatives taking a child to enter into an agreement executed by the husband and wife, outlining the principal care that shall be given the child, in some instances requiring those taking the child to be guaranteed by responsible neighbors . . . When such natural home is fit, it is best for a normal child to be brought up in its natural home. When such home it not fit, it is best for the child to go into a good foster home rather than stay too great length of time in an institution, it matters not how well conducted." You had better get together on this now, or instead of me having a debate with you, you will kill yourselves on this question.

He makes another statement. "The Saviour says I was sick and ye visited me." Now there is the word "visit". I am glad he introduced that. His position is that "visit" in James 1:27 means to go and do some work, and authorizes the establishment of another institution—a home. That would make the Saviour's statement read like this: "I was sick and ye established an institution through which to come and visit me, or better yet, elected a superintendent to do it for you. I was in prison and ye built a great institution to minister unto me." I did not hear him say anything here which would indicate that I should do the visiting in some kind of second-hand method. It is an individual matter. He says, "Inasmuch as YE did it to one of the least of these, YE did it unto me." Not the orphans home but YOU. You find Orphans Home in there, will you?

We pass on a little further. My friend mentions that the record says, "Go and preach," but does not tell us how to go. Ah yes! That is true, but hold on just a minute, let us apply my friends reasoning. The word says to go and preach, but doesn't say how to do it, so we'll hire a bunch of people to do that for us, to collect finances, send out missionaries, and organize a society in order to take care of this matter. I want to impress upon your hearts and write in your minds that if a man or group of men were to advocate a separate institution to preach the gospel, this man would oppose it. If it is wrong to organize another institution for preaching the gospel, I ask in the name of Heaven, why is it not wrong for you to authorize another institution to take care of the orphans? Is preaching the gospel a good work? I ask my friend to extricate himself from this dilemma. Brother Porter, that is your argument, and now I've knocked your peg over.

I notice that he also said, "He is the man who is responsible for the division." He says there was no division before I came, but that when I condemned the Homes and Colleges, division resulted, so I am the responsible party. Yes indeed, and I remember one time back in the Old Testament, the wicked king Ahab met the old prophet and said to Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" But Elijah said, "I am not the man, but thou and thy father's house, in that you have forsaken the commandments of the Lord." Those are the people who are responsible for the division today; the ones that have forsaken the commandments of the Lord. Brother Porter, thou art the man!

Now listen, suppose this gentleman here were talking to a Christian church preacher. He would come to the question of instrumental music in the worship. The digressive preacher would say, "You are the man who divided the church. You came in here opposing instrumental music, missionary societies, etc., and you are

the man who is responsible for it!" My friend would deny the charge and show that the schism came, because the other was introducing something that the Scriptures do not authorize. I tell you right now (pointing to Porter) that you and your brethren are running around over this country establishing institutions and organizations for which there is not one iota of scriptural proof, and you are the man responsible for the break. Rather than have fellowship with your brethren, you would stay with an unscriptural institution, and attempt to defend it. You would rather have that organization than harmony in the church of Jesus Christ, and fellowship of brethren who love the Lord. I am thankful that the only charge against my brethren tonight is this charge. He has pointed to me, and in effect has said, "I charge you with coming into this community and preaching that the Church of Jesus Christ is the only authorized, divine institution for doing the work of the Saviour." I thank you for that! If that is the thing I am accused of to night, I thank God I can stand before you and plead guilty to the charge that I have preached that there is One Body, and that I have declared the blood bought Church of my Redeemer is that Body. They have tried to make you believe that because I stand for the church alone, I am responsible for the division. Thank you for that! I appreciate it!

I notice my respondent said, "If my brethren teach anything that cannot be found in the Book, we will give it up." Well, you had better be giving up your Orphans Homes. We have begged for him to find it, and he hasn't found it yet. When are you going to cut loose from it? He stresses once more that they chose this method as the most economical and best, and I read where one of his own brethren denied it.

Again he tells us about all the good he has done, and he points to me and says, "What has he done?" He has remarked so much on the subject of what they are doing for the orphans, I think it is about time we should examine the records. I hold in my hand a copy of the Tipton Orphans Home Messenger, of August 1933. Let us check up on the amounts contributed by the congregations sending to the support of orphans. I find that 110 churches gave amounts ranging from 75 cents to \$40.00. Of this number 59 churches gave \$5.00 or less. And 27 churches in the group gave \$3.00 or less, the total for the twenty-seven being \$60.01. Notice that! Twenty-seven churches gave \$60.00 did the wonderful work of giving \$60.00. Let us make the conservative estimate that in each of these congregations there are fifty members. I know there are more in some of them. According to this, there would be a contribution of four cents and four mills to the Lord's work each

month from each member, or in other words, each one of the individuals of the churches gave the immense sum of one penny a week. So my friend says, "look what we have done. What have you done?" Twenty-seven churches whose members have given a penny a week! You can't deny it. He says, "That is what we have done." Wonderful work isn't it?

Now I am going to come to you and say that this organization, this institution that these brethren have attempted to tack on to the body of Jesus Christ is squarely contrary to God's eternal truth. With your kind indulgence I am going to read it; I am going to make an argument on the matter. I want you to listen carefully, because I want you to know what God has said on the proposition. Ephesians 3:21, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." Unto him be glory **IN THE CHURCH**. Get that! That excludes every other place of giving God glory in Christian work. "Unto him be glory." Where? In Tipton Orphans Home? No! In the church.

But some may say, "Hold on Brother Ketcherside, the argument is no good because the orphans home is not another institution." It is though! And lest my respondent should try to get around the passage I introduced in making that kind of contradiction, I want to read from a paper published by one of the very Homes specified in the proposition. Page 2 of Tipton Orphan Home Messenger, Dec. 1936: "Is it no concern of yours if many have no "HOME" because you refuse them the privilege by refusing to support such an institution as the Tipton Orphans Home?" It is an institution. You cannot take the position that it is merely the church at work, and not an institution, because here is the record that it is an institution. It is not the church. It is another institution. We must give glory to God in the **CHURCH**, and here is another institution established through which to do a part of the work of the church, and take away from God the glory that belongs to Him. They are failing to sanctify God, and I fear are going to lose the right to enter the Heavenly Canaan. Not because they are not doing good, but because they are not doing it in the way God commanded.

Now I want to show you, that not only do these people claim it is an institution, but even teach it is a greater institution than the Church of Christ. This is the Tipton Orphans Home Messenger, February 1930, page 8: "The people of Tipton and community are continually showing, individually and through the various clubs and orders, how they appreciate the greatest institution in their midst - Tipton Orphans Home - and the work it is doing for homeless children." That puts my man on the spot! If he claims that the Orphans Home is the church at work, then I will show that the

church has to depend upon secret orders and clubs for its financial support in doing the Lord's work. If he says that it is another institution, then I will show that those who run it, claim it is greater than the church. What will he do?

I have made the statement time and again that the church is self-sustaining, and self-maintaining, and if it has to depend upon the world to keep it up, and if it must look to the Lions Club and Masonic order to keep it up it is not the Church of Christ. But notice, "The people of Tipton and community, are constantly showing how they appreciate the greatest institution in their midst - Tipton Orphans Home." There it is! They have a church over there at Tipton, and these men have the brazen nerve and affrontery to say that Tipton Orphans Home is the greatest institution in their midst, even greater than the Church of Christ! To what depths will men stoop in trying to justify something that God has not advocated? The GREATEST institution! I tell you before I would stand here and defend a thing like that I would rather suffer my right arm severed from my body. To think of it! It takes the name of another society, and robs the church of her glory. GREAT-EST, greater than the Church of Christ. A little ashamed, aren't you?

I am going to turn to a man who is thoroughly acquainted with the situation in the South. All of the Orphans Homes I know of are in the South. Brother Porter would have you believe that because we of the north have no institution but the church through which to work, that up here, the orphans are lying out naked and hungry and dying from want and starvation. North of the Mason-Dixon line they are dying head over heels and nobody to care for them. The only place where they are being taken care of is in the south.

So let me read from the Apostolic Times, Nashville, Tenn., issue of May, 1936, page 8: "Orphan Homes. Brother Weathers, is the Orphan Home God's way or man's way? Do you believe that God would tell you to do a certain thing and not tell you how to do it? There are preachers in the Church of Christ who say that; and they are Bible College adherents too. Do you believe in a God of that kind? "Visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions." (James 1:27). How many visit the Orphan Home? Ninety-five percent never go about them; the other five percent go maybe once or twice in a life time, more for curiosity than anything else. They give a paper of pins, a few spools of thread, some paper napkins, some old clothes and shoes, and some congregations will give five or ten dollars; all at the general round-up once a year, and exult in the self-satisfaction of having done their duty. And they call that visiting the fatherless. You know these things are true." That is

one of Brother Porter's southern brethren speaking, and he says you know these things are true.

Let me read some more like that. He says again, "If Christ had a home on earth here today, would he refuse to take an orphan child in his home and care for it? Would he, really? Did he tell his disciples to refuse them? Is such a thing mentioned, spoken of, authorized, or even remotely hinted at in the word of God or by the Word of God? My dear brother, you know, and you know that I know that you know, the reason that people endorse the Orphan Home is because they do not want an outside child to come into their home and live with them. That is the whole truth. Is that the spirit of Christ? Are you not begging the question when you ask, 'Do you find very many of those who object to Orphan Homes doing very much for the orphans?' What has that got to do with the question at issue? I am doing all I possibly can for widows and orphans, and that is all that I can do. I have no luxuries and without some of the necessities of life to so do. Come straight. More later."

That is one of your own brethren asking you if you think you have the spirit of Christ. Let's hear you answer him. Your own brother says to you "Come straight." Even he is ashamed of the foolish reasoning you use. I ask you Brother Porter, as this man did, to come straight.

My respondent said much in conclusion about the spirit of Christ and told about all the good he had done. I want to tell you the difference between Brother Porter's position and mine as it relates to caring for orphan children. Let us imagine that there is an orphan in the community near Neosho, and somebody says, "Brother Porter, we have located a little homeless orphan, destitute and alone. What shall we do with it." My friend says, "We have an Orphans Home at Tipton, ship the child down there, and when the truck comes around once a month, we'll send them a peck of potatoes, fifteen cents worth of sugar, and a box of salt, because that's the way we obey the command to visit the fatherless and widows. If we have anything we can't use we'll send it down there, perhaps once every three months."

But the scene changes. Someone comes and says to my wife and I, "Here is a poor little homeless waif, with no one to care whether she lives or dies." What should we do? We take that orphan child into our home, and when the eventide falls, and all the world is still, my faithful companion holds that babe close to her breast and soothes it with those words she speaks. And the little child says, "Where is my daddy and mother, I want my daddy." My wife whispers to her, "This man is going to be your daddy and I am going to be your mother, and you shall have this golden-haired

girl of ours for your sister, and we are going to keep you and take care of you, watch over you, and see that you are protected from the chilly blast of winter, and the heat of the summer. We will try to rear you in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and you may call me "mother" and him "daddy." And when that poor child falls asleep at night, with the tears dried from her eyes, my wife tucks her into bed beside our own dear children, and her sleep is happy and contented. I am asking you my friends, if you can contrast the difference between this gentleman here, and myself? I am asking you, which one has the most of the spirit of Jesus Christ about it?

You people must constitute the jury. You have to weigh the matter to night. You shall reach a logical, a scriptural, a right conclusion; and above all else, a decision that is in harmony with the Divine Truth. My dear Saviour never turned a helpless one from his door. He said that whosoever should give one of these little ones a cup of cold water in his name should not lose his reward. My honest, sincere belief is that there is more of the spirit of Christ in the way that I am defending than there is in the other.

WEDNESDAY NIGHT, MARCH 24, 1937

MODERATOR BLUE: I want to thank you good people in advance for your good behavior. Last night the order was as good as you could ask it to be, and the best of feelings prevailed. We want to go through the discussion this way. We can't afford to act any other way, except as Christian men and women.

Now one suggestion that I want to make, and I think Brother Roberts would say the same thing. It is best not to make any demonstration on either side. Of course, many things come up that are a little amusing, but let us be as quiet as we can along this line. I think it will be best in the long run.

Now, Brother Porter will be in the lead tonight. He will finish his proposition tonight. The debate will be two hours; half hour speeches, two speeches each. Brother Roberts, do you want to say *anything tonight?*

MODERATOR ROBERTS: Nothing tonight.

MODERATOR BLUE: All right, Brother Porter.

MR. PORTER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, and you, my Christian brethern and good friends: It is a genuine pleasure to me to come before you tonight. I should like to begin by congratulating each of you, and myself as well, upon the fact that we have received so many good things from the Lord, and that we are able under His providence to come together once again, and continue our studies in the word of the Lord, and especially with reference to the things introduced last night.

The proposition under discussion is the same as last evening, and reads as follows: "The erection and maintenance of Orphan Homes, such as the Arkansas Christian Home, and the Tipton Orphans Home, and others of like character, for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphaned children, is authorized by the New Testament Scriptures."

I state that again because there are some of you here tonight who were not present last evening and did not hear the discussion at that time. There are a few things that of necessity must be repeated tonight for the benefit of those who were not here, and since I want to make this speech altogether affirmative—for I realize the inadvisability of introducing new argument in a closing speech—I shall notice in my closing speech whatever argument my friend introduced last evening.

In defining the terms of our proposition, we told you that "The erection and maintenance of an orphans home," simply means to bring into being, and to keep up the home, or place in which orphaned children, those bereft of one or both parents, are kept and protected from the elements, and where they can be given such care as they are in need of and as we are able to give them. Such building is authorized by the New Testament Scriptures. We offered a number of proofs last evening and continue that line of argument tonight.

I read James 1:27 at the beginning, and to that passage your attention is again invited. It is the very crux of the whole matter, the pivot around which the whole discussion is turning. The apostle in this place declares that "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

We argued last evening that the word "visit" as used in that passage is generic term, and not specific. It means: Look after the orphans and widows in a substantial manner; not simply to look at

them, or to see whether they be black or white, or to determine their sex, or age, or something of that kind; but that we visit such children, or afflicted ones in a substantial way. We contended then that this is the meaning of the word, and we still contend for it. No man has a right to claim a religion that is pure and undefiled, unless he does that thing.

Then the question was raised as to how that thing shall be done. I insist again tonight that it is utterly impossible for any man to find in the word of the Lord a specific statement of what must be followed in carrying out that command to "visit" as it relates to orphans and widows. Certain it is that some means must be used. If my friend visits, or cares for orphans at all, he does it in some way. Which way makes no difference to me or my brethren. We have never for a moment contended for the way I am contending for tonight as the only way it can be done. In fact, we argued last night that there is no specific law governing it, and none of us say it must be done this way and none other.

Well, I suppose we will have more argument tonight about this feature, but I restated it that you may be sure to understand. This is the thing God commanded us to do, but gave no specific orders as to how. I placed it last evening on an equal basis with, and as parallel to the Lord's commandment to the disciples to "Go teach all nations." It matters not whether they "go" by horse and wagon, ride on a train, a boat, submarine, or an aeroplane; but GO! Do the thing the Lord commands. I am not contending even for a moment that men must build an orphans home in order to carry out the order "to visit the fatherless and the widows," but I do contend that when we do that thing we are doing exactly what God commanded us to do. We are visiting them in a substantial way—providing what they need.

I raise the point again that no man or set of men have the right in the Kingdom of God to set themselves up as the authorized explainers and expositors of those things about which God said nothing. They have no right whatever to make and bind upon us as individuals, or as congregations, rules which God said nothing about. This is one thing which cannot but stand out clearly in the minds of all who study the matter at all. God does require all men and women who follow Christ to "visit the fatherless"—the poor and needy ones. Nobody disputes that. My friend said last night that he agreed, and even said that what we do is a good thing. He said that! There is agreement on this point. The only issue in fact, is, how shall it be done.

I now advance to a new argument, or rather an elaboration of the argument made on James 1:27. I turn over to Luke, chapter 10,

and call your attention to the story of the good Samaritan. There was a man, as we all know, on the Jericho road, who fell among thieves, and they "stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead." A terrible condition—an awful plight. After a while a priest came by, and "When he saw him, he passed by on the other side." paid no attention to him. So the Levite. But finally, along came the Samaritan, and when he saw him, he had compassion on him. He took what he had, began where he was, and did what he could with the means at his disposal. What did he do? He "bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him upon his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him." He paid that man's fare at a hotel. Now my friend had much to say last night about institutions of a worldly nature. I ask him this question, and want him to say something about it; I want him to tell us whether or not a hotel is a worldly institution? Was it erected and maintained by the authority of God? Was it a religious institution? I insist upon the fact that when the Samaritan took this man to that kind of place, and paid for his keeping, and promised to pay more if needed; and when my Lord said "Go do thou likewise," as in verse 37, he gave us an example of using such an institution for the purpose of helping those in need. Go! Do! Go and take care of those in need by using whatever legitimate means at your disposal when you find him, even if it be such an institution as an hotel.

In order to quicken your interest in this matter. I mention another thing in this connection. We live in a land that is filled with useful institutions. We have those called hospitals, where the sick are cared for, and the wounded are attended, where broken bones may be properly set by skilled attendants. Now I wonder if it would be wrong for me to take a man who needs such attention, to a hospital that he may be properly attended? May I do that? Is it right or wrong to do it? Is this institution "of the Lord by specific authority?" I insist that our Lord never established, nor gave instructions for the operation of such an institution. He said, however, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Matthew 9-12. Our Lord left this instruction for me, that, when I get sick I may know what to do about it. I should find a man who knows something about this body of mine, and who can give me the remedies needed for its recovery. "Your body," says Paul, "is the temple of the Holy Ghost." My friends, a Christian should take care of his body. It should be given the very best of attention. Keep it clean and well as your opportunities will allow. But, may I make use of such an institution as an hospital to attain this end? My friend says that "authorize" means that "the law must be allowed to govern the

thing," and that "The law must be revealed in the New Testament scripture!" I should like to know where in the New Testament does he find authority, in his sense of that term, for taking a sick person to an hospital? His position makes it a sin!

I call to your minds a question asked him last evening. You ask him about it some day and see if he ever finds an answer for you. "where is that passage of scripture that authorizes the erection of a meeting house?" He will not find it. Again I remind you that to work for the Lord is just as necessary as to worship Him. God demands that we worship Him "in the beauty of holiness" and "in spirit and in truth"—not in ignorance as the Athenians did, but as it is written. Now the very same God demands that **WE WORK** for Him. It is right to build a house of worship, although no one ever found the verse in the New Testament that says so. Yes, it is certainly right to build a house for the worship of God, **BUT I** maintain that when my friend finds the passage authorizing that, he will have found authority for the erection and maintenance of a house—a home—in which to take care of orphaned children that are destitute. Ladies and Gentlemen, there can be no possibility of doubt about that.

The worship of God is an important thing, but the work God has commanded us to do is also important. I read Second Corinthians 5:9. "We labor," says the apostle. Why? "that whether present or absent we may be accepted of him." Again, Hebrews 4-11, where the apostle says, "Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest." I tell you, my friends, it is just as important, and is just as much obedience to God to do the work he has laid out for us as to worship Him. The work we are talking about tonight is the care of the orphan child. That is the thing under consideration tonight. God has commanded that they be **VISITED**, but has given no specific law as to the manner or method to be followed. Now I insist that when we obey the command, human wisdom **MUST BE FOLLOWED**, and with sufficient wisdom God has provided us.

You know, sirs, there is another thing comes to my mind just here. I turn to Acts 6, and find where just such a matter as we are discussing arose, and where Spirit filled apostles were present to suggest the remedy. There were some widows there who were destitute, and they were being neglected in the daily ministrations. It came to the ears of the apostles. Now what do they do about it? Guided by the Holy Spirit, they said, "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." The seven men were chosen and appointed. Now here is an example with which I should like my friend to grapple. Here is a direct example of inspired men appoint-

ing a SPECIAL COMMITTEE for the very purpose of looking after those who were destitute. Here is the example in plain black and white. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, HOW did they do this work? This is the question my friend will find no answer for. He will NOT FIND the "how." They did the work all right, for they were chosen for that purpose, but the details of it are not there. Being inspired, they did it right, of course.

If my friend could find where they took those widows into some private home, and said "thus shall ye care for the destitute, and in no other way," his side of the question would be established and I would hush. I pledged you last night that I would agree with him and stop the debate the very moment he brings from the New Testament that passage which indicates a method or manner in which this work shall be done. I will do it yet. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is one thing I know my friends recognize about me as a minister of the gospel: I am a man of my word, and practice what I preach. I'll surrender the proposition the moment he produces the passage.

He had the courage last night to make fun of the work I am doing and for which I am pleading, and said I would send an orphan child to the Home, and then "send it a box of salt, a sack of beans, and a paper of pins, and call it taking care of orphans!" I should be ashamed to make such a charge as that against a man. I am not boasting of the things I have done. Certainly it is but little, but I say to you, sirs, that if I wanted to measure arms with him on this score, or boast of things done for fatherless and motherless babies, I would not be afraid to compare my record with his.

I am wondering if he has any orphans in his home? Has he ever took one there? He says the church—his home congregation—did it. Well, I challenge him to find the verse in God's word that says it is right to do it this way! Will he find it? He cannot produce it. I do not say it is wrong, and never so contended. I say amen. This is "what" God said to do, and is certainly right. What is that? Visiting the fatherless, taking care of them.

My friend says, "Now since you admit this is a way, and is right, then EVERY OTHER WAY IS WRONG!" That is the proposition of my friend, and is the thing I am fighting against here. I am contending that God's people are a free people, and that no congregation has right to lay down a sepecific law where God has not spoken, and bind it upon all others. Local congregations certainly may do as they please about the matter, and no law in God's Book says I may go from one congregation to another and bind upon them my custom or method of doing a thing. They may chose where God has not chosen the method.

I want to read a few things at this point. I want to keep before

you constantly, the opposition. Does he help care for orphans? Do those who stand with him on this question help? If so, HOW? And where is the verse saying "Do it this way." Where is it?

All right if he does, but it must be done in some manner if done at all, and we want to know what manner? What chapter and verse gives authority for that manner? We want him to offer it, for he is the fellow who claims to know all about it.

Galatians 2:9,10. "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do." It is as applicable to all Christians as to any individual. Even my friend insists that it is an individual matter. True, too. None excepted from it. None are excused. Every man according to his ability shall render whatever aid he can. I should like you to remember that we do not challenge the right of a Christian to take orphans into his own home if he wants to. What we challenge his right to say, "This is the only way you can rightly visit them." My friend says it is, and I call for the proof.

Again I call attention to Noah and the ark. God told him to make an ark of gopher wood. That excludes every other kind of wood from that ark. Genesis 6 tells the story. Christians are told to "make melody in your hearts" by singing. Colossians 3:16. This passage excludes every other kind of music from the worship. We are told that when men are baptized, they are buried with him by baptism." Romans 6:4. This excludes the idea of sprinkling or pouring water upon the person for baptism. We are told to "Visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." Now, WHAT DOES THAT EXCLUDE? Put that question down my friends, and watch when my friend comes to grapple with it. WHAT IS EXCLUDED BY THAT PASSAGE?

God says, "visit" the fatherless and widows. Take them a sack of beans if I have any? Certainly. Take them something substantial. Surely we should do that, but what does this lay down more than the general principle to visit and look after them?

I call to mind this fact. I read from two or three translations for the purpose of simplifying the language of the passage. I notice Wilson's *Emphatic Diaglott* renders the passage, "Taking the oversight of the fatherless and widows." TAKING THE OVERSIGHT, i. e., see to it that they are provided for. There is the proposition. Now, we are told to "Remember the poor." Galatians 2:8,10, and 4:18. What means does this passage exclude? Does it forbid going to a group of them at the same time? Or does it forbid

a whole group of us going to them at the same time with the things they need? Surely not.

Again. I notice that while this is an individual matter, it is also a congregational duty, because congregations are made up of individual members as sure as the word of God is true and right, and this is especially true where the work is great. The apostle Paul, going to Jerusalem to deliver the offerings of the brethren for the poor saints, is positive proof of this. Acts 11:29,30. The Corinthians were taught the principle of individual giving for such purposes. "I gave my advice; for this is expedient for you, who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be forward a year ago. Now therefore perform the doing of it; that as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have. For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened: But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality." 2 Corinthians 8:10,14.

Now this argues and contends for the very thing I am upholding at this time. Every single member of the church is given the responsibility, and is bound by inspiration to help to the full extent of his ability in relieving those who are in distress. Even so, I insist again, my friends, that there is no specific manner of doing it laid down in this or any other passage.

I should like to call attention to another point in this connection. Notice it. We are discussing a principle here. We are not discussing institutions as such, and even though my friend should fail to call upon me to do so, we are going to get to that and have some real debating on it directly. He has talked about the custom or manner of doing things, and that, my friends, is the principle under discussion here now.

Shall we build a home, a place of residence for orphans? I thought about that before, and copied the definition from Webster's Twentieth Century Dictionary; "Home—a dwelling house; a house or place where one resides; the seat of domestic life and interest. 2. (Here is another definition. Hear it!) A place provided for the needy and the homeless; a home for orphans." That is the meaning of the word home, as it is written in my proposition. An orphan's HOME. A place for orphans to reside. A place for orphans to stay, and the purpose of providing it is, THE HOUSING AND OTHERWISE CARING FOR THEM. And this man my good personal friend, and my brother in the Lord, has been so deluded, sirs, as to say THAT isn't right! It isn't right to PRO-

VIDE A PLACE INTO WHICH WE CAN TAKE THOSE FATHERLESS AND MOTHERLESS CHILDREN AND TAKE CARE OF THEM! He denies this being right. There is the proposition we differ on in a nut shell.

But the erection and maintenance of an orphan's home stands on exactly the same ground as the erection and maintenance of a meeting house, a place of worship. I want to keep that before you so constantly that you cannot forget it. That is the parallel. There is the example of authority. God said "WORK," and "WORSHIP." Shall we build a house in which the worship shall be conducted? Where is the law that says we must build a house to carry out command? There is the proposition.

I note again that the word "visit" is similar to the word "go" as found in the commission. Go! Ride, walk, swim, float, fly; any way of going, but GO! Get it? The Lord says of widows and orphans, "visit them." Whether in private homes, a public place, in groups, in crowds, or individually, is not the question, but VISIT THEM get the work done.

I insist that you remember, sir, that I HAVE NOT LAID DOWN A LAW which says "It must be done my way." Here is THE MAN that lays down the law, and sets himself up as THE AUTHORIZED EXPLAINER OF THOSE THINGS THAT GOD NEVER SAID! There sets the man that says, "Here is the way to do it, and there is no other way." There you are, sir, and there is the point upon which this whole matter rests tonight. If he could—and would, bring THAT LAW, I remind you once more, I would surrender the proposition in a moment.

Again. Here is the idea. The Lord said; "Go teach all nations, baptizing them." They must go to the water, and go down into the water and be buried in it, and "come up out of the water."

All that is clear, but there are many incidents not mentioned after all. A young preacher in my home congregation performed a baptismal ceremony the other night, and I saw it. He happened to lay the candidate back over his left hand, and after it was over I asked him, Where is the chapter and verse for baptizing people LEFT HANDED? Of course there isn't any, and if his life depended on it he could not find it. Neither will he say that it MUST be done THIS way, or THAT. There is no difference in it after all. The thing is. We know WHAT to do,—BURY the man. But such incidentals as to whether or not it should be running water, a pond, a tank, warmed water, or a hundred and one other items that are not named in connection, are PURELY INCIDENTAL and make no difference. So, when our Lord talks with us about visiting the fatherless and widows; God did

not count that we would be a group of idiots and fools! Certainly not. God knew we would have enough sense to figure out a thing like that. Some of them need one thing, and some another. Shall we do for them **THE THING NEEDED?**

Where is the law that specifies **METHOD**, or **MANNER**? Where is the man who has a right to say, "Here it is. I will fix it for you. Lord, you forgot to say anything about it, but I **WILL FIX IT!**" That, my friends, is the way **SOME PEOPLE** would do it.

We call attention to this: No congregation is bound by any law to give their means for any particular home. They are free to visit the fatherless and widows in **ANY MANNER THEY CHOOSE, BUT THEY MUST** perform the doing of it.

(Time called)

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: Eleven years ago, or approximately that, there were two congregations existing in the city of Ozark. One of these apparently was in favor of Orphan Homes and Colleges, institutions not mentioned in the realms of God's divine truth. The other congregation at this time took a stand in the opposition of such foreign institutions. But, by some method, there was a reconciliation effected, and those that came back and took their stand with the Church of Christ in Ozark promised they would not endorse a man who stood for those things, insofar as public preaching was concerned. The congregations worked on that basis for awhile, until some gradually wormed themselves into the confidence of faithful brethren and began to advocate those things, not only privately, but publicly. The charge was made by the gentleman who preceded me on the floor tonight that not until I came into this community, and assumed a dictatorial attitude was there a division. The gentleman, on this as on every other matter, did not understand the circumstances and did not know whereof he spoke. The congregation, it is true, is divided at this present time. It is a matter of deep concern to myself and every one of my brethren. We regret it a great deal. But it must be understood very clearly that this discussion has been brought about by that division, and we are here to answer the age-old question, "Shall we speak where the Bible speaks, and remain silent where the Bible is silent, or shall we uphold and endorse publicly and privately those things which God's divine truth does not authorize?"

The gentleman here on my left has persistently tried to get me to take the affirmative. Brother, you are going to get all of that you want tomorrow night. I expect to take my proposition and go to work on it like a man ought to do. But your affirmation very plainly and specifically declares that you believe, "The erection and maintenance of an Orphans Home, such as Tipton Orphans Home is AUTHORIZED by the NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES." That is his position, friends, and I submit to you that insofar as his argument tonight is concerned, he has demonstrated that as a debater he would make a good hash slinger," because all we have had tonight is a simple rehash of the things spoken last night. Even the smoke screen he threw around the issue last night was cleared away, and yet he comes back tonight presenting the same argument, thinking perhaps he can persuade a gullible public

to believe something he knows God's word does not command.

But let us review his arguments, and notice some of the things he said. I will begin with some of the last statements. He accuses me of making fun of him, by saying that he sent the Home a paper of pins and that constituted his care for the orphans. I never said anything of the sort! I did do this, however. I turned to the Apostolic Times, published in the south where they endorse the Orphan Homes, and I read this, "Is the Orphans Home God's way or man's way? Do you believe that God would tell you to do a certain thing and not tell you how to do it? There are preachers in the Church of Christ who say that; and are Bible College adherents, too. Do you believe in a God of that kind? Visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions. (James 1:27). How many visit the Orphan Home? Ninety-five percent never go about them; the other five per cent go maybe once or twice in a lifetime, more through curiosity than anything else. They give A PAPER OF PINS, a few spools of thread, some paper napkins, some old clothes and shoes, and some congregations will give five or ten dollars." There it is! Look it over and see for yourself. I didn't say it. It was one of your own brethren!

The statement was made in the Springfield paper tonight that there was no division over these things in the south, that there was no opposition to the Homes and Colleges, below the Mason-Dixon line. That was quoted from Mr. McGaughey, pastor of the South National Boulevard Church in Springfield, and yet at the same time I presented unto you indisputable evidence that there is division over it in the south. Either Mr. McGaughey doesn't know what he is talking about, or he has endeavored to misrepresent the situation. Again I remind you that one of your own brethren says, in no uncertain terms, that the way you are advocating is not the Lord's way. That is your brother, Brother Porter. You take him and fellowship him. He is a good one!

Now going back to the first of his speech, my friend says, "We do not say that the way we are advocating is the only way to care for orphans, and that you must do it this way, or we will not endorse you". Ah, yes you do! I read from one of your preachers, who was a soliciting agent for the Orphans Homes. Listen to him again, "I am sorry to say we have a few preachers who are not in sympathy with Orphan Home work. They have not foresight enough to see it, but I am telling them now that their 'days are numbered,' **SO FAR AS THEIR WORK AND INFLUENCE WITH THE CHURCH IS CONCERNED.** I say a preacher who will not endorse such work, had just as well 'fold his tent and fade away,' join the 'anti-Sunday school' crowd where HE

WILL BE FORGOTTEN, SO FAR AS THE GREAT BROTHERHOOD OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS CONCERNED. Our brethren, God bless them, are going forward and are 'doing things' and have no time to listen to a knocker."

Yes sir! You either line up and support this Orphan Home work, or you are through. Your influence is killed! All right (handing the clipping to Mr. Porter) you take it, and read it, Brother Porter. And don't make another statement like you made awhile ago. You know it is not according to the facts. You heard me, gentlemen! I want him to read it in full to you. I hesitate to call him dishonest. No, I am not going to do that! Still, he should not have been ignorant of it, because I read it to him last night.

Now I will go a little further than that. I want to read for my very good friend from the Tipton Orphans Home Messenger. Here it is, and the date is June, 1929. I turn to page 5 under the heading of "Fifth Sunday Contribution." Here are some of the statements: "As this will be the last issue of the Messenger published, preceding the first Fifth Sunday contribution to Tipton Orphans Home for 1929, we wish to urge everyone to do their utmost to make the offering greater this year than ever before." Then there is something regarding the necessity of Church Orphanages in which children are to be placed so they may be reared and educated to obey the gospel. Then we have this; "We hope you will read these lines prayerfully and be ready with the approach of the Fifth Sunday to help in whatever way and to whatever extent it is possible for you to help. No matter what your financial circumstances may be, there will be some way provided for you to serve, in one capacity or another, the orphanages of the Church." Finally the article states, "If we are to practice right thinking and living, we must abide by God's law. This offers the only course by which we must be saved," and then continues to show that providing for existence of the Homes is a part of God's plan.

There it is Brother Porter, in the last paragraph. Your contribution will be your salvation, and that if you refuse to contribute, you are going to be damned. That is the statement in black and white. And this man has the nerve to come before this audience and tell you sensible people, "We don't say this is the only way to do it, and you must either do it this way or be lost." But the Tipton Orphans Home official journal says just that. I will be glad for you to read the whole article.

He says, "No man has a right to bind upon anyone a rule where God has not legislated." I have proved to you that is what he is trying to do.

I note what he had to say about hotels. Bless your sou',

Brother Porter, we are not talking about an individual building a hotel. We are discussing the church erecting, financing and creating separate institutions to care for the needy and destitute. We are not debating hotels, inns, or tourists camps; but we are discussing whether or not scriptures **AUTHORIZE THE CHURCH TO MAINTAIN SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS** to care for the destitute. Read you proposition, man, and see if it says anything about building hotels.

I was a little afraid my opponent would declare that the church he is affiliated with didn't believe in supporting the Homes and Colleges, as congregations. I know that his brethren in this section have repeatedly declared that they are no more in favor of such things than am I. So I was much amused this evening, to note what this debate is doing to those on the other side. That same Springfield paper I mentioned awhile ago, Brother Porter, declares that four of the Springfield churches support those two institutions. Don't say you don't stand for those things anymore. Don't preach it any more in Springfield like you have in the past. You have declared that you did not contribute to these things, but the paper said you did, and quoted your own statement.

You have misled many churches in the south, and now you would like to get the people in the north to believe that it is harmless to deviate from the truth, but as long as there is a drop of blood in my body, and I possess the power and ability to stand before an audience, I shall oppose those institutions which are contrary to God's eternal truth.

For that reason, it is my happy privilege just now to make this statement as I pass along, that the brethren of Springfield have requested me to ask Brother Porter to meet me on these propositions over there, to discuss it half the time in one of their houses, and half the time in one which we will provide. I venture to say they will not do it. I had a discussion like this arranged a short time ago, with a man who is in the Public Speaking Department of Iowa University. We arranged to debate in Springfield, but he sent me a telegram saying that his people in that city refused to permit it, because they said, "We do not want these things brought to light in the Springfield territory." But they are being brought to light. We are smoking some of you out from under cover, and are now seeing exactly where you stand.

I want to challenge Brother Porter also to meet me in Kansas City. We have present with us, C. Roy Bixler, pastor of the 39th and Flora Church in that city. It is a "college church" and I presume he stands with you on these matters. There are several churches opposed to you in Kansas City. I want you to ask Brother

Bixler to let you meet me there. My brethren from St. Louis also invite you to meet me in that city. My friends, I want to meet this man wherever possible, and expose his wrong position, as we are doing here.

Brother Porter doesn't understand the difference between building a meeting house and ORGANIZING AN INSTITUTION to take care of the Lord's work. It was pointed out to him last night, but he is troubled with forgetfulness occasionally. I regret that his mind does not retain these facts, but sincerely hope and trust, before he meets me the next time, his memory will be better cultivated. I pointed out to him last night there was a great difference, but he affirmed that I could not show a single place where the church is authorized to hold, possess, or worship in a meeting house. I am going to show you one. Turn with me, Brother Porter, to 1st Corinthians 11:20. The apostle is talking about the disciples turning the Lord's supper into a riotous feast, and says, "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper . . . What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God?" Thus we see that they had their own houses, but came together in one place, the Lord's house. So they did have a house of worship separate from their own, didn't they? Now, he said if I found the scripture he would admit the debate was over. I suppose it is over, but if anyone leaves now, come back tomorrow night, and we will have another, and it will be a good one, too.

In Acts 6, he tells us there is a specific example of how the church took care of the destitute. It is rather interesting to me to listen to the gentleman. For approximately an hour last night he made two thirty minute speeches he told you there wasn't an example within the pages of God's divine word of how the needy should be cared for. He challenged me to find one, and tonight he turned to Acts 6th chapter and found one himself. What is the matter with a man like that?

Some of the most beautiful scenery in the Ozarks region is to be found on the White River division of the Missouri Pacific Railroad with which I have been associated for awhile. At one spot a great bend goes completely around a mountain, and some of the railroaders have told me that here, an engineer could lean out and light a cigar held in the hand of the rear brakeman. I rather doubt that, but I have discovered one man who runs into himself every time he makes a turn. I expect him to be shaking hands with himself soon, or to twist himself into a figurative pretzle, so that it will be a hard job for me to undo him. First he declared that the Word does not say how to care for the destitute. Then he goes to

Acts 6 and says, "Here is the way the apostles did it. Well how did they recommend the matter be taken care of by building a widow's home, and electing a Superintendent? No sir, they appointed deacons to assist, and the local church took care of its poor, not another organization.

We go a little further and find him asking,, "Do his friends take care of the orphans?" What if we did not relieve the destitute at all, that doesn't make the Orphans Home system scriptural. But sitting over here to my right is a man who has taken four little orphans into his home. Brother Cuppy has opened his heart and house to four homeless children, and in the evening they came in and bowed their heads upon the knee of Sister Cuppy, and she taught them to pray to the father above. Brother Roberts has an orphan in his home to night, a sweet, Christian girl. Did the brethren you represent here, Brother Porter, leave the church because it did not care for orphans? Why, Brother Boyd who is an elder in the faithful church has an orphan in his home now. Can any of them say as much?

Let me ask, "What are you doing for the orphans, and those who stand with you?" I quote again from one of your own brethren, "They give a paper of pins, a few spools of thread, some paper napkins, some old clothes and shoes." That is what your man says, and he should know.

We pass on. He had something to say about baptism. "When the Lord demanded burial in baptism that excludes every other way of performing the rite." That is true! Then he turns to James 1:27, "Visit the fatherless and the widow's in their affliction," and he wants to know what that excludes. According to the meaning of the word "visit" there would be one thing always excluded and that is "sending." The Book says to "visit." You don't do that—you send. Better than that, they send a truck around to get it. The Book says you must do it. But you don't visit the orphans, and know you don't. We are telling him what this command excluded. He asked for it, and now he has it.

I am surprised at my respondent! He hasn't presented a new point. He said he was going to present a new argument on James 1:27 or rather an old argument in a new way - and then he talked about building hotels.

I want to notice some things my opponent said last night. I asked him whether Tipton Orphans Home was a divine or human institution? He replied, "What about a building committee? Is that a divine or human organization?" What kind of an answer was that? Even if you could prove it was wrong to have a building committee, does that prove it is right to have an Orphans Home?

Why didn't you answer the question I asked? Were you afraid to tell us whether it was a human institution?

Then I asked this, "What chapter and verse expressly mentions God's authorization of such a Home?" I didn't ask what chapter and verse expressly mentions such a home, but what scripture mentions **GOD'S AUTHORIZATION** of such a home? You must remember that he is affirming such homes are authorized by the New Testament. I asked him what chapter and verse authorized them, and he said there was no such passage in the Bible, **NO NOT ONE!** That is what we are debating on! I ask you where the Bible **AUTHORIZES** it and you say it **DOES NOT AUTHORIZE IT.** We are going to be together and kissing each other before this is over.

MR. PORTER: I hope so, too, brother.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: I next asked which of the apostles or their contemporaries ever made of himself a traveling beggar, soliciting money from the churches, and working on a commission. Do you recall his answer? "Brother Ketcherside, which of the apostles said we couldn't do it that way?" That is the old Christian Church argument used to justify instrumental music. Porter has had 25 debates and he knows that. When a Christian Church preacher can find no authority for his practice, he always asks, "where is the chapter and verse that says we can't have instrumental music?" Now my friend cannot find authority for his Orphans Home, and he asks, "Which of the apostles said we mustn't do it that way?"

I want to make clear the difference between Brother Porter and myself. The Church I represent believes in doing what God's word says we should do. Brother Porter stands for doing anything God doesn't say you can't do. One of us is standing upon what God has said, and the other is standing on what God hasn't said. He had something to say about me trying to pose as an interpreter of God's sacred silence. He admits then the scriptures are silent with reference to the Orphans Home. Why then did he affirm they **AUTHORIZED** such homes? Why did he not affirm that "The Orphans Home is authorized by **DIVINE SILENCE?**" That is enough about that.

He did not answer the other questions but maybe he will yet. I trust you will listen to him carefully.

Let me make it clear again that I am not in the affirmative tonight. Brother Porter has endeavored to shift the burden of proof to me, and has been unwilling to assume it. For a little while now I am going to gratify him, and present for your consideration, certain arguments upon things which the scriptures teach. First, I find in Ephesians 4:4 "There is one body." **ONE BODY.** I want

that fact to stand out. In Colossians 1:18, we learn concerning Jesus Christ, that he is the head of the body, the church. In the same book, chapter 2:10, the apostle says, "Ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power." There is ONE body, the body of Jesus Christ, and we are complete in Him. Brother Porter, every thing you need to do in taking care of the sick and needy, the poor and those who are destitute, can be done through that institution God has set up and through that body. But Brother Porter says, "No sir, the body God established can't take care of orphans in a decent manner, and we need another body to do that in a way that is systematical, economical, etc."

I turn to page 11 of this paper and I see the words: Tipton Orphans Home, Incorporated. Look there. Do you see that word "INCORPORATED," Brother Blue?

MODERATOR BLUE: I can't see without my glasses on.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: It is there whether you have your glasses on or not. Do you know what the word "incorporated" means? It comes from the Latin "corpus" which means "body". A body for what? Taking care of orphans. The record says there is One Body. Porter says there are TWO BODIES, the Church of Christ and the ORPHANS HOMES. That is his teaching. Now Brother Porter, I want you to wrestle with that word "incorporated" when you get up. And I want this audience to see if you ever attempt to refer to my argument.

I go once more to Ephesians 3:21. "Unto him be glory IN THE CHURCH by Christ Jesus throughout all ages." Get that! Then in Isaiah 48:11, the Father says, "My glory I will not give to another." God says that glory must be given him in the church, and says he is not going to give that glory to another. It is not going to be assumed by another institution. The work that we do for his glory must be done through the church, as the divine institution appointed for the purpose.

In connection with this I want to read a statement from the pen of J. N. Armstrong, former president of the three "Bible Colleges" and Dean of Bible at Harding College now. We are not going to talk about Colleges now, but will have much to say on that subject in the next session. We will no doubt hear more from Armstrong as the debate goes on, but suffice it to say that he stands firmly with Brother Porter and his position. Here is the quotation: "The church's mission, its work, is clearly defined and appointed by the Lord. God has sent forth this one institution to do that work, and in, through and by that institution, that work must be done, if done in the name of (authority) of our Father and his Christ to their glory. Any other institution"— any other institution. GET THAT!—

"that is created to do his work, or after created assumes to do this work is an intruder, dishonors God, and saps the church of its efficiency. Certainly if God created, brought into existence his church for a mission, to do a work, it is amply able to do that work, and is in every way adapted to and prepared for it." That is one of your own brethren! He says if an institution is erected to do the work of the church, or assumes to do it, it saps the church and not only that, dishonors God!

I am going to show you that Tipton Orphans Home is an institution, and you have already admitted it was established to do part of the work of the church, in caring for the destitute. I shall prove it by your own literature. Tipton Orphans Home Messenger, Dec. 1936, page 2: 'It is no concern of yours if many have no home because you refuse them the privilege by refusing to support SUCH AN INSTITUTION as Tipton Orphans Home.' Your own brother said that any institution created to do the work of the church, sapped the strength of the Church and dishonored God. Here is Tipton Orphans Home, an institution created to do the work of the church? What a predicament my respondent finds himself facing now! I wonder how he will twist out of that? In his arguments thus far he has been like the proverbial serpent,

"He wiggled in and wiggled out,
Leaving the people all in doubt
Whether the snake that made the track,
Was going south or coming back."

We haven't been able to find which way he is going yet. In one breath he talks about an *institution to help the church do its work*, and in the next he goes off talking about hotels. Shame on him! But maybe it is the best he can do.

Now I will notice the teaching in Colossians 3:17. "Whatsoever you do in word or deed do all in the name of" — Tipton Orphans Home. I beg your pardon, I made a mistake there. The verse does not read that way. I will try again, "Do all in the name of — Southern Christian Orphans Home?" I must beg your pardon again. The verse says, "Whatsoever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." Do it how? In the name of the Lord Jesus. What does that mean? It means to do it by his authority and give him the honor. That is what it means, but when Tipton Orphans Home converted the wild boy who scratched like a cat, *who got the glory for that?* Did the church? Brother Porter said, "No sir, the Tipton Orphans Home did that." God said, "My glory I will not give to another," but here comes a man attempting to defend an institution, unauthorized by the Holy Writ, to do the Lord's work, and give the glory to

someone else. God have mercy on the man!

Let us proceed to 2 Timothy 3:16,17. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto ALL GOOD WORKS." My friend has talked much about "good works." Now get this! The scriptures furnish us unto all good works; not only furnish us, but THOROUGHLY furnish us. Does the New Testament scripture have a single passage furnishing us with Tipton Orphans Home? My respondent says, "Not one, it isn't there." Then it is certainly not a part of God's scheme of good works.

I asked him when the first Orphans Home was built, and he said he didn't know, because he was not a historian. I thought since his proposition stated that these things were authorized by the Bible, he might be able to go to it, and show us one in there. He wouldn't need to know much about history to do that. All he would have to know is his Bible. But no! he says it is authorized by the New Testament scriptures, but he can't find one in there, you have to go outside the word of God to locate the first one. Like the flea, it is always somewhere else when you try to put your finger on it.

Brother Porter is going to say, "Now, Carl is a good boy. Carl is a fine boy, but he can't point his finger to the passage that tells how the church took care of the destitute." Of course, he found one example himself, after he said that, but I am going to find another one for him. We are going to Acts, 11th chapter, and I am going to read what the recorder, Luke, has to say concerning the care of those brethren who were made destitute by famine. The disciples contributed according to their financial ability to relieve the stricken in Judea, and in verse 30, we learn they sent it TO THE ELDERS by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.

A few minutes ago we found that the scriptures furnish us unto all good works. To accomplish the works of God we are furnished with two institutions that operate by divine sanction. The Bible furnishes us the home with its father and mother, and its children clustered about the hearthside. Six thousand years ago God said to man, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." Thus the Creator gave his approbation to the home. Nineteen hundred years ago the Son of God died on Calvary's tree, and by the shedding of his blood purchased another institution, the Church. I challenge this man tonight to find any other institution mentioned in God's word to carry on his work or worship, except the home or the church. You do that! I found you an inspired

example for the elders of the congregation to administer relief to the destitute, now you find me one which authorizes me sending funds to the Superintendent of an Orphans Home. You cannot find it, and you know you cannot.

If I take an orphan into my home, and find myself through some stroke of misfortune, incapacitated, and unable to take care of and provide for that child, the elders of the church can direct that a part of the church treasury may be given me to assist. That is doing the thing scripturally, but to take the Lord's money and organize another institution, spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on buildings, and continually rob the church treasury to pay large salaries, is not even hinted at in the scriptures.

I have a few minutes left and I want to talk just now a little, about the method employed to get the money for maintenance of the Homes. You know the Tipton Orphans Home has a system like this. After the regular contribution has been taken on Lord's Day, they take up a special collection for the orphans. I have here before me one of their papers advocating this, and if Brother Porter cares to question it, I will be glad to turn it over to him, to read to you. On this matter I am reminded that once when I was preaching in the west, there came to visit my meeting a preacher who looked much like Brother Porter. Probably he was a little better looking than my respondent. He requested the privilege of saying a few words at the close of the service, and so when I was through, I gave him the floor. He was a solicitor for an Orphans Home, as I soon found out, but when he first took his place before the audience, he was quite profuse in complimenting the sermon which had been delivered, and went to great length to commend—

(Time called)

MR. PORTER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have enjoyed the verses my friend brought to answer (?) my questions to make clear those things we asked him to explain from his point of view. I am certain you got a lot of satisfaction out of the different scriptures telling how orphans are to be looked after and cared for! I must notice some of the many things he said, as we hurry along and come to the close of this debate tonight. Just thirty minutes from now my part of this discussion will be over.

He says "Eleven years ago there were two congregations here, and they finally got together. They made an agreement that they would never call or tolerate the presence of a preacher that mentioned these matters publicly." Now I challenge him to tell the name of the preacher that first mentioned it publicly. Who first broke that agreement? I want him to tell you. Was it Diestelkamp? Was it Tillman Prince? Was it Clarence Wilkerson? Was it Preston Fields? Who was the preacher who broke that agreement? I challenge him to tell you, sirs.

In the first part of his speech he asserts that we do claim that Christians **MUST** work through the Orphan Homes. It is amusing to hear the man say things like that. He says, "Porter does claim they will be lost if they do not." My friends, I am surprised at the boy. I thought surely he would have enough Christian courtesy to believe me when I say, "Brother Ketcherside, this is what I believe." I had no thought that he would turn and say, "Porter, **YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU BELIEVE**. You are wrong; I know what you believe, and you are trying to pull it over the eyes of this people. I am the fellow that can tell you what you believe about it." Pshaw!

He gabbles on and on about a report made in, and clipped from the Firm Foundation or some other paper. I have seen the statement, but I tell you, my friends, under God, that statement does not say what Carl Ketcherside charges that it says!

MR. KETCHERSIDE: Read it!

MR. PORTER: It says no such thing, sir!

MR. KETCHERSIDE: Read it!

MR. PORTER: You put it in the record when you read it last night. It does **NOT** say you must do the thing this way. It just isn't in the statement, and you can't find it there. Ladies and gentlemen, it just isn't there.

We pass hurriedly on, and notice another thing here. He

says he is "smoking us out." Then he launches out in a long tirade and a lot of challenges. He wants me to meet him in Kansas City. He wants me to meet him in St. Louis. My friends, it is altogether possible that before this thing is finished, he will have another notion about that matter. If my brethren in those places should find it at all necessary to have such a discussion, if interest in these matters make it seem at all necessary, I am quite sure the young gentleman can be accommodated.

He reads another "example" to me. He is good at bringing examples, except they don't do what he wants them to do! They fail to show his point. He says: "Porter has been calling upon me to produce the example of a meeting house, and I will accommodate you, Brother Porter. I will give it to you." And he turned to 1st Corinthians 11, where Paul asked those people, "What? Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise you the CHURCH of God, and shame them that have not?" I am made to wonder, before the Lord, I wonder if that man has the affrontery, the moral courage to stand before this audience and say that this expression has reference to a material meeting house? I am ashamed of the man who would make such a statement as that, and I say it with the greatest possible degree of sympathy for him, but with no sympathy whatever for the position he occupies.

Oh, yes, he says, after I had argued throughout last night's session that no example could be found of how this work should be done—"Now Brother Porter has turned to Acts 6, and read the example himself." Why, Ladies and gentlemen, I introduced Acts six, and showed in my argument,—and the report of the stenographer will bear it out,—that here was a special committee appointed by the apostles, and that he could not show the manner in which they worked, and he knows that this was done as well as any one in the house, and every one knows it. Why surely they do! He misrepresented me completely on this point, and doesn't make a thing out of it either.

He gets up here with a long face and tells about Brother Cuppy having four orphan children in his home. Brother Cuppy, God bless you. I say, Amen. I say amen to such a thing every where I go. But, I insist upon the fact that when he finds the passage of scripture that authorizes him to take one or four, or six into a private home and care for them, I will show by the same authority that we may take 497! He says that when one takes that number into his home and finds that he is unable to provide all that is necessary for their care, that every brother in the land who chooses to share with him the burden, is entitled, or has the right under God to assist him in carrying that out. Now that is just what I show-

ed you by my argument based upon Acts 11, where the bounty was gathered up and sent by the donors to those who were ministering to the needy.

I come now to notice another point. He wants to know, or rather he answers my inquiry about James 1:27. I asked him "What does that passage EXCLUDE? Is there anything in that passage that excludes the caring for orphans in greater numbers than four? That is the greatest number he has named in one group. He answers by saying it excludes "institutions." But the justification of Tipton Orphan Home is in the fact that it is a HOME, a HOUSE and was built FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOUSING AND OTHERWISE CARING FOR ORPHANED CHILDREN, and the expense of conducting it and of caring for them is borne by brethren and friends all over the land. He said last night in connection with this point, "They get out and beg the world to help them." I don't know so much about that. I haven't heard the world begged for help. The world has given, and has the right, if it wants to do it, to help take care of that kind of work. Certainly, there is apostolic precedent for that.

In a statement made by Luke (Acts 28) Paul stayed some days upon an island after having been shipwrecked and was entertained in the home of an heathen man. When he left that place, the heathen "laded us with such things as were necessary," and he took it! It was not too much for Paul to do, to take the gift the heathen offered him. If a man of the world should say to my friend, "I appreciate the things you have said, and have been benefitted thereby. Here are Five Dollars for it." Would you turn it down, Carl, or would you take it? You would take it. I would be afraid to guess you wouldn't.

He charges me with saying that "Anything God has not expressly forbidden is allowed." I want to say to you that I never said any such thing as that. I never hinted such a thing. There are two extreme positions on this point, and I quote from Daniel Sommer, the great old sage of Indianapolis here. "Two extreme positions are held by some of the brethren. One is that whatever is not expressly forbidden is allowed, and the other is that whatever is not expressly mentioned is forbidden." These are extreme radical positions, and I hold neither one of them! Somewhere between these radical extremes is a common mean, a happy medium upon which common sense agrees with God's word, and upon which we should be able to agree and do what God requires.

He talks about Wallace, Armstrong, and Slater. He reads from a number of papers, and I wonder what he would do for something to say if it wasn't for something of this kind? What in

the world would he have to talk about that would be interesting if he couldn't find something these men have said? Is he debating with Armstrong, Wallace, or Slater? Is he? Surely not! Why doesn't he spend his time answering the arguments put before him for consideration here and now?

I want to go back now and note a few things said last night, and draw this matter to a close so far as my part of it is concerned. I call your attention to the fact that caring for the poor is an individual work. We agree on this point. He turns around tonight, and calls attention to the fact that the example to which I cited you Acts 11 is the church work, that the gifts were sent to the elders of the church, and administered by them. Well, I have nothing to argue with him about on this, whether it is done individually or by a group of individuals. When I do a Christian work, that which God commands, whether it be yesterday, today, or tomorrow, I do it as a member of the church. I must do all such work as a Christian, whether alone, or a hundred others join with me in it.

He says: "The fellow gets himself into trouble," and compares me with a Christian Church preacher and predicts that I will soon be preaching for the Christian Church. I have preached to them many times. I have been invited into their buildings, and have gone there, but have never consented to any unscriptural practice while there, and the reflection which my friend tries to cast upon me goes for naught, even though he says I am departing from the faith little by little when I go there. Twenty-five years I have preached the gospel up and down this land. I have been as busy as Carl has, and have had as many calls ahead of me as he has had, or any other man as to that matter.

In all of my work carrying me into 18 states and preaching for hundreds of congregations, I have never in my experience occupied a pulpit but in one place, so far as I know, but that I have a standing invitation to return. The one place is Exeter, California. I had more converts there than all the rest of the preachers put together, and the records show it. But 87 of them, if I remember the number right, were driven out because they would not come up and submit to such things as my friend is advocating here. That is the fact, Ladies and Gentlemen. That is the fact!

He comes up again and reads Ephesians 3:21. Read last night and tonight, "Unto him be glory in the church throughout all ages." And he says to give the church glory. Why the passage doesn't say it. He wants to glorify the institution rather than the instituter,—the creation rather than the creator. That is the thing my friend is doing. The glory is to be given to God, glory given by Jesus Christ, and is to be in the church. Then he said last night,

"It is the only institution, there is none other." Then tonight he says, "Yes, there is another." There is a different one now! He says there is the home. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like for him to tell you where is his authority for calling a home a Christian home? I believe it is right to do that. I suppose he and his wife are both faithful members of the church. That being true, it is a Christian home. Here is Brother Fields, into whose good home I have gone many times. Here are his wife and children, all faithful to the body of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a Christian home. My friend cannot read in God's book, however, the SPECIFIC authorization by which he is justified in calling it that.

There is still another institution that exists by divine authority and that is the civil Government. Romans 13 exemplifies, if it shows anything under Heaven, that there is a third institution that exists by the authority of high heaven. It exists by divine right, but the thing it does, God does not always approve. The thing done in the Church, God does not always approve. My friend knows that the simple fact that things exist by divine authority does not make it infallible. Rome claimed that. Cardinals voted it about 1870 or 1874 - I do not remember the exact date at this moment. They declared the Pope infallible in matters of faith. My friend comes along and tries to occupy the same position tonight.

He told us last night that Moses was condemned. I asked him was a man ever condemned for doing good—you remember that, don't you? He said, "Yes, yes, Brother Porter, Moses was condemned for doing good!" He cited the place where Moses disobeyed the Lord at the rock, and was refused the right to enter the land of Canaan. He says that the meek old servant of God, the man that put the shoes off his feet when he saw the flaming fire in the bush, did a good thing and God condemned him for it! If I ever get so excited that I will make such a perversion of the truth as that, I will never be able to hold my head up again. What did he do, this Moses?

Numbers 27:14 says, "Moses trespassed," -re belied against God! I want to know if it is a good thing for a man to rebel against God? I want to know! In Deuteronomy 32:51, the record declares that he sanctified God not in the eyes of the people at that place. He didn't do what God told him to do. He rebelled. 1st. Samuel 15:23 says, "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," and witches under the law of God were put to death. Moses was refused the right to enter the land of Canaan because he sinned against God; and not because of any good thing he ever did, and I repeat again tonight that there is not a single sign of a hint of a shadow or an indication that God's people from the first to the last have been or

will be condemned of the Almighty for any good thing they ever did. There is not a case of it. My friend is badly mistaken. Surely he was excited beyond his ability to control. Moses punished for doing good! "Yes, here is an example, Brother Porter." Poor old Moses punished for doing good! And after all that punishment God called Moses back after awhile and the Lord talked with him and the disciples saw him. My friend is badly mistaken about it. Moses was not condemned for doing good, and even the wrong he did was atoned for when he died. God held no guilt against him after that. In the top of the mountain of transfiguration God laid no charge against him on that account.

I shall notice one other thing, "Brother Porter would prefer his plan rather than have peace." No, sir, I tell you, my friends, I want peace. I am anxious to have peace, but the kind that God agrees to. I do not want peace at the price of my liberty. No, Sir, *I do not. I am a free man in Christ Jesus, and what he commands I do.* But when the Lord has not specified the manner in which the thing shall be done, I do not propose to submit to the man who puts himself up as an authority and tells me, "Here, Porter, you must do it like this."

He tells you of the man who complimented his sermon, and says the man was better looking than I am! I suppose he thinks the man is entitled to a compliment for that! He would be too, wouldn't he, W. G.? (Moderator Roberts.) Yes, he is entitled to the compliment as sure as the world.

He talks about a *Fifth Sunday offering* as reported in the Home Messenger. He said last night that those who support the Home spend about 4 cents and 4 mills per member! Told of 27 congregations that gave \$5.00 each, and left the inference that those congregations were doing no more than that per year. He made light of it as being so nearly nothing that it should not be counted as help for them. He did that thing, and in the same breath charged that those in charge of the Home were spending huge sums of people's money to build fine houses! It would take a long time to build such a house as he talked about when the churches were only giving \$5.00 apiece, wouldn't it? It would take a long time to get that house built and paid for.

He brings one other thing to us just here. Oh, yes, he admits responsibility for this division down here. He did that last night, too. He then got up on his high horse and shouted in tones that could be heard even through thick walls, and thanked God that he was able to go out and divide people when he was leading them to the Lord.

But I am reminding you once again, after the statement made in his opening address tonight, that that gentleman is the man who broke that agreement upon which the congregations here were brought together. Just as sure as God or records are bearing out truth at all, this is true.

He goes back once again and calls attention to my hotel proposition. First, he says, "Not a new thing in his speech, a re-hash." Well, it is better to have a hash than nothing at all, so far as that is concerned, but here is something different. Ladies and Gentlemen, some hash has garlic in it, and this smelled pretty strong. It stifled the gentleman! Except to say, "We are not discussing hotels" - he says nothing about it. That is true enough. We are not. But hotels are other institutions. We introduced the example and showed that the Lord Jesus Christ absolutely recommended, or commended a man for taking a helpless one into a hotel, a worldly institution. The man took him into this one and cared for him, and Jesus said, "Do thou likewise." In 1st Peter 2:21, the apostle says: "He left us an example that we should follow in his steps," and my friend turns it all aside and says, "No, Huhuh, not that. We are not talking about hotels." That is the way he answers it! He turns again to Acts 6: and says, "That is Porter's specific example," after Porter had argued against it. "A specific example and he brings it." I remind you again, I did no such thing. I said that here was the example of the apostles appointing a committee to look after it, and I challenged my friend, and again repeat it, to produce the evidence to show what method or means the committee used. He says these men were deacons. The word means, a servant. These were to look after this business. How did they do it? I insist, my friends, as I close this argument, my friend has not met the issue. He has paid no attention to my points except to barely mention my comparison of the orphans home with the meeting house.

It is useless for him to put up a straw man. Let him meet the issue. God has NOT SPECIFIED the means by which the fatherless and widows shall be cared for. God has not specified the place where we shall worship. Does my friend say the orphans shall be taken into private homes? Well, why not worship there? Early Christians met for worship in private homes. Acts 12:12 and 1 Corinthians 16:19 say so. I insist that he cannot find the passage that authorizes in the sense that he used the word the building of a meeting house. He cannot find such a passage to save his life. I believe it is right to do it, because the law of necessity demands it. The law of common sense demands it. The law of inference demands it. The house of worship is a necessity and is authorized by that

law. But it is just as much a part of God's will that we WORK, as that we WORSHIP. It is just as much our right to build a house in which the work of the Lord shall be carried out, as it is to build one in which to worship. If not, Why not? Work! Worship! For whom shall we work? Whom shall we worship? God! The thing we are discussing here is, the work of caring for orphans. Do we have right to provide the means by which the commandment of the Lord to "visit them" shall be carried out? If it be done in a private home, well and good; but remember my friend has not yet brought the example, or the chapter and verse that says so, and Ladies and Gentlemen, you watch him closely in his closing speech.

He will not do it, and cannot do it. It must be decided by human judgment if we are to get the job done and get the widows and orphans cared for. That is what I am pleading for.

I want peace, not division. I am willing to fight for it. I contend for it earnestly. I will surrender anything I have ever taught when my friend puts his finger on the place in the Bible that shows that thing wrong. But he cannot find a specific law to save his life, nor can any other man find a specific law governing this particular case. It is not to be found. Remember it Ladies and Gentlemen. I ask him, is it wrong to do right? He says this is a good work. In Ephesians 2:10, God authorizes us to walk in these good works, which he hath before ordained. It is right to do what God commanded. This is a good work, my friend being witness. Is it right to do it?

The wrong of the missionary society, the wrong of these institutions to which he has called attention is not the fact that they do things that are good. No, sir, that is not the thing that makes them wrong. It is the usurpation of authority. It is pretending and putting themselves in authority to do those things which God did not authorize them to do. God did authorize, his word does demand that we look after the widows, and orphans, and does not provide any specific instructions by which this shall be done. Somebody's plan must be adopted or else the work must be left undone. Who has the right - - why should he have the right to say, "Brother Porter, you must adopt my plan, or I just refuse you fellowship?"

All this fuss about institutionalism and organizations amounts to nothing. Does the gentleman not know that he is technically at least a part of an "organization" tonight? We, this assembly, are an organization as Webster's Dictionary defines that term. "An assembly called together, and presided over by an officer of any kind." No matter about the name by which it is called, it is technically an organization. My friend is a part of it and a party to it. He is!

An organization, indeed! Is this gathering at the church? He will not so recognize it. Those of us here, or elsewhere, that stand on other ground than that which he occupies, are disfellowshipped by him. All about something God never mentioned, too.

Now this being so, I make this statement unto him. Brother Carl, are you going to continue to make this opinion a test of fellowship? Or, are you willing to say, "Sir, let brethren do what God commands, and where there is no specific commandment, we will do as our best judgment indicates." Are you willing to strike hands with me on this, sir? I offer him my hand on that, and my brethren stand behind it. We do not want division.

(Time called)

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Brother Porter, Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Well, I leave it to you if I did not give him plenty to do that last time. Brother Porter keeps talking about a boy all the time. I wonder what he would do if he met some of our men? If a boy could get him as excited as I have made him tonight, and make him almost stomp the floor through, he would really be "up in the air" if he ever got into a debate with a man. But I suppose that since he refers to me as "the boy" I will, in all respect, have to call him "old brother Porter." I don't know how old Brother Porter is, but he looks as if he might be slightly under seventy. He is at least old enough to be my father and to know better than he has been acting tonight.

I don't think that, in my career as a preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ, or in my association with men and women, I have ever come in contact with more unfair tactics than those evidenced in the first part of my brother's speech tonight. I hesitate to make that statement, and would not do so, were it impossible for me to back it up. He stood before you in his first speech tonight, and declared that he did not say and teach that the Orphans Home was the only method of taking care of that part of the work, and none of his brethren taught that one had to endorse the Homes in order to be in their fellow's ip. You heard him say it! I then read from the pen of Will W. Slater, and he acknowledges Slater as one of his brethren, and showed that he positively taught that unless a preacher endorsed the Homes, he might as well fold his tent and drift away. I gave it to him, and said, "Brother Porter, you read that to this people. Read it all!" He left it at his desk when he arose, but pointed at it, and said the article didn't say it, that it wasn't in there.

I am going to read it once more, and show you that it is there. Someone has told you something that is not true! Either my respondent cannot read and understand the English language, or on the other hand has wilfully spoken that which is untrue. I choose to believe that Brother Porter isn't able to read his own language. Listen to this, "I say a preacher who will not endorse such work, had just as well 'fold his tent' and fade away, join the anti-Sunday School crowd where he will be forgotten, so far as the great brotherhood of the Church of Christ is concerned." What is this Orphans Home agent talking about? Go back a little beyond this, and hear him, "I have met a number of the preaching brethren,

and they, God bless them, have been most wonderful to me. I shall never forget their kindness. Only three preachers with whom I came in contact, turned a "cold shoulder" to me. One refused to announce for me. They too, WILL REPENT some day."

REPENT! If you don't do it our way, you are wrong and have to repent. Repent or what? Or go to Hell, of course! That is the doctrine of Slater. He says, "They will repent some day." Suppose they don't repent? The Saviour said, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Slater infers and even says, "They are not with us because they are not supporting the Orphans Homes, and I hope they will repent some day." He says that if we don't line up and do it his way, we might as well "fold our tents and fade away." Porter didn't dare read that statement to you. I wonder if he thought I was dumb enough not to read exactly what Slater said? I am ashamed of my respondent tonight, very ashamed of him. If I misquoted Slater, I expected him to read what Slater said, and show my error, but he didn't do it, even with me begging him to do so. I had to read it! You heard it. There it is! Now friends you can reach your own conclusion about the matter.

He says that since I have challenged him to meet me in Saint Louis, Kansas City and Springfield, I will have the privilege of doing so before this is over. I will have the propositions ready the last night of the debate, with my signature affixed, because I am going to claim that privilege. I want him to begin immediately to make preparations in Kansas City and Springfield, and I will warrant you, that ere this is over, your brethren from Springfield will fold their tents and fade away.

My friend referred again to Acts 6. He denied that the appointment of deacons to look after the destitute was a special instance of how this should be accomplished. He admitted that the apostles introduced them as a special committee for this occasion, and he stomped the floor again at that point, and did he stomp? I felt the floor jump clear back where I was sitting. Brother Roberts leaned over and whispered to me, "Better go a little easier on him Carl, because he will have stone bruises on both heels before the debate ends." In any event the passage in Acts 6 shows that the early church had deacons to minister to the needy, and if you would let the Bible govern this thing, there would be no officers but the elders and deacons, and no organization other than the Lord's house and the individual family. I wouldn't be in this pulpit debating tonight if Brother Porter believed in doing the philanthropic work as did the early church. I believe the scriptures authorize elders and deacons, to look after the spiritual and temporal affairs of the

congregations, and I find nothing said about sperintendents, matrons, etc. receiving their big salaries, for doing the work every child of God should be doing. If this gentleman stood with the truth alone we would not be engaged in this discussion. I regret that he wants to go beyond the things that are written.

He criticizes me for reading from their papers. I want to hold up the papers I have been using as evidence. Here is the Tipton Orphans Home Messenger, The Apostolic Times, The Gospel Advocate, and Firm Foundation: The papers I have read from tonight are all in favor of the Orphans Homes, except one. All of them are published in the south where these organizations exist. The one I have referred to most is published by Tipton Orphans Home, and furnishes me the most of what I know about the unscripturalness of the institution. Will Rogers used to say, "All I know is what I read in the papers," and all I know about the Homes is what I read in THEIR PAPERS. But my good brother will say, "Don't you read any of those papers. Why those things condemn us before we get started. We can't have a debate if you do that." I don't blame him for not liking it, but when he asks me what I would say if I couldn't read from his papers, I will answer that in all probabilities I would be like him I couldn't say anything!

Passing on, I note that he became a little mixed up by trying to confuse you folk. He contends that I first took the position last night that it was an individual work, but later he claims I took the position that it was the church's work. Then he accused me of coming back tonight and saying that it was a work which must be accomplished by two institutions the home and the church. That is exactly what I said. I said it last night and I say it tonight. Whatever I do as an individual Christian, to the glory of God, I do through the church. Certainly you understood that, Brother Porter. What is the matter? Didn't you sleep well last night, or did you have to keep busy thinking all night?

H doesn't like it because I compared him to a Christian church preacher. But it is true that every argument he has introduced in this debate is exactly the same as those offered to defend instrumental music and the missionary society. I pointed that out to you, and he jumped up and told you that his experience as a preacher was just as great as mine, that he had preached in as many states as I have. He hasn't preached in quite as many states as I've been in, but he was in one more tonight, the state of desperation. He declared he would let his work speak for itself, because he had never gone to but one place that would not permit him to return, and that point was Exeter, California.

He charged that the congregation drove about eighty of the faithful out from them, because they would not bow their knees to those who believe as I do about these other institutions. Now, I happen to know something about that case, and I have here an article written by Porter himself that will make it clear. I am going to read it, when I find it, and show you how he misrepresented a faithful church. Ah yes, here it is.

MODERATOR BLUE: I object! You can't introduce that. It is new material.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: I beg your pardon, Brother Blue. He made the statement that the church in Exeter had driven out eighty members. He misrepresented that, and I have here the article written by Brother Porter to prove it.

MODERATOR BLUE: Go ahead!

MR. KETCHERSIDE: Brother Porter won't want this read either. It is a statement taken from the Christian Worker, March 17, 1930, and is a report by Rue Porter of a meeting at Exeter, California. "Our meeting at Exeter, California, closed on Wednesday night, March 12. It was the best meeting in which I ever had a part in this state . . . Brother J. C. Weekly is yet there, AND A MORE CAPABLE, GODLY, CONSCIENTIOUS, AND EFFICIENT BISHOP would be hard to find. I am sure they will enlarge their building soon. One of the commendable things among the brethren there is the fact that THEY ARE REALLY CONVERTED TO CHRIST."

That same elder is out there yet, and he is still elder of the faithful church, and he is the one, who standing with the remainder of the congregation behind him will not permit this man to preach there now. Why? Because Rue Porter stands identified with the faction that pulled off from the church, and left the loyal brethren because they were unwilling to compromise with their additions to God's word. That same godly, conscientious, efficient bishop that Porter lauded in his article is the man who says, "Because you preach things not in harmony with the truth of God, we cannot endorse you." That is the reason Porter cannot preach there. He is identified with the faction in this city that left the loyal church. Now you understand why they won't let him come back. His own work does speak for itself, doesn't it?

I hasten on to investigate another point which he tried to make. Ephesians 3:21 which I quoted says, "unto him be glory in the church, throughout all ages." He says I am trying to give the institution the glory instead of the instituter. You recall that I made this point, that all glory given by us to God, must be given IN THE CHURCH, and not through any other organization.

I still stick to that. When someone asks my respondent, "Who reared those orphans?" Does he say the Church of Christ did it? No, the Tipton Orphans Home. "Who collects the money from the saints to care for the needy?" Tipton Orphans Home. "Who turns out these gospel preachers?" Tipton Orphans Home. And I maintain that is robbing God of the glory that belong to him.

Further, he tries to make it appear that I am wrong, in that I speak about "two divinely authorized institutions," when he says there is a third - civil government. I said there were two institutions to carry on the Lord's work and worship, and I believe that! I maintain that the work of the Church of Jesus Christ must be done through the church, and that when I take care of an orphan in my private home, and do it as a Christian, I am a part of the church at work. Is our brother trying to plead that we should turn the orphans over to the civil government to care for?

He referred back to what I said last night about Moses being "condemned" for doing good. Brother Porter, you made a mistake again. You said that I could not point to a passage of scripture within the pages of God's revelation, showing where any individual was ever "punished" for doing good. PUNISHED, not condemned! Tonight you twist and change the thing around, and try to leave the impression on these good folk that I said Moses was condemned to hell. That wasn't what I said.

You asked for the case of one who was punished for doing good and I showed that when the God of Heaven told Moses to go and speak to the rock, Moses became angry, smote the rock twice and said, "Ye rebels, must we again bring forth water for you?" He watered all the people and their herds, and saved their lives. That was a wonderful work, but did God punish him for the way he did it? Did he? Porter quoted tonight, "Moses failed to sanctify God in the sight of the people," and he was not condemned for DOING GOOD BUT FOR THE WAY HE DID IT. That is my contention exactly, and the point I am making. The purpose of a thing might be good. But what about the way you do it? I say when you establish another body besides the church, to do a part of the work of the church, beyond a doubt you have transcended God's record, and the Book states, "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God."

I notice again that Brother Porter says, "I want peace, but I want the kind that God will agree to." I wish he had told us what kind that was. But let God tell you: "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, and then peacable," says the inspired James. That is the kind of peace my brethren want, we want the wisdom that is first pure and THEN peacable. What does the word "pure" mean?

It means "unmixed, untainted." So the wisdom from above must be "unmixed." Unmixed with what? Worldlyism, worldly ideas and doctrines. That is the peace I crave. Does Porter want that kind? No, he will cling to his worldly institutions, and refuse to come to what God has said. He would rather have his Homes and Bible colleges than to have the fellowship of his brethren in Christ. But the only unity that we as Christians can uphold is that which is based upon the wisdom from above; wisdom that is first pure, and then peaceable.

Brother Porter is welcome to any compliment he may deserve with reference to his beauty. I casually mentioned a man who was a little better looking than my good friend, but upon second thought, I was too conservative, the other man was much the best looking. But Brother Porter, like myself, cannot help his looks, and I will not cast any further reflections on his beauty. However, I want this idea carried with you. The other gentleman was a solicitor for an Orphans Home, who came into my meeting for the purpose of taking up a collection. After the regular offering had been made he passed the plate again. I told him I could not contribute, because I had just given the Lord all he had prospered me. I would have had to keep back from God what belonged to him, if I made a second gift. Will a man rob God?

I have to watch my respondent closely, in order to keep things straight in your mind. He said that I admitted it was a pleasure to me to go around dividing congregations as this one is divided. I would have you remember that the question arose as to this division at Ozark, and I took the position that I was scriptural in the part I played. Perhaps someone will say, "No, no, there is no such thing as scriptural division." The Book says, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and AVOID THEM." There is such a thing, then, as scriptural separation, scriptural division. When I came into this territory, from the very first until now, I have pleaded for brethren to mark those who cause division by the introduction of unscriptural practices. I preached against the things the Bible does not advocate, and certain ones became angry. They went out from among us! It was the "marking" that hurt. That is all there is to that.

My friend makes another statement which must be called in question at this juncture. I do not know how long he has been associated with the church here, but I want to supply him with a little authentic information on a certain matter which he has introduced. Those brethren who are here standing with him, and some of whom he had named, openly mentioned and gave their endorsement to the colleges from the local pulpit before I ever came into this

section of the country to conduct meetings. It is true that some of the rest of them would go around telling those who were opposed to the colleges, that they stood right with them, in such opposition, but Brother Porter has named them out one by one, and told us who they were, and that they stood as he did. We are glad to know who you are, boys, and we will know who to mark the next time.

It is true as can be that some of these college advocates did mention Abilene Christian College and David Lipscomb College in their public preaching here in Ozark. They introduced it! When I came to Nixa for a meeting, and God blessed that meeting with a reasonable amount of success, some of the Ozark brethren suggested that I come here for a meeting. Certain ones who are identified with the faction tonight said, "If Carl Ketcherside comes here for a meeting the Community Hall will not hold the people." One year from that time they took a position against me, because I stood in the pulpit at Nixa and pleaded for the church supreme, the only organization in the world to carry on the services of God. I would like to be together with all of my brethren. To those of you who went off and started meeting in the Klepper Funeral Parlor, let me say that I wish we could be together. But in order to enjoy such union, it becomes necessary that I turn my back upon the Church of Christ, and swallow all of these other things, we will never be together. I stand where I have always stood. I shall make one unceasing plea for the Church of the True and Living God. There I stand and there if need be I shall die.

I am not going to notice further what he said about hotels, because I would only be getting off the main track, and I am barking close to his heels now. I do not propose to be led off on a tangent. The building of hotels does not enter into this debate, which I would have you realize is on the proposition: "The erection and maintenance of ORPHAN HOMES, such as Tipton Orphans Home, is authorized by the New Testament scriptures." That is the issue.

Just last night the two of us came before you people for the first time in this debate. We came realizing the divided condition of the church and entire brotherhood over these things. He came here to uphold the Homes, to show that they were scriptural. Did he do it? No! He went to the Bible and showed where it endorsed the doing of good works. We are not arguing that. I believe we ought to accomplish what God wants us to. The question is not "Resolved that we should do good works; or that the New Testament Scriptures authorize us to do good works." The thing which we are interested in and the thing which Porter has to uphold is the erection and maintenance of Homes SUCH AS Tiphon Orphans Home. He says that it is authorized by the scriptures. That is his proposition.

and not one time has the man hit the proposition in the last two nights. He has dropped like a hot potato every time it was mentioned to him.

I trust you will bear with me while I summarize the arguments which I introduced. I must confine myself to them, because I am not permitted to introduce new matter in my last speech. I go once more to Ephesians 4:4, and find that there is ONE BODY, and then I again refer to Colossians 1:18 which declares Christ to be the head of that body, the church. Colossians 2:10 says we are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power. You remember that just here I took up the Tipton Orphans Home Messenger, truned to the heading, and showed you that the place was Tipton Orphans Home, Incorporated. Next I demonstrated that the word "incorporated" comes from a word meaning "body." I specifically charged my respondent with teaching that there were "TWO BODIES." I asked him to notice the word "incorporated" and my argument on it. Did he touch it? Did he mention it? No sir, he fought shy of that. He was afraid to take hold of it, for he knew it branded Tipton as another body. Porter and his brethren say, "There is more than one body." The apostle Paul says, "There is one body."

I refer to Ephesians 3:21. "Unto him be glory in the church," and to Isaiah 48:11 where God said he would not give his glory to another. Did he handle that argument? Did he even touch it? Not once did he deign to notice it, because he knows that the Orphans Homes are taking the glory that belongs to God.

You have not forgotten my quoting of Colossians 3:17, " whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." I proved that whatever we do or say must be done in the name of, that is by the authority of the son of God. We must hear him.

Again I went to 2 Timothy 3:16-17. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction, etc., that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." I asked him since he contends that Tipton Orphans Home is a good work, why the Word of God does not furnish us with instructions as to its care and management. He did not even refer to the scriptures. He paid not the least bit of attention. He stands convicted by his own silence, and the silence of Brother Porter gives assent to the things which I have spoken.

I said the Orphans Home system robbed the church by its special collections. Did he deny it? Did he mention it? The Book asserts we are to give as we have been prospered. If I give everything which the Lord has prospered me in my contribution on Lord's Day, will

I have anything left for a special contribution? If you do keep something back out of the Lord's treasury, have you not robbed God. Did he touch those arguments? No sir, he very coolly disregarded them. He talked about "the boy" but not about what the boy had to say. Again I wonder what he would do if he should ever have a debate with one of our full-fledged men? It has been said that man is the only animal that can be "skinned" more than once. So our good brother has had one "skinning," and if he lives up to his promise to meet me again, he will get another. I hope when the time comes, if it ever does and I do not expect it will, that Brother Porter will make up his mind to meet the issues face to face.

As we near the conclusion of our first proposition, there are a few things which must be rehearsed and which should be reconsidered. At the risk of boring you by constant reiteration, I am going to ask your kind indulgence, while I read to you once more the proposition. "The erection and maintenance of Orphans Homes such as Tipton Orphans Home, Southern Christian Home, and others of like character for the purpose of housing and otherwise caring for orphan children is AUTHORIZED by the New Testament scriptures." I showed that the word "authorize" meant to "commission, or give authority for." I asked him for the scripture that divinely commissioned such Homes. I showed that it meant "to clothe with legal power," and asked him where the Word of God legalized the existence of these institutions. He made his affirmation two months ago, and said at the time that the Homes were authorized by the scriptures, but when I asked him if there is any such chapter or verse, he replies "No, not one." He says it is authorized by the silence of God. We are not debating the silence of God. He must have recently changed his mind on the subject.

Ladies and Gentlemen, in conclusion tonight, I stand before you pleading again for the supremacy of the Church of Christ, over every institution and organization in the world. The Christian church introduced the missionary society, and split the brotherhood of Christ into two conflicting parties. Brother Porter and his group of friends are seeking to introduce the Bible college and they have split the brotherhood into two more parties. Those who injected the missionary society were responsible for the division, and here sits the man tonight who drove the wedge of Homes and Colleges, and split the Body by advocating that which the Word nowhere mentions.

I thank God, as I stand here this evening, that I can come pleading for the old Ship of Zion, that has borne all the storms and lashing waves of fury, through nineteen hundred years. I am thankful that I can take my place at the foot of Calvary's cross and with my back firmly placed against it, lift up my voice in proclamation

of the gospel of Jesus Christ, pleading with men to come and give God the glory in the church. May the Father above bless you who have gone out from us, and grant that sometime you may return again. God is my witness tonight, that as I gaze into your faces, I would gladly exclaim, "Let us fellowship together and work together," but remember that there is but one thing that stands between us to keep us from doing it, and that is the fact that you are upholding things which even this man who represents you, able as he is, acknowledges there is no scripture to substantiate.

That is why we cannot be together tonight. My heart is broken because of the divided condition of the Church of Our Redeemer. May the Lord have mercy upon those who cause offence by their departures from the truth, for the record says, "Offences must come, but woe unto him by whom the offence cometh. It were better for him that a millstone be placed about his neck, and he be cast into the sea." God forbid that I should ever cause the soul of a single child of humanity to be lost by advocating something unauthorized.

Tonight as I look into the face of Brother Porter, and realize that one-half of our discussion is about over, my prayer is that the time may arrive, when both he and his moderator may take their stand for the Church of Jesus Christ, and in, through and by that church, carry on all the work of the Lord. Friends, it is evident that if we do not get together down here, we will not be together up there. That is the saddest part of all.

And now it is my prayer for all of you that God may bless you to a greater understanding of His will, that we may strive to live so that we may unite in fellowship, firmly grounded upon one proposition and one alone; the Church eternal, the Church undying, the Church of Jesus Christ alone. Brother Porter, may God bless you, and may you sometime realize the necessity of preaching the truth without addition, building on the rock and not on the sand. That is my prayer in conclusion.

(Time called)

THURSDAY NIGHT, MARCH 25, 1937

MODERATOR ROBERTS: We have Brother D. A. Sommer from Indianapolis, Indiana, with us, and we will be pleased to have him lead our prayer.

Prayer by D. Austen Sommer, Indianapolis, Indiana.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: The moderator on the other side suggested, and I concur with him in the suggestion, that you leave the debating to these two men here. They like each other. You don't believe that, do you? They do! They may not like the doctrine of each other, but they like each other. Of course they do. They will get along just fine. And can you folk do that way? Just leave it up to them. Last night some of you got warm under the collar, and that is a very, I was going to say a bad sign, but it is a bad sign on one hand and a good one on the other. Some of you last evening got a little warm. Now you keep quiet in here, and if any bad results come from this debate in any way, shape, or form, it will be because of you, and not these men here. The rest of you behave! Of course, everybody knows I will, and we will get along fine. You folk just keep cool and be easy, say nothing unless you want to talk about the rain—nothing about the debate. It is evidence of defeat, and we noticed that some of you must have felt it last night, judging by the way you acted.

I will read the proposition for tonight: "The erection and maintenance of schools and colleges, such as Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb College, and others of like character for purpose of teaching the Bible, and other branches of learning in connection, is contrary to the New Testament scriptures and should be condemned as an innovation in the church." W. Carl Ketcherside affirms. Rue Porter denies. Now hear Brother Ketcherside.

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: Again tonight I stand before you to open the second half of this discussion with the same feeling of sadness in my heart as at the beginning, a feeling of sadness at the divided condition of the Church of Jesus Christ, and particularly as that condition affects the Body here in the City of Ozark. Four months ago, I came to this city to conduct a very brief meeting with one of the congregations meeting here and was told by some of our brethren they had come in contact with those in sympathy with Porter's views on this matter, and Porter had declared to his brethren that there was not a single man among us who would meet him in public discussion on these issues. Immediately I sat down and wrote Brother Porter and invited him to meet me in Ozark or Springfield and to discuss the differences between the two congregations, and I asked him to affirm his position on the college question, and I also made the affirmation which you have heard read by my moderator tonight. Brother Porter wrote back and said two night's discussion was enough to spend on one subject and wrote out a proposition which we should also debate and discuss here, the question of the Orphans Home. I obliged Brother Porter on that and was very happy to have the opportunity of standing before you, Ladies and Gentlemen, and setting forth the position which I hold relative to caring for destitute orphans. I am also pleased to be able to defend the truths which I represent as I come before you this evening.

I am further happy because of this fact: Last night, you remember, I made the statement I would be very glad, indeed, to have Brother Porter meet me in Springfield, in St. Louis, or in Kansas City, and take up the issues which we are here debating, and upon which the churches in those cities are also divided. Brother Porter said to me, "Brother Ketcherside, before this is over you may not want to meet any one, but I guarantee you this, you will have the privilege of being satisfied relative to this matter if this thing keeps on." Brother Porter, it is keeping on. I expect Porter shall live up to his promise, and if his brethren in Springfield show any moral courage at all, and if they manifest a proper Christian courtesy, they will permit this discussion to take place in Springfield at a very near date to the present time. We are already making arrangements for it in Kansas City, already doing the same in St. Louis, and I want you to know that if these questions are not discussed in either of these places soon, it is because Brother Porter's brethren will not permit them to be discussed there.

In introducing the first affirmative speech on this new issue, I am obligated tonight, first of all, to define the proposition for dis-

cussion. I shall define the word "erection." Brother Porter said in reference to that, in speaking of the Orphans Home, that the word "erection" means to "build up." I shall accept that definition. Regarding the word "maintenance," I also accept his definition for that, "keep up." We are tonight discussing the building up and keeping up of such schools or colleges as David Lipscomb College, Abilene Christian College, and others of like character.

By "others," I shall expect you to understand those schools that stand for the same principle and ideas as the ones just mentioned. Thus I may refer to the Freed-Hardeman College of Henderson, Tennessee. I shall refer to Harding College of Searcy, Arkansas. I may make some passing reference to the Potter Bible School or Western Oklahoma Christian College at Cordell, Oklahoma. Sometime or other in this discussion I may likewise make reference to the school which once existed at Odessa, Missouri, and to the one which once existed at Hartford, Kansas. Those schools all contend for the same principle.

I pass on to the other words in this proposition: "The Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb College, and others of like character, for the purpose of teaching the Bible and other branches of learning in connection." By "other branches," I mean Science, Philosophy, Mathematics, Literature, and those things. I shall expect to show in my speech then, that such schools established for the purpose of teaching the Bible and other branches of learning in connection, are contrary to the New Testament scriptures. Webster shows that "contrary" is defined as follows: "opposed; diametrically different, mutually opposed; antagonistic."

I shall expect to prove these schools are opposed to the spirit of the New Testament Scriptures. We are not here discussing school buildings. When we debated on the Orphans Homes we talked about the work of the Homes, and in this question we are discussing the work of the Bible Colleges, and what they stand for, the position they occupy. The statement says they are contrary to the New Testament scriptures, and should be condemned as an innovation in the Church. The word "innovation," according to Webster, means: "Act of innovating; introduction of something new, especially in customs, rites, etc."

I shall demonstrate that the Bible College is the introduction of something new into the Church of Jesus Christ and should be condemned as something not apostolic, and therefore, contrary to the New Testament Scripture.

As my first point of proof on this matter tonight, I shall begin with Matthew 16:18, where the Savior addressing Peter said, "Upon this rock, I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not

prevail against it." So I want to take my position upon the great proposition that Jesus Christ built His Church.

All right, I next turn with you to Acts 20:28, where the inspired apostle Paul, speaking to the elders of Ephesus, whom he had called to Miletus, says, "Take heed unto yourselves, and the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Jesus Christ built the Church, and he purchased that Church with his own blood. Now in Ephesians 4:4, the record says, "There is one body." Turning over to Colossians 1:18, the writer, referring to Christ, declares, "He is the head of the body, the Church." So we see that the Church of Jesus Christ which was built upon a confession of faith in Christ, the son of God, and purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ, was a unit.

I want you to turn with me to that same Ephesian letter, chapter 4:16. While it might be possible for us to quote it to you, I shall read it because I want to impress this upon your mind as the Word of God, and I want you to see it. Ephesians 4:15, 16: "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in 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." Now get that! The body of Jesus Christ, the Church established upon the day of Pentecost, is able to edify ITSELF. The word "edify" we have derived from several words, but from the word as used in the Latin, it means to "build up." "Thoroughly capable of building itself up," is the state of Christ's Church. That blood bought institution needs no addition of a man-made creed. It needs no addition of a man-made institution to do its teaching, or any other type of work.

Now, I want to pass on to Colossians 2:10, which, in speaking of Christ, says, "Ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power."

I turn next to 2 Timothy 3:16,17. I read that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." And thus I learn that God's word declares our completeness in Christ, and further says that within its pages is provided absolutely everything we need.

Suppose some one comes along and plants something else, builds another institution? What will be the fate of that institution?

Matthew 15:13, "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."

I shall expect to prove to you tonight that the colleges mentioned, and others of like character, are not planted by God. I shall expect to prove they are not planted by the preaching of the truth and are not a part of the Gospel plan; consequently they shall be rooted up. Not only that, but I expect to go further and show you, my friends, that such institutions exist in disobedience to that passage quoted several times and found in Ephesians 3:21, "Unto Him be glory in the church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages, world without end."

This discussion is going to center around the proposition as to whether or not it is right, proper, and scriptural for disciples of Jesus Christ to build other institutions to aid the Church in her work, and to assume the prerogatives of that Body. Let that sink into your minds. That is the central issue, the central thought of this debate, and if the gentleman who is in the negative tonight, shall endeavor to cloud the issue, and draw your minds away by sophistry, you will see through that smoke screen and remember that it is not a question of whether people should be educated or not; it is not a matter of whether it is right to teach the Bible or not. We are not here debating whether it is right to teach the Bible in school, or not. The issue is just this: Do disciples of Jesus Christ have the right to build human institutions? Get that! Do disciples of Christ have a right to sponsor other organizations to do the work of the Church, to take the glory that belongs to the body of Jesus Christ? We shall expect our opponent to make some statements about that.

What I believe to be the position of the early Church regarding these matters was ably stated by Alexander Campbell as follows:

"In their church capacity alone they moved. They neither transformed themselves into any other kind of association, nor did they fracture themselves into divers societies. They viewed the body of Christ as the scheme of Heaven to ameliorate the world, as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or educational society, a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should ROB THE CHURCH of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God."

Now get that! The early disciples moved alone in a Church capacity, they didn't transfer a single cent of money individually or as a congregation to an educational society lest they should rob the Church of its glory and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God.

About this matter, President J. N. Armstrong, who has been associated, as president, with the colleges at Odessa, Missouri; Harper, Kansas; and Morrillton, Arkansas; and who is now associated with the school of Searcy, Arkansas, as Dean of Bible, says this: "The Church's mission, its work, is clearly defined and appointed by the Lord. God has sent forth this one institution to do that work, and in, through, and by that institution, that work must be done, if done in the name (authority) of our Father and his Christ to their glory."

Listen, "Any other institution that is created to do this work, *or after created*, assumes to do this work, is an intruder, dishonors God, and saps the Church of its efficiency. Certainly if God created, brought into existence his Church for a mission, to do a work, it is amply able to do that work, and is in every way adapted to, and prepared to do it."

Brother Porter, the president of one of your colleges, *or rather three of them*, Dean of Bible in one at this present time, speaking about this thing that you are defending, said, "Any other institution that is created to the work of the church, or after being created, assumes to do it, is an intruder, dishonors God, and saps the church of its efficiency."

Now I pass on to read from page 18 of that same tract, where the same man says, "All worship, all religious services, **ALL BIBLE TEACHING**, all prayers and praises, must, in honor to God, be rendered in, and through the church. This field of service is sanctified, set apart, for the Church of God, and not another institution has any part or lot in this point. **NO SCHOOL**, no missionary society, association or league, must intrude upon, or invade this field. No other institution, or organization can offer a prayer, sing a song, preach a sermon, or engage in any other religious service in the name of Christ or **BY THE AUTHORITY OF GOD.**" No school must invade what field? The field of Bible teaching. The president of a Bible College, Dean of Bible in one at present says, "No school has the right to teach the Bible. That belongs to the Church of Jesus Christ."

I read further from page 9 of the same tract. "Any other institution that sets itself up to teach the word of the Lord"—this is good! I want you to get it! I will repeat it.—"Any other institution that sets itself up to **TEACH THE WORD OF THE LORD** or to **EQUIP AND PREPARE WORKERS** for the work of the church is **BORN OF PRESUMPTION AND UNBELIEF.** The very idea that any other institution could better fit and prepare workers for the church work, missionary work, *or the work of building up the body of Christ itself*, is born of a misconception of

the Church of the living God and its work in the world."

There you are! And this man comes up here tonight before this audience and tries to prove that you have a right to establish an institution to teach the Word of the Lord, or to prepare and equip workers. If he does that, regardless of whether it is a church or a private organization, he finds himself in a serious predicament. What did this president say? He says such an idea is born of presumption and unbelief. Brother Porter will be an unbeliever if he does that, and infidel, you know! 'Too bad!

I want to read this again and talk about it still further. I am going to drive a peg right here for my respondent to deal with. "Any other institution could better fit and prepare workers for the church work, missionary work, or the work of building up the body of Christ itself is born of a misconception of the church of the living God." This man here on my left stood in the pulpit at Star, near Granby, Missouri, and made the statement that the only institution authorized by the Word of God, to carry on the development of the church, was the Church of Jesus Christ itself. He stood up in the tent here in Ozark, took his text, and plainly and firmly declared that he considered the church a self-supporting, self-perpetuating institution. He bitterly attacked the missionary society of the Christian church. Will he come to you tonight then, and uphold an educational society to teach the gospel? Will he do it? We await his time to speak, to see if he will or not. He took the position with the Christian church that no society except the Church of Christ was legalized by the Bible to do that work, and the president of the college said the same.

Now I am going to prove to you that David Lipscomb College and Abilene Christian College are human institutions, set up to do the work of the church. I am going to prove it point by point. I am going to make it so plain that even my opponent can see it. The first thing I shall do, Brother Porter, is to prove that these colleges are INSTITUTIONS, next, I will prove they are HUMAN INSTITUTIONS, and finally that they are HUMAN INSTITUTIONS TO DO THE WORK OF GOD'S CHURCH.

First, I refer to this book, "The Visions and Labors of the Pioneers," which was published by David Lipscomb College to beg the brotherhood for a little money. On page 9 I read, "The Nashville Bible School had a small beginning; only a few young men met David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding the morning of October 5, 1891, in Nashville, Tennessee, to begin the school. This number grew slowly and gradually until a large number received part, or all, of their training in THIS INSTITUTION." All right, then, it is an institution, isn't it?

I turn to page 11, and here is what I find: "David Lipscomb College has been no less effective in its far-reaching influence; boys and girls have been trained IN THIS INSTITUTION and have gone out into all parts of the country." Next, I go to page 13 and read: "When we think of the good being done through these INSTITUTIONS, and then think of what might have been done, had they been better equipped and more faithfully supported. . . . we are caused to wonder why every member of the body of Christ does not want to perpetuate THESE INSTITUTIONS." Now to page 15 where we find the thought expressed three times in one paragraph. "But times have changed. INSTITUTIONS cannot be maintained now without adequate equipment . . . The sacrifices of the few then were great in founding THESE INSTITUTIONS; far greater sacrifice should be made today by all who have been blessed by the influence of THE INSTITUTIONS in their earlier days." Thus by their own literature I have proven that David Lipscomb College is an institution.

Now comes the easy task of proving that Abilene Christian College is also an institution. I turn to the Abilene Christian College Bulletin, 1936-'37, page 13. "When President Baxter resigned in order to assume the presidency of A SISTER INSTITUTION, David Lipscomb College, Dean James F. Cox was unanimously chosen president." Now on the next page, "Abilene Christian College is graded 'First Class' by the Texas Department of Education and by the Association of Texas Colleges. This places the school in the first group of EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS of the state." There you are! We have proven it also an institution by their own books. Here they are right before you. Read them to the audience. We will be glad to have you do that.

In the second place, I want to prove that these are human institutions established by man and not by God.

On page 13 of this book, "The Visions of the Pioneers," as published by David Lipscomb College, is this: "Even when David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding founded the Nashville Bible School, only meager equipment was necessary." Who founded it? The Apostle Paul? No! David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding.

Abilene Christian College is in the same boat. My brother will not like for me to read from his literature like this, but I am going to anyway and see what he does about it. Abilene Christian College Bulletin, page 12: "Realizing the importance of teaching God's word to the young people of their time, David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding BEGAN A MOVEMENT in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1891, which resulted in the establishment of the Nashville Bible School." Now get that! They began a movement. It wasn't begun

in the days of Paul, didn't start in the days of the apostles, but began, says this statement, in 1891, and resulted in establishment of Nashville Bible School. So that proves they were human institutions.

In the third place I want to prove that these human institutions were established to do a part of the work of the church.

Freed-Hardeman College Bulletin, April, 1936, page 12. There is a nice little story here, a bed-time story, and it will be mentioned several times in this debate. "Not only is the school maintained in order to develop the moral and spiritual qualities of its pupils, but it also has another objective, little, if any, less important. There is a constant tendency on the part of the Churches of Christ to depart from 'the ancient order of things.' Likewise our so-called Bible schools manifest the same inclination. Freed-Hardeman College is trying to stem this tide and stay these departures." Hear that! The Church of Christ is liable to depart, and it isn't able to stay on the track, so we will build a "sister institution" to stay these departures. Have to have a college to do that, you know, sir! Not satisfied with the Old Book, are you?

I read further: "Freed-Hardeman College stands unreservedly for the primitive faith. It subscribes wholeheartedly to the famous statement of Thomas Campbell: 'Where the Scriptures speak, we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.' It believes in the motto of Barton W. Stone: 'The Bible alone without note or comment.' It is trying to stand upon 'the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.'" Why here is a college that says it is built on the foundation the church is on. I shall expect to prove that it shoved the church into the background and crawled upon the foundation.

I pick up the Abilene Christian College Bulletin, page 13, and read you another little tale, to which I hope you will listen. Under the heading "Purpose" I find: "There are two outstanding reasons for the existence of Abilene Christian College. First and foremost, Abilene Christian College proposes to emphasize the study of the Bible as the inspired Word of the living God. It is the purpose to get the great truths of the Bible into the hearts and minds of the students who attend it, in order that their lives may be influenced, guided and directed by its sacred teachings."

Now let this man show me anywhere in God's truth where a college is authorized to preach the Word, or teach it and take the glory therefor. It is the purpose of Abilene Christian College to teach the Word of God to those who attend it. What am I proving? Why that a human institution has been established whose purpose is to do the work of the church, thus taking the glory from God, that this

thing unknown to the New Testament is sapping the life's blood from the church.

Let me repeat this, "It is the purpose to get the great truths of the Bible into the hearts and minds of the students." Did you get that? That is its purpose, to teach the Bible. I want to read to you again, Brother Porter, "Any other institution that sets itself up to teach the word of the Lord is born of presumption and unbelief." Now I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, by the testimony of their own college presidents, they are **BORN OF PRESUMPTION AND UNBELIEF**. Wrestle that around when you get up, will you please?

Still I am not through, and want to go on further. I hold up before you a booklet called "Pressing On." It was printed by David Lipscomb College to beg a lot of money from the brotherhood. On page 3 I find—but wait a minute, here are the pictures of the men who helped start this mammoth plant. They took the money which God prospered them, and instead of putting it in the treasury, they built a big school, costing several hundred thousand dollars. They robbed the Lord of that and built a school. But now the statement: "Christians can have no hope of Christianizing public education by injecting religion into it. Their only hope lies in maintaining strong and thoroughly equipped institutions of learning, unfalteringly loyal to the Bible and to Christian principles, which, at the same time, give intellectual training equal to any that can be secured elsewhere." **THEIR ONLY HOPE!** The church and religion of Jesus Christ are not enough. Our only hope as Christians of properly educating the world, is to "maintain strong and thoroughly equipped institutions of learning" like David Lipscomb College. But I read again from this article: "**THIS IS AN IMPERATIVE NECESSITY. IN NO OTHER WAY CAN WE SECURE THE TRAINED AND CONSECRATED CHRISTIAN LEADERS SO GREATLY NEEDED!**" Remember again what Armstrong said: "Any other institution that sets itself up to teach the word of the Lord or **TO EQUIP AND PREPARE WORKERS** for the work of the church, is born of presumption and unbelief." What will our brother do with this?

There is still more about this college. Listen again. "It is also necessary in order to keep alive **THE SPIRIT AND IDEALS OF APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY.**" This man's position tonight, since he is defending David Lipscomb College, is that the ideals and spirit of apostolic Christianity cannot be kept alive without the college. Oh, the folly of it! But that's what the colleges advocate, and that is what Porter is defending. By the way, Brother Porter,

any time you want to borrow this literature I've been reading, you are welcome to it.

I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I have proven out of their own statements that these people have an institution, a human institution, to do the work of the church. Somebody is going to say, "Brother Ketcherside, if the things you have said are true, and you have certainly proven them, what is this man going to say?" There is no telling what he will say. We have found that out! There may be several false positions which he could take. Some of his brethren in the past have demonstrated an appalling ignorance, by saying that these were individual institutions, that building a college was like buying a farm and teaching your hired hands the Bible. I can hardly believe Brother Porter will offer that kind of absurd reasoning. He is too smart for that. But if he should, I am prepared and that argument will be blown into bits. I challenge you to take that position tonight, Brother Porter.

He might go to Acts 19:9, where mention is made of the school of Tyrannus, and say this was like one of the modern Bible Colleges. They do that sometimes. But you just let him do that once. Just let him try to prove that Paul was Dean of Bible in the same kind of a school as Abilene Christian College where they teach dramatic arts and football. Just let him assert that Paul sanctioned anything like that! You do that, Brother Porter, and I will put your college under you like a bomb and strike a match to it. When you get through with this debate you will never have the courage or *affrontery* to stand before an audience of men and women again and demonstrate lack of knowledge. You know you can't substantiate those ideas.

And now, once more! Even the college presidents themselves have admitted that there is but one institution to teach the Word of God, and that is the Church of Jesus Christ. Any other institution established for such a purpose is born of presumption and unbelief. I have proven to you that Abilene Christian College and David Lipscomb College are institutions founded by human beings for the purpose of doing the work of the church. My opponent signed his name to this *proposition* and he upholds those things. He is defending something that is born of presumption and unbelief. His own brethren are witnesses to that. My time is up, and I relinquish the floor to him. See if he deals with my arguments. Let him take them up one by one, and let us see what kind of a mess he will make out of his attempt.

MR. PORTER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, and you, my Christian brethren and friends: I am delighted indeed, to be here tonight. I am feeling about as good as I have for a long time. I don't know when I have listened to a man speak who was laboring under greater stress and excitement than my good friend, Carl, has been tonight. I want to begin this speech with an apology to him. I called him a "boy" in a jocular kind of way, and he took exception to it. I apologize. I meant nothing bad by that. I used the term in the friendliest sort of way, and make this apology because I want to show you that I want to do exactly the right thing. Of course, it was all right for him to take a slap at me because I was not the most "handsome" man he had seen! I enjoyed that as much as anybody, because it was funny to all of you. I thought at the time, however, that he was wrong about it. If you will get a copy of the Springfield paper of yesterday afternoon, and will look at the picture of me on the front page of yesterday afternoon, and at one of him on the back, and then decide that he has any advantage of me, I'll apologize again!

Now then. I appreciate your presence, and thank you in advance for the good attention you will give to my speech.

Our brother comes before you and reads the proposition we are to discuss, and tells you no less than a dozen times, by count, what he intends to prove, and how he is going to prove it, but some way or other, he failed to do as he promised in the speech he made.

I shall now notice some of the things he said, and try to help him along a little.

I accept his definition of terms, as he understands and uses them. Certainly every man who writes a proposition and affirms it is entitled to say what he means by the terms in which it is expressed. I never fight with a man about that. He knows what he means when he uses those words, and we gladly agree with him, and shall help him in the study as to whether or not he is living up to the provisions of the proposition.

In order to bring a little more information to light, and get the issue more clearly before us, I have a few questions. He brought some for me the other evening, and of course I have the same right now. We have a right to know about these things, and I want his answers to them. They may not be in correct form so far as the English is concerned, but you will understand that I am not teaching English here! I must not do such a thing under circumstances of

this kind, else I will get myself in bad with him! The questions:

1. Is it a *sin* to organize and operate a school in which nothing is taught other than the natural sciences?

2. If the school in which the Bible is not taught is right, would the teaching of the Bible in it cause it to be wrong?

3. Is it scriptural for Christians to teach school at all?

4. Is it ever wrong for a Christian to teach the word of God?

5. If it be right for a Christian to teach the word of God at all, please tell us where and under what circumstances does it become wrong for him to teach it?

6. Can a teacher give instructions in morality without teaching the word of God? I want to repeat that. I want my brother, when he comes to deal with this question, to tell us plainly if it is possible for a man to teach true morality without teaching the word of God? Is there any such thing as true morality other than that derived from the word of God?

7. If the teacher in the secular school instruct the student in morals, from what source does such moral teaching come?

8. Would you endorse a man as loyal if he would teach the Bible in school?

9. Would you endorse the same man if he also teaches English?

10. Is it right under any circumstances to teach the Bible in a school?

I hand these questions to my brother, and shall expect him to give them consideration when he comes to the floor. This is perfectly proper and right, and I want him to do it, as it will help us to understand each other. I am following him now, and I pledge you that I will deal fairly with the matter he offers.

Brother Roberts suggested in his announcement last evening that "Carl has been kicking Porter around for two nights, and now it is his turn to be kicked." Of course, he said it as a joke, and I hope all so understood it. But so far as I am concerned, I am not in the "kicking" business. This is no theological football game. I am here to discuss matters of difference. I assure you, too, that if it were possible, I would rather than most anything else be able to shake hands with my brother and know that we had reached an agreement.

There are many things to which he referred in his speech that are not at issue in this debate. Much of his speech I endorse heartily, because I teach exactly the same thing. I offer no reply to any truth he uttered, for I believe it no matter who teaches it. I want you to understand first of all, and am saying it plainly, I DO NOT BELIEVE, and the brethren with whom I stand DO NOT believe THAT THE CHURCH OF THE LORD JESUS

CHRIST HAS ANY SUCH BUSINESS. AS the establishment of schools for the purpose of teaching secular things. All his argument against a school is wasted, for I, too, oppose it.

The church, as such, is not in that kind of business. But my friend contends for the proposition that individual members of the church—those who belong to the church—are forbidden to do this! This is where the difference comes, else there would be no issue between my friend and myself. It is NOT because I favor the building of schools by the church, as he would have you believe, for I do not favor such a thing.

There are a few men who favor schools and colleges to such a degree as to be radical. Some men take radical positions as to schools, even as they do about other matters. Some among us have become radical about lodges, for instance: and tobacco, and the manner of dress. Some press these things to the point of fanaticism. I could name a dozen or twenty things about which we could find radically minded men in the church, but, shall the radical position of that extremist be forced upon me, and crammed down the neck of every man who stands with me?

Brother Sommer, (D. Austin Sommer) do you believe it is right for another to force upon me the radical ideas of another? My friend takes up some of these extreme positions and tries to compel me to acknowledge them as mine! And when I come before you and say that I DO NOT endorse the thing, and I do not so understand it, is he going to continue to treat me thus?

This proposition, Ladies and Gentlemen, simply consists of these things; there is a difference between this brother and myself, and there are differences between those who stand on his side of this question. There are also differences among those who stand on my side of it. Those who are with him on this matter are no more at agreement among themselves than he and I are so far as that is concerned. He gains nothing by such a statement as made about this.

The Apostolic Review, a great and good paper, had most of these men as editors a few years ago, and all were united in opposing the establishment of church schools, and the taking of money from the treasury of the Lord for the purpose of maintaining such schools. Now, I want to say to you candidly, that there hasn't been a single day since I have been in the Church but that I stood foursquare with that principle.

No, I never did believe, sir, and no man living or dead ever heard me say that it was right, to take money out of the treasury of the Lord for that purpose. These brethren, however, teach that it is wrong for a person to take his own money and establish a school to teach the arts and sciences and then take donated money and

employ a teacher to give instructions in the word of the Lord. If *one is even allowed to teach the Bible in such a school, it becomes wrong!* That is the position my friend occupies.

This is in fact the real issue. My friend has tried to becloud the issue. Brother Carl, I had expected something better of you. I should love to see this matter come to the point where our friends could at least see what the real difference is. My friend, however, seems set upon following a different course. He boasts and glories in stating that "the Church is the only divine institution in which the work of the Lord is to be done." Ladies and Gentlemen, I preached the truth on that matter when he was a boy sure enough. I have preached it for many years as sure as he has.

I thank him for the compliment he paid my preaching at Lone Star, and I want to tell you that in all other places where I have gone, whether North or South, or East or West, in literally hundreds of congregations I have preached from the pulpit the same things I preached at Lone Star. I said there just as much, and no more, about schools and orphan homes, as I ever said from any other pulpit.

These are questions of an individual nature. They are for the Christian to decide as an individual. It is a matter of opinion and not a matter of law. No, sir, it isn't a matter of law. Our God has not infringed upon us, nor has he invaded in the sacred precincts of the home to tell us where we must set the dresser, or where the cook stove may be placed! He has known all along that we would have sense enough to arrange such affairs. *With reference to the home it is said: "The husband is the head of the wife."* God does not pretend to regulate my wife's arrangement of things in the house. And as the head of that house I may call her sweetheart, or sugar-lump, if I choose. Such a matter is MY business, and God gives me that right. Individual rights is the question here.

I have been a farmer, and also a carpenter. Such work is honorable, too. My Lord was a carpenter by trade. While I worked with my tools as a carpenter - - and drew top wages, too, for I was a good carpenter, whether or not I am much as a preacher - I preached and taught the word of the Lord to those with whom I worked, and I challenge my friend to dispute my right to do it.

Christians have the right to teach the word of God, either as individuals, or collectively, *anywhere on the face of the earth.* "Preach the word," is the order God gave unto his people. "Teach all nations." My friend tells you that I am defending the idea of the church building a college or school to do this. He is stating that which is NOT TRUE, and his extracts from the papers introduced do not prove that I am. I know what I am defending and upholding. He is not debating with those absent men tonight, but

has "old ugly Porter" after his "tale" and on his trail. Yes, he does, and he shall not put such a thing as his mistaken charge over you for a moment. His bluster and bluff proves nothing at all.

Now we notice what he has said, to see whether or not he has accomplished anything in his speech. He said, "We are not debating whether or not it is right to teach the Bible in school." But we ARE! That is exactly the issue, my friends. That is IT in spite of what he may say. What does the proposition say? It says, "The erection and maintenance of a school or college," - - - What is a school? A place where instruction is given. What is a college? It is a school of higher rating than the ordinary school. "The erection and maintenance of a school or college FOR THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING THE WORD OF GOD." That is the issue. He seems not to realize that it does NOT say, "the church" shall not build a school. Had it said that I would have denied it as quickly as he, for I DO NOT BELIEVE such a thing. And, except for a very few of those who are extreme and radical, not one of us has ever been known to offer an argument to show that the Church should build them. We never affirm such a thing. This man has no right to force upon us, and try to make you believe that the radical idea of any such man is what we teach! We do not accept what that kind of a man says, and he is not in this debate, nor is Carl debating with such a man, but with me.

He reads from Armstrong, and had he read the rest of that speech, he would have found that Armstrong is just as much in favor of schools today as he ever was, and was simply showing in that speech the difference between a Church owned institution and one built by a group of individuals. That was his point.

I have here a paper to which attention is called for a moment. I obtained it from Brother Cox, of Abilene Christian College. He gave it to me when I visited with him in Little Rock recently. It is offered as an answer to some questions as to ownership.

1. To whom does Abilene Christian College belong? Does it belong to the local Church?

Answer: "Abilene Christian College does not belong to a local Church."

2. Does it belong to certain individuals?

Answer: "Abilene Christian College does belong to certain individuals." Here is the answer to the question of ownership over the signature of the President of Abilene Christian College. Here are more questions in the list:

3. Does Abilene Christian College belong to the Church universal?

Answer: "It does not belong to the Church universal." The President of Abilene Christian College has said here over his own signature that the college does NOT belong to the local Church, nor does it belong to the Church universal. To whom does it belong? He says it belongs to a group of individuals. Just who those individuals are, I do not know, but they own it. It is NOT A CHURCH OWNED college.

I want to make another statement about the colleges just here. I am forty-seven years old, and have preached the gospel for more than twenty-five years, and, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have never in my life so much as saw one of the institutions. I have never been in Nashville. I have never been in any place that had such a school in it. I care nothing about their location, however, for the principle of this thing is the "rights of Christians." May they exercise individual choice as to the teaching of the word of the Lord? I am convinced that they are privileged to do that under any circumstances. I should like my friend to answer this question. Is it ever wrong, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, for a Christian to teach the word of God? I am maintaining that it is always right.

Whether at home, or abroad, in a college, school, blacksmith shop, ANYWHERE ON EARTH, and under any condition in which a Christian has been found, he has authority from High Heaven to teach God's word there. Brother Carl believes that! He practices it! Ladies and Gentlemen, I am going to prove to you before this thing is over that the brother who is in the affirmative of this proposition tonight, actually has engaged in teaching the Bible in school. I am prepared to prove it to you if he dare deny it. I can prove it by a hundred people who are in this audience tonight.

We pass on to another point. He quotes from Campbell, "Not a cent should be transferred (from the treasury) for an educational society, etc." I say amen to that. Carl then says it has been done. Well, even if it has, I do not teach it, and it is NOT the position of my brethren. We do not contend for any such thing.

We are simply contending for the right of Christians to build a school if they choose to do it, and if they choose to teach the word of the Lord there, where the other branches of learning are taught, I insist that they have not only the privilege and liberty, but also the right to do it. When Christians go into the school and teach the arts and sciences, they do it as a member of the faculty, under the board of directors, and in harmony with the laws of the state. But when they teach the Bible in such a school, they do it as a Christian, and under the directions of the elders of the Church

where their membership is. My membership at this time is at Neosho, Missouri. I am answerable there for my conduct wherever I may be. If I do a wrong, and refuse to make it right, it is the business of the brethren who were wronged to make it known to my home congregation. Teachers of the Bible are all subject to their home groups.

Christians who chance to be employed as teachers of history, geography, or any other branch of learning may teach the word of God to the students in that school, if the school gives them authority to do so. Who is my friend to say they must not do it? This is the issue between us, sir. My friend can talk about institutionalism, but he may search God's word until he is gray-haired and he will be unable to find therein anything to condemn the practice.

I note here another statement of my friend, and make special reference to the point in it. He quotes from, and gives endorsement to a statement from J. N. Armstrong, to the effect that, "No other society has a right to teach the word of God." He calls with much gusto upon me to produce the authority for any other society to do that work. Now here is the real point and I want each of you to keep it in mind. Armstrong's position is **MY POSITION**. When the Christian in the school teaches the Bible, he does it **AS A CHRISTIAN, AND NOT AS A MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY**. Sure he has **NO OTHER RIGHT** to do it but the right of a **SON OF GOD**. When one becomes a child of God, the scriptures say, "Let him that heareth say come." There is plenty of authority for teaching, plenty of scriptural authority. Who shall he teach? Why anyone under the heaven who has an ear to hear. Let my friend deny it if he dares. The many passages he cited do not hint at this being wrong.

When he introduced 1 Timothy 3:15, Colossians 1:18, and a number of other passages, and made a beautiful argument about the Church, I sat back with admiration in my heart, for I tell you now that I believe everything that these verses say about that divine institution, and have no reply to make to them. I remind you just here however that the church is **NOT** the only institution, existing by divine authority. There is another, the home, that is much older than the church, and surely we may teach in it. Then there is the civil government again. It too exists by divine authority. I want my friend to come now and say whether the church is the **ONLY** institution through which the children of God may teach the word of God.

He said so last night, and stressed it. He almost stamped his foot, as I had done, to give it emphasis. "The Church is the **ONLY** institution through which the Bible may be taught." I should like

him to tell us about the home. It is an institution as sure as the word has a meaning, and exists by divine authority. God established the home. God certainly did that. God established the home, and gave orders to parents that they should "Be fruitful and multiply." God has blessed our home with four children, and in that home, sir, I ask, do I have the right to teach the Bible to my children? Of course I do. Under whose authority should I teach the word of God to the members of my family? As a Christian. It will help to clarify the issue if my brother will explain himself when he gets to this matter.

My friends, I am just as willing to support the Church as he is. I am just as willing to defend it as he is, and so far as my ability goes, I do that. Perhaps I haven't as much ability as he, but such as I have, I give. Now about those fellows who have made blunders, and have strayed from the truth, and made arguments out of harmony with the general teaching of the brotherhood, I ask you not to pick out their erroneous statements and force them upon us. Certainly you should not. There are radicals in every institution under the sun. There are many "pet" ideas. Why the first holiness movement in the world is not yet a hundred years old, but there are forty-seven different groups and institutions that have grown out of it.

A certain gentleman said to me—rather, I heard him say it—"It is a shame that those fellows are divided over there, and I am not going about them." I want to say about that - - and Carl will agree with me about it: We are men enough to come before the public and openly discuss our differences, and invite all to come and hear it. Most of them are not willing to do this, and this is a fact.

Coming down from the Pentecost that he mentioned through the centuries until now, what do we see? There are three or four groups of us that are not altogether agreed about some things. But look at the Baptist Church! The first one on the earth began in 1607, and how many are there now? You have to have more fingers than are on your two hands to count them - the different kinds. The same is true of the Methodists. You fellows find yourselves in poor business when you criticize us for our differences.

Here is another point I want to impress upon your minds. I am here to get the truth before you. Regardless of his purpose, I shall try to get to the place where I can agree with him wholeheartedly. If it be possible, I want to do that. I want peace and unity. I plead for it, and our brethren are anxious about it. If he will cease to make laws, and lay aside those already made and say: "Brother Porter, I know that the Bible does NOT SPECIFICALLY

LY AND POSITIVELY regulate this, and you may use your judgment about it,"—if he will cease to bind that on me as a law, we will have agreement and I will strike glad hands with him in a moment and stop this debate. Will he do it? We can have peace in a moment if he will but take down this man-made law through which he undertakes to tell me where, how, and under what circumstances I may spend my money in educating my childrn. He has taken the position, sirs, that I must educate my children under his instructions! And, where the Bible IS NOT TAUGHT!

If the Bible is taught there, or if the school is in any way supported by Christian's money, it is a SINFUL INSTITUTION! It is, according to his position, an innovation that deserves condemnation! That is his position. Excuse me, please.

Where should I send my children? Shall I send them to the schools that are hotbeds of infidelity, and where the word of God is held up to ridicule and scorn? Shall I send them to a place where they are thrown under such influences as that? Persuade yourselves, sirs, that I should say: "Son, I have done my best to teach you while you were a little child, but I am going to send you over there and let those brazen faced skeptics kill your faith!" Shall I treat my child like that? Has my friend the right to say to me: "Brother Porter, you must either let him grow up without schooling, or send him to such a place?" May I send my child to a Baptist school? A Methodist school? Or Aimee Semple McPherson's? I protest against his assumed authority to tell me that I may not send my child to school where he can learn under the influence of a man that believes God's book - - believes the truth.

I shall send my boy to school where he may be taught mathematics and other things he has to learn by a Christian. Then let him take my boy at the proper hour and teach him the pure word of God without addition, or subtraction, or alteration or substitution. My friend says: "No, Brother Porter." If he doesn't say that, then one other thing must be done. He must concede my position, or, say that there is a school of some sort where the Bible may be taught, and that I may send my boy there. If he is ready to define that kind of a school, let him do it. If he will find that kind of a school, and if it be within the realms of reason, I will strike hands with him, and so will my brethren. This is the point.

(Time called)

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Porter, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman who preceeded me on the floor, made a very wonderful address, setting forth his hopes of our getting together, after having told you that the group he belongs to, is divided into four, five, or a half dozen different bunches. The place for him to start is with his own folk. Unity, like charity, begins at home, and I advise him to get together with his own brethren on his proposition.

At the present, I am going to notice some of the things he said, and will overcome them tonight, by the quotations which I am sure I can produce at the proper time. Insofar as his statement concerning "the boy" is concerned, I appreciate very much the fact, that Brother Porter called me a boy, and I suggested that if a boy could give him the worry which I've been giving him, I wonder what he would do if he came in contact with one of our full-grown men. That is all right! If you'll spend a little less of your time apologizing for your wrongs, and give a little more attention to the things we are discussing, I will appreciate it.

The audience remembers that he said, "I do not believe the church has a right to establish a school to teach secular branches, or anything else" but remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are here tonight debating this question, whether schools, **SUCH AS THE TWO MENTIONED IN THE PROPOSITION**, have a right to exist. I am contending that Abilene Christian College and David Lipscomb College do advocate that very thing, and this man comes here and says I have no right to oppose or condemn those schools.

He has just repudiated the presidents of the schools. Brother Porter said he didn't know very much about the schools, and acted as if he were quite ignorant, but he doesn't hesitate to stand up and brand the presidents of the schools, a bunch of radicals and hobbists. I thought when I read what the president of three schools, and Dean of Bible in one said, I was using good authority, but my friend, who admits he was never in one of those schools in his life, says these men are radicals. No wonder the schools don't get anywhere, with men like that at the head of them.

Brother Porter says, "I do not believe it is right to take money out of the church treasury to support those schools." If I can prove to you tonight that the two schools named have taken money out of

the church treasury, and still do, in order to maintain themselves, is evident that our friend has tonight repudiated Abilene Christian College, and David Lipscomb College. I want you to get that, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I repeat it again. This man asserts that it is unscriptural to take money from the church treasury to support these schools. If I produce testimony showing that they do that very thing, then my friend is forced to admit they are unscriptural. I am going to prove it right now.

He read a letter from James F. Cox, who is now president of Abilene. I will introduce this letter, I hold in my hand, which was written from Texas. Porter knows the man who wrote this, because it is his good friend, C. R. Nichol, and he will endorse him. Writing from Mason, Texas, March 3, 1932, he says this: "I was in Abilene twenty-four hours during Lecture Week. No, I was not on the program. I did hear some speeches made in an effort to get churches to put the Christian College in the regular "budget" of the congregations. Send the money from the congregations to the Board and let the Board use it as they see fit. In other words have the congregations function through the Board. How long will it be till there will be the move to have a Missionary Board, and all the congregations function through the Central Board, in missionary work?"

Brother Porter says it is wrong to support the colleges with the treasury. Abilene Christian College is doing that! Therefore it is wrong! That is my point! That is what we are debating. My proposition says that colleges such as that should be condemned. Porter denied it but now he admits that Abilene Christian College is unscriptural.

We read some more, and since we have been talking about Abilene Christian College, I will stay with it. This article is by J. D. Tant, and was taken from the "Firm Foundation," a paper with the endorsement of my respondent. Brother Blue has heard of Tant several times, haven't you? Here is what he says: "If they are not church institutions, then to whom do they belong? When Bro. Jesse Sewell, president in Abilene ten years, resigned, why did he publish a letter to all churches, telling them he took their school under certain conditions, and spent his time and ten thousand dollars and then returned it to THEM? If the Bible College is not a church institution, why did a "Bible College" send out agents to get church elders to make a TWENTY YEAR PLEDGE FOR THE CHURCH TO GIVE SO MUCH A YEAR for twenty years TO KEEP UP OUR COLLEGES? If they are not church institutions, then why were the churches of Christ called on recently to raise two hundred thousand dollars to keep our school from going

to the wall? Why did a certain church raise two hundred dollars at once to help save our school? If our "Bible Colleges" are not church institutions, why was a brother selected at a salary of four thousand dollars a year, and sent out to beg churches for a million dollars to endow our "Bible College?"

That is one of your own brethren, Brother Porter. He writes for the same paper you write for, and I have one of the papers right here, with his article on one page, and yours on the other. I want to know how, in the name of common sense, you are going to have the nerve to get up here again and defend these schools, after acknowledging that they were wrong? Tant says they are CHURCH INSTITUTIONS. You say that is unscriptural. That is my proposition! You and I are really going to be together yet before this is over.

Here is another article by Tant. Listen to him, "I find at some places where I go that some churches are bound on 'twenty-year pledges' to keep up some of our so called 'Christian Colleges.' Elders have been persuaded to sign pledge cards on twenty years' limit, leaving unborn children under said obligation after the elders are dead and gone."

Brother Porter says it is not right for churches to keep up the colleges, but Tant says that is exactly what they are doing. Tant lives and preaches in the south, and he ought to know. But here is some more from him in which we learn he is the very man who started Abilene Christian College. Listen: "F. B. Srygley takes the position that men have a right to run 'Bible Colleges' and teach the Bible as a private enterprise; and while I am just as big a fool as he is, YET I HAVE LOOKED IN VAIN FOR SUCH A BIBLE COLLEGE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST and fail to find it." There you are! There is one of your own brethren. He has looked in vain for the kind of a college like you endorse and failed to find it. Brother Porter, will you point out one of those individual institutions tonight? Oh, you say Abilene is one of them! All right, let us listen to Tant again:

'It was J. D. Tant who lectured in Abilene on 'Bible Colleges' and persuaded Bro. Gilbert to give his home and thirteen acres of land where the old 'Bible College' was located. I, like Srygley, thought it was a private enterprise. But when Bro. Sewell resigned as president he told the churches what 'your' college was when 'I' took it; and 'I' have given \$10,000 and so many years of my time, and now I turn it back to you. Which, to my mind, proves the College Society with its president, board of directors, secretary and treasurer, was just as much a society tacked on and getting ITS SUPPORT OUT OF THE CHUR-

CHES OF CHRIST as the Endeavor Society is among the digressives. HOW CAN I FIGHT ONE AND DEFEND THE OTHER."

Brother Porter, your own dear brother, whom you endorse as a truthful man, and a loyal preacher; who is standing for the same principles you are contending for, says that Abilene Christian College is a church enterprise, and he should know, because he is the man who started it. Ladies and Gentlemen, this man upon the platform tonight, who says he was never inside of Abilene Christian College, comes to you and tells you he knows more about it than the man who started it. That is the proposition, but what is he going to do about it? Here is all the proof an honest man would want that these things are maintained with the church funds. Then why will he stand up before you, and try to mislead you, and misrepresent facts? Why does he do it? I have laid before you the personal testimony of the man who began Abilene College, and I read you a letter from C. R. Nichol, both of which show that the college not only takes the church's money when offered, but begs it! Porter knows that these preachers are not lying.

But here is a recent copy of the Firm Foundation, January 26, 1937, and on the very front page is an article stating that the Southside Church of Christ, at Austen, Texas, has Abilene Christian College on its regular budget. Brother Porter knew that, because here is an article on page 3 by Rue Porter. Why did he stand before you tonight, and tell you the things he did? I want to know! I tell you he has whipped himself. I have shown you that the schools he is defending are the very ones that are doing the unscriptural things he says he opposes.

Why on earth then did these people in Ozark divide the body of Jesus Christ? I said it was not right for the churches to build colleges like Abilene and maintain them. You say you also believe that! Then why did you divide the church over it? I tell you that the faction meeting in Ozark, and those who have universally divided the church over these schools are under condemnation for their proceedings. Why have you done it? There is an Ethiopian in under the pile of cord wood somewhere.

Brother Porter has this to say: "These are individual matters - not a matter of law, etc." Thus according to his theory, it is all right for an individual to build a school for the purpose of making a living, and then beg and ride the churches to death for money to keep up that school. That is his position exactly!

He said something about teaching the Bible while a carpenter. What has that to do with the question before the house? We are

not discussing the individual labors of Christians, but we want to know if disciples of Jesus Christ have the right to keep back money which belongs to the Lord, and use it to build colleges, in which to teach the Bible and other branches of learning in connection? I say, No. But he says, Yes. And I still say, No, they do not have the right to thus rob God. No man has that right, sir. But now suppose my friend started a carpenter shop and called it a *Christian Carpenter Shop*, and he taught the Bible while he was doing carpenter work. Would that authorize him to beg the churches for a \$500,000 building fund, and hire a man, letting the churches pay him a salary of \$4,000 per year to go and beg the churches for money to keep the shop going?

I have a statement here made by the head of Harding College, but of course my respondent will say he is a radical. In any event he is president of the College, and he says, "We are begging the brotherhood to give more than they have ever given before." There it is, read it! Now conceding that it is a private institution, and not a church organization, does that change the situation? Certainly not! Why? Because the college as I have proven before, has been established to do part of the work of the church, and here it is begging the brotherhood for money.

I made those things clear before, and offered my arguments. Did he touch it? Did he deny it? No, he did not! And it stands as it did at first. But he offered a lot of questions. I was surprised at some of them, because I had nailed them in the first few moments of the first speech I made. But he had to read them anyway, in order to fill out his thirty minutes. He wants to know, "Is it a sin to organize and operate a school in which nothing is taught other than natural sciences?" I answered that about the very first thing I said. I told you it is not a question of a Christian teaching school. What does this question have to do with Abilene Christian College?

"Would the teaching of the Bible in such a school cause it to be robbing God?" I do not propose to permit myself to be led away from the subject, or have it thrown into confusion. Did you hear me say that it is not a question of whether Christians may teach the Bible in school? Surely you did. We are here to discuss whether it is scriptural to organize another institution FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching the Bible. My opponent said he was following me, but he was like Peter that time, he was following afar off, not even close enough to hear what I said.

Let's see some of the other questions. "If it be right for a Christian to teach the Word of God at all, please tell us where and under what circumstances it would be wrong to teach it?"

Now friends, suppose I went into a long speech on that subject, would that be relevant to our proposition tonight? I point out to my friend once more that **IT IS NOT A MATTER OF CHRISTIANS TEACHING THE BIBLE** but whether or not they have the right to **ORGANIZE OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAN THE CHURCH THROUGH WHICH TO DO THE WORK OF THE CHURCH**. I refuse to be led away from the true issues of this dispute!

"Can a teacher give instructions in true morality without teaching the word of God?" "Would you endorse a man as loyal if he taught the Bible in a school?" I wish I knew of some way of getting my friend to listen to the outline of the discussion laid down in the very first speech we made to you in this debate. Why all of this fol-de-rol and rigamarole? Has he said anything about Abilene Christian College? Has he mentioned David Lipscomb? Why the poor fellow is raving about the kind of schools that his own men say do not exist, and for which they have searched in vain. Get down to the issues of this debate, Brother Porter, please!

"Would you endorse the same man if he also teaches English?" I do not know why he slipped that one in. He has said something about not being well versed in English. Perhaps he wants to secure some man to teach him a little in that subject. I do not know about that, but I know that his question is clear off the subject. "Is it right, under any circumstances, to teach the Bible in school?" I am not going to bore you further by reminding all of you that we have a proposition which we should follow in this debate. Since I am the affirmative, it is my duty to protect the audience from any attempt of the negative to obscure the issue, so I say once more, that is not the issue.

I have a right to demand that my friend answer the affirmative arguments which I have made. I proved conclusively by the presidents of the schools, and by friends of those institutions that it was wrong to establish another institution than the church, through which to carry on the Lord's work. I showed you by the same men that these schools you are defending are doing just that thing, and you paid not the least attention to it. He says he is following me. He hasn't got in sight of me yet, he's so far behind!

A little further on in his speech, he said that these schools do not ask for money from the churches as such, that they do not believe in taking the finance from the treasury. I have here the proof that they do the very thing he denied. I'll read this letter from Western Oklahoma Christian College, Cordell, Oklahoma, "The last Sunday in November which is the Sunday just before Thanksgiving Day has been designated as 'Christian Education Day' not

with any idea to detract from the main fact that it is the Lord's Day, but with the sole purpose of advancing the cause of Christian Education, which is without question part of the Lord's work. Upon this day we hope that **EVERY CONGREGATION IN THIS STATE WILL SET ASIDE A SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION FOR THIS WORK.**" There you are! He said they didn't do it, but here is a man, the Secretary-Treasurer of the college pleading for that very thing. I have another letter here too, that is pure dynamite, but will save it for the big shot!

Again he states, "Oh yes some of our men have blundered about the churches supporting colleges, but why try to cram that down our throats?" Those men who did the blundering were college presidents! What kind of schools are those anyway, with the Dean of Bible, blundering around and letting the cat out of the bag? Strange isn't it that Porter has to come along and say, "I never went to college in my life, but I know that the heads of all our Christian Colleges are a bunch of blunderers." Those schools must be wonderful places to receive an education. I would be afraid that if they blunder about one thing, they might blunder about everything.

He made a wonderful plea for his colleges, by calling your local institutions of learning, "hot-beds of infidelity." He asked the question, "Do I have to send my children to such places where brazen skeptics teach them?" What is he trying to do? I'll tell you. He is affirming that everyone of your boys and girls that go to Springfield to State Teachers College, are in a position where perhaps the most of them will go to hell. That's what he's telling you. If you send your boys and girls up there instead of sending them to Abilene Christian College and paying them \$460.00 a year, your children will go to hell and you'll be responsible for it. He is telling you that your High School is not a fit place to send your boy, and there are some of you people here, standing with Porter, whose children have gone to Teachers College and they are still faithful members of the church, in spite of the fact that they have been taught by "brazen-faced skeptics." You did wrong. You should have sent them away from home to Abilene, Texas, where they would be under a better influence than you could give them. You people of Ozark are not going to permit this man to accuse your schools and colleges that way; you are not going to let him get away with that kind of plea.

He asks, "Must I send my boy to a Methodist school?" You might just as well, Brother Porter, and I'll tell you why. I turn to page 17 of this little booklet to get a quotation from the "Optimist," a paper published by Abilene Christian College. Listen:

"Thursday morning the president of Abilene Christian College appeared before the executive committee in charge of the Chamber of Commerce drive for the new METHODIST COLLEGE. He came for the purpose of making a personal subscription to that \$100,000 fund." Who? The president of Abilene Christian College! Doing what? Making a personal contribution to build a Methodist College! Mercy! Mercy!

But hear some more: "He made it, and he also made substantially the following statement; there are a good many very good reasons why I am for the building of a new college in Abilene, why I am earnestly in accord with this campaign to build such a college, and why I am willing to support it morally and financially. . . . Therefore, if only for selfish reasons, I would strongly be in favor of the NEW METHODIST COLLEGE." There you are! Brother Porter yells, "Shall I send my children to a Methodist College?" And the president of the one you are defending, gave a big allowance to one of those sectarian schools. Yes, he did. Brother Blue. So it amounts to this. Don't send your children to a Methodist school, but send them to one where the president is in favor of Methodist schools. Yes sir, that's the thing to do! Brother Porter, you're a little sorry you introduced that, aren't you? Now, don't do it again!

But I must hasten on. My friend says he wants to send his children to a place where they have a wonderful atmosphere, and he reasons that because it is a Christian College, it will have a Christian atmosphere, etc. I hold here a little paper called, "The Babblers," published at David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn., in February, 1937. Here upon the front page they define their objectives in the publication of the paper. One of the immediate objectives is, "To publish no gossip that is not true." I guess they will just publish true gossip then. I note another objective is this, "To encourage students to trade with BABBLES advertisers."

What are some of these Babblers advertisers? Here is one, Loew's Theatre," and what is being featured there? Joan Crawford, William Powell and Robert Montgomery in "The Last of Mrs. Cheyney." That is what they are encouraging your children to go to. They advertise that kind of a thing, and you call that a Christian atmosphere! I have here a news review of "The Last of Mrs. Cheyney." Let's investigate and see just what they are urging the students to patronize. It mentions that the picture centers around "a young nobleman who has been pursuing the members of English peerage evidently being none too particular about the wives they have taken to their heart, as this story has it." Then it says, "Mr. Powell is his usual competent self as the suave, IF

UNMORAL, Charles, and Mr. Montgomery has one of his best parts in recent months as the Lord Dilling who weds Mrs. Cheyney, **REPROBATE THOUGH SHE BE.**"

That is what the press club of the college is urging the young people to dabble with, and you call that a Christian atmosphere? You ought to be ashamed of yourself! But here is another theatre receiving some advertisement. "**PARAMOUNT STARTS FRIDAY! 'ON THE AVENUE,'** starring Dick Powell and the Ritz Bros." Here's a review of that picture which states, "The Ritz Brothers have climbed to a new peak in madness, and they are crazier than ever." It is said that the picture is plenty wild! And their own paper says they are encouraging them to patronize the advertisers.

But you may say, "Brother Ketcherside, you can't prove to me that the students of David Lipscomb College would go to those shows — no sir, not one from our Christian colleges would do that." I have all the material I need in this debate, and I have the proof on that. Here is an editorial in the same paper on the same date. It is entitled, "We Need to Grow Up." It says, "Many students go to the **MOVING PICTURE SHOWS EACH WEEK**, yet an educational lecture, deemed worthy of attendance by the entire faculty, manifest by their presence, was attended by a group of students fewer in number than the faculty." That's the Christian atmosphere that exists at David Lipscomb College.

Now I call attention to the atmosphere at Abilene Christian College, the other school mentioned in the proposition. This is from their paper, "The Optimist," Nov. 25, 1920. The article says, "**A. C. C. BUNCH GO WILD.** When the news came Thursday night of the Wild Cat's victory over the John Tarleton squad — well things happened. Pandemonium, hullaba-knockdown-and-drag-out, unrestrained exuberance of spirits — all these terms fail to give an idea of the joy demonstrated on the gladsome occasion. The bell was nearly worn out, the students snake-danced, yells rent the air, and a large bunch paraded through the streets of Abilene. **DECORUM WAS FORGOTTEN, PROPRIETY WAS BENCHED, RULES TABOOED** — joy alone was triumphant." Get that you people who live here! Do not send your children to Springfield, do not let them go to your local colleges, but send them to Abilene Christian, to the place "where joy reigns supreme, and hullaba-knock-down" and no-telling-what provides a Christian atmosphere, for their spiritual nourishment! Remember that we are here to nail every argument this man advances, and they are being nailed by the papers published by the very colleges he is defending.

The gentleman has not yet answered the first argument I made,

but I am going to make another. The Bible College was not only established for the purpose of doing the work of the church, but **IT EXAULTS ITSELF ABOVE THE CHURCH!** In order to prove that I am going to read from "Truthseeker" magazine, April 1936, an article entitled "True Merits of Harding College," by J. N. Armstrong: "In my judgment there is no more effectual door of utterance open to teachers of the Gospel than the privilege granted to them to teach the word of God to the youth that assemble from year to year in our Christian schools and colleges. It is my belief that those **WHO BUILD AND EQUIP THE PLANTS** of these schools are **RENDERING THE GREATEST OF SERVICE TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD** in providing this opportunity to **TEACH THE WORD OF GOD** to the young." In his judgment there is no more effectual door open! Goodbye Church that Christ died for. You are not in it. Abilene and Harding are the most effective places of preaching the gospel! "It is my belief that those who build and equip the schools are rendering the greatest of service to the Kingdom of God." People there you are! Not only do they claim the college is upon an equality with the church, but even ahead of it.

Christian Leader, page 26. You wonder why I am reading from all of this. He isn't going to like it, but I am reading just the same, in order to get these points before you tonight. I am going to read it to him, and will be glad to give it to him if he wants it. "Abilene Christian College is **DOING BUSINESS FOR THE LORD.**" There is an institution doing the Lord's business, and listen at them beg for money now. "The only thing in the world that is going to survive time and continue, in eternity is the soul. All material things will perish. You may gather into your possession vast amounts of silver and gold, houses and lands, etc., but one day you must leave it all, and one day it will all perish. You can take none of it across with you. None of it will precede you, none will follow. But every soul about you will pass over and continue to live. Hadn't you better invest some of your substance in souls as you pass along, that you may not lose it all?" What is this—a wonderful plea for the church? No, no, he is not pleading for the church. What is he pleading for? Listen! "No better souls can be found in which to invest than those fine souls **IN ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE** susceptible to teaching an influence. **NO BETTER PLACE** can be found for investing in souls than **IN ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE**, where they are taught God's word daily, and the highest ideals of Christian living are constantly held before them."

Goodbye church! We can't invest in you! They have found a

better place to save souls and invest in eternity — Abilene Christian College, where they are taught God's word daily, and engage in hullaba-knockdown-and-drag-out. That is the place to spend the Lord's money. No better place in which to do it! It is a shame to think about any such thing as that.

I read from page 3 of "Pressing On" published by David Lipscomb College a statement which I offered a short time ago. You remember it says that the only hope of Christians lies in maintaining strong and thoroughly equipped institutions of learning, and then adds, "It is also necessary in order to KEEP ALIVE THE SPIRIT AND IDEALS OF APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY." The church for which Christ shed his blood is ineffectual in preventing apostacy, and we must have these other institutions to do that work. That is what Brother Porter says, and I demand him to meet this thing squarely when he stands before you next.

I now find that there is another point that stands out very clearly; the fact that these institutions exalt men above the rank of humble disciples and honor them because of their worldly attainments. I will refer first to 1 Corinthians 4:5-7, even though I know he will pay no attention to it. Here is what Paul says, "Ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another. For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?"

I now turn to "The Babblers" again and read about a service held in the Central Church of Christ in Nashville. "This year, for the first time in many years, a special chapel program HONORING DAVID LIPSCOMB began the exercises of the day. President Ijams, Vice-President Baxter and Professor Pittman reviewed the life of Lipscomb and paid tribute to the 'educator, minister and business man', and to his wife." This was a service held in the church honoring David Lipscomb. Paul says, "not to think of men more highly than you ought to think" but here was a service dedicated to a man, who kept back from the Lord's work the money he was prospered and built a big school.

Now I would like to read another article by J. D. Tant. He states, "Two years ago I was at the close of the David Lipscomb College, and heard so many compliments of Bros. Lipscomb and Harding I felt like any man made a mistake to study under PETER AND PAUL INSTEAD OF THESE BRETHREN. There was a move put on foot then to raise \$1,000,000 to endow this school to make it a great school to meet the requirements of the college as-

sociation. A brother was selected to go out and solicit funds at a salary of \$4,000 a year to endow this college. The churches of Christ were expected to support him! I then thought if this \$4,000 could be given to four Gospel preachers to go out in the byways and preach the Gospel for one year, no doubt they would baptize five hundred men and women into Christ in one year; and in eternity would not the Lord approve of this work more than to spend the money for fine buildings?

Then again, "I thought if \$500,000 of this fund could be spent in building twenty school-houses, putting \$10,000 in each building, and set aside \$15,000 at each place to help poor boys and girls get a religious education, these twenty schools no doubt could give 4000 boys and girls the advantage in giving Bible knowledge in their homes and in their communities without an outlay of \$2,000 each for a four-years' course in the 'Bible College' to get a degree! Then the \$500,000 of the \$1,000,000 fund would employ one hundred preachers for five years to go out and preach the Gospel in mission fields, and no doubt these preachers during this time would baptize 50,000 people; and as our object should be to prepare people for Heaven, I am confident such work would save more people than to put \$1,000,000 in school buildings to give three or four hundred boys a worldly education — with a degree!"

I will also read the last paragraph so you may have the truth about these schools. "If the time ever comes when my brethren will learn we are a peculiar people; and cannot please the Lord trying to ape the sects; and when they learn 'the world by wisdom knows not God,' and that old-time gospel teaching is all that will save the world; when the Elders are taught to feed the Church of God, and that every Church should be a 'Bible College' to teach the word of the Lord; and **QUIT OUR FOOLISHNESS IN TRYING TO BUILD UP BIG SCHOOLS TO GIVE 'DEGREES,'** like the sects around us,—it may then be that we will then get back in line with Gospel work, as we did in the long, long ago. Don't forget, brethren, we **ARE** drifting!"

Your own brother says, "Quit your foolishness," Brother Porter, and he says to get back in line with gospel work as we did in the long, long ago! Yes, and he says you are drifting! What are you going to do about it? Answer! Answer the questions submitted tonight!

MR. PORTER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators and Ladies and Gentlemen: In thirty more minutes, this session of the debate will have been finished. This thirty minutes will last exactly one half hour.

I suppose you enjoyed the wonderful answers my friend gave to the ten questions I handed him! I have never in all my life heard ten questions as different from each other as these were, that could be answered in the same words exactly. "It is not the question." No! That isn't the question! Do you know that this boy, — Excuse me Carl, is one of the the knowing fellows. He knows everything! He, knows when a thing has nothing to do with the question. He is not willing for me to tell what I believe about it, because I don't know what I believe! He knows just what I believe about it. I tell you my position, and then *this learned and gifted gentleman* comes along and exercising his gift says, "Tain't so, he don't believe that." He tells you, "Porter doesn't believe that, but this." He puts into my mouth the words he would have me say, and battles away at the straw man thus created, rather *that shoot at the real issue*. He couldn't hit topside, bottomside, inside or outside of my objections to his proposition, and does not state my position fairly. I told you plainly that we repudiate the idea of taking money out of the church treasury for the support of schools. My brethren DO NOT believe that, but he says, "You do too!" That is the type of debater he is.

He has been reading quite a lot from the papers. I have a notion to do some reading myself tonight.. I prefer reading the Bible, but he compels me. Some people read much out of the Bible. He has done thrt. The religion I hold however, is one found in the Bible. Since I am after him tonight, and he has chosen to go outside, I must go after him. Now you watch the fur fly!

I believe that Brother Zerr is on my brother's side of this question. He is a good man, and I think well of him. Brother Zerr however, has my position exactly with reference to this matter. I have his position here, as published over his own signature in the paper, and I want to read it to you that you too may know what he says. I read; "As long as the worship publicly is pure and the doctrine and practice of the Church as a whole are scriptural, we should remain with it. Where the worship is scriptural and where the Church as such does not support the college and other innovations, one should not refuse to worship with them on account of

private opinions." That is Brother Zerr. Now THAT POSITION IS MINE. Brother Zerr, will you shake hands with me on that tonight?

MR. ZERR: No sir!

MR. PORTER: He has repudiated his former position then. That was his position; now it is MINE.

MR. ZERR: I beg your pardon, Brother. That is a misconstruction.

MR. PORTER: It says it over your name.

MR. ROBERTS: I object. It's against the rules to debate with someone in the audience, and personate individuals like that.

MR. PORTER: I haven't cast any personal reflections.

MR. ROBERTS: You are not allowed to talk to him, and he is not allowed to talk back.

MR. PORTER: I hope then that you will stop your man from pointing out other men in the audience as he did.

MODERATOR BLUE: Well, I suppose we will have a nice debate from here on, since Brother Roberts has learned how to moderate! I didn't object to your man when he pointed out this brother here. (Loud cheering from the audience). Brother Ketcherside did that, and had a great deal to say to this man about it. Now then, I think it is best myself, to let the congregation alone, but I have just called his attention to that. Brother Porter is no more wrong than their man was last night. That is all.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: Why, he asked that man no question. He didn't appeal to him in any way. However, Brother Porter had referred to the man on a previous occasion, but it was his business. Just like a — — —

MODERATOR BLUE: We've already lost a minute and a half.

MR. PORTER: Ladies and Gentlemen: I knew things would get hot around here. They are, no doubt about it.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: Behave yourself and it won't.

MR. PORTER: Now, you see smoke, because the heat has been turned on. We will bring them some ice to sit upon if the seats

get too hot. This thing is going to be brought out, and he need not think for a minute that I can be stopped.

I am going to read this, and if he wants to he can read it. I have a great stack of such stuff there on the table, and I can read. I am not bringing anything into this debate as a personal reflection upon any one. Before God, that man (Zerr) stated a truth, and when I asked him to get up in open fairness and shake hands on it, I simply did it for the sake of truth. He stated my position exactly, and now they repudiate it! I asked him to take my hand in evidence that we are agreed on this point, and he declined and spoke up about it.

I had no intention of infringing upon the rights of any one. That is the first time I was ever called to order in a debate, and I never infringed upon any right of any man a bit.

I want now to read a little from something else. My brother has been having much to say about taking money out of the treasury for the different sorts of things, and I want to read another item concerning it. My friend says, "It can't be rightly done." It isn't right, according to him, it isn't right to take money out of the church treasury to support anything of this nature. He read from some papers of some folk who did that, and when I said I did not endorse it, and put my foot down on it he still charges that I do believe and do it! Now here is part of a letter that was signed by-- But maybe Brother Roberts thinks I shouldn't read a name signed to a letter! Should I?

MODERATOR ROBERTS: I never objected to your reading any thing.

MR. PORTER: All right, I will read; "This congregation here in St. Louis," — This is one of those congregations Carl talks about wanting another debate, "has sent a contribution to help the September drive which has amounted to a little more than \$50.00 each year. Not much, but if every congregation would send a new name for each dollar sent in, if possible, publishers can send the paper to - - - etc."

This item is from the Apostolic Review, September 18, 1928. There is the letter which says the congregation sent \$50.00 a year for two or three years, out of the church treasury. I suppose it came from the church treasury, for the congregation sent it, and the paper accepted it. Now Carl, **WHAT IS THE PAPER?** Is it the home or the church? Is it an institution or organization? Money out of the church treasury to support **IT!** He was standing with it at the time it accepted the gift, anyway.

I want to read more just here. Page 87 of the Sommer -Armstrong debate, published in 1908. I read from the speech of Brother Daniel Sommer, - a bitter opponent of church schools from the first. I want you to get this: "My opponent several times has challenged me to indicate the kind of school I would approve." My friend says, 'That is not the question,' and wouldn't answer a similar question, but Daniel Sommer answered it, and I MAKE HIS POSITION MINE. Here it is, "If Alexander Campbell had been desirous only of assisting his brothers and sisters in educating their children aright, he could have established a good school without, perhaps, FOOLISH WORLDLY TITLES and he could have thereby done much good without perhaps, doing any harm. The same may be said of David Lipscomb, J. H. Harding, J. N. Armstrong, and others, but JUST IN PROPORTION as they show themselves determined to make a BID FOR POPULARITY WITH THE WORLD." "While this subject is before our minds, I now state that I am in favor of all CHRISTIANS WHO ARE COMPETENT TO TEACH, but cannot preach the word effectually, and for some reason cannot leave home to do the work of an evangelist, TEACHING THEIR PUPILS IN THE BIBLE to the extent that they are able, and may lawfully do so."

There is my position, Ladies and Gentlemen. The very thing for which I am contending. The venerable brother said this back in 1908. That is the kind of a school he endorses, and that IS THE KIND OF SCHOOL MY BRETHREN ENDORSE and stand behind. One where the Bible is taught to the pupils to the extent of the ability of the teacher. My brother picks out the mistakes that have been made by men in the schools, and blames the school for the mistake of the individual! He points to every such mistake and cries out, "There is the fault with the school where the Bible is taught."

I have never claimed perfection for any man. Certain it is that I do not claim perfection for any school, paper, publisher, or other thing. The paper for which I write,—The Christian Worker, is published by Brother Homer E. Moore. Sometimes he says things that I don't like so much, but that is his business. He is the publisher of the paper, and may run it as he chooses. He is liable to make a mistake, but that does not make it wrong to publish a paper. You too, make mistakes sir.

Yes, I have a copy of your paper too, sir. (Pointing to D. Austen Sommer.) I now read from it. "Moses E. Lard was a faithful gospel preacher of three quarters of a century ago, - - -." The writer calls attention to the fact,—By the way Carl, I suppose that is your item. It stands on the page with your name beside it

(Carl shakes his head, No.) Well the paper for which he writes, says, "Moses E. Lard was a **FAITHFUL GOSPEL PREACHER.**" Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand tonight **EXACTLY WHERE MOSES E. LARD STOOD THEN**, and these brethren do not! There is a proposition for you! He was a faithful gospel preacher back yonder, and I am standing tonight, my brethren, under God, I am, on the very same ground that he occupied then, with reference to this proposition. The paper for which these brethren write, — the paper which constitutes the only channel through which they express themselves and teach their principles, says that Brother Lard was a faithful gospel preacher, but they will not accept me as such! What is the difference between faithful gospel preachers sixty or seventy years ago, and now? If he was faithful while doing these things, and while he stood upon this foundation, I want to know why the same rule does not apply in 1937? I ask you, has God made a new law? No? Well, somebody has! Who made it? I tell you who made it, Brother Carl, and those of the brethren who stand with him. They made the law sirs, and their law says, "If you don't lick the salt where **WE** place it, and if you don't suscribe to the principles for which **WE** stand, you are to be disfellowshiped." Yes you are not "faithful" unless you do that!

That is the mark by which you are to be known sirs. He might call it the "mark of the beast!" For all I know, they would put such a mark on me and all other faithful gospel preachers who go up and down the land preaching the gospel and **NEVER DIVIDING** congregations over such a matter. I told you last evening that in all my experience I had never preached from the pulpit any matter of opinion. I don't do it sir! I never divide congregations over this question, but my brother, and those who stand with him **DO**. The first thing they do when they come among you, or you come among them is to ask, "Where do you stand on the Colleges?" In Acts 8, the man who wanted to be baptized was told, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The man said, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Had these fellows been there they would have said. "That isn't enough, sir. You must also believe that it is a sin to teach the Bible in the school where arithmetic and grammar are taught!" That is what they would say. I do not wonder that they are ashamed of their position tonight. No, sir, I don't wonder at it.

Those questions! I mentioned them a while ago. "Is it a sin to organize and operate a school in which nothing is taught other than the natural sciences?" He answers, "**NOT THE QUESTION.**" He won't say whether it is right or wrong. He dare not.

Again, "If a school in which the Bible is not taught is allowable, would or does the teaching of the Bible in it cause it to be a sin?" Again his erudite answer, "That is not the question."

Well then tell me please, in the name of God tell me, **WHAT IS THE QUESTION?** The right to do that is exactly what we are discussing. My brother says, "Huhuh! They are not being properly taught down there." Somebody has taught a snake dance, and therefore it is wrong to teach the Bible in school! Why, somebody advertized the theatre in the school paper! Carl, I want to ask you a question just here. I intended to write it out, but forgot it. You shall have it in writing however. Do you disfellowship those who attend the theatre? I want to know about that, So I ask you to put it down. Is that a part of the law of discipline you have made?

Do not misunderstand me, I am not encouraging theatre going. It was he who introduced it into this discussion, and charged that "This is the kind of Christian association" students have at the schools where the Bible is taught. I venture the guess that many of his own people attend the theatre. Others walk on past them as they go to hear him preach. He will never raise a "fuss" about that however, if you will just oppose Bible colleges! I declare to you that that is his attitude. You need not tell me it isn't, for it is, and people all over this land know it. Then he comes here and talks about the mistakes that some men have made, and lays the blame on the school. I want you to notice this particular point; that principle, my brethren, would subject every congregation of the church to condemnation! Why? Because there are some members who do not always do the things they should. **MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH ERR TOO.**

I am more than willing to admit that there are men in these schools and colleges that have made mistakes. Do you know that the Firm Foundation has been featuring some very strong editorials pointing out these mistakes? Brethren J. D. Tant, Foy E. Wallace, and many other brethren, all of whom are true to God's Book, have been trying to correct the errors that these schools and members of their faculties have been making. Thank God, they have in a great measure attained their desire. Of course some of them have made mistakes. No one claims perfection for them. My brother says that when they taught football and such things as that, that it proves that it is wrong to teach the Bible in a school! And that it is wrong to build a school in which the Bible is to be taught along with other branches of learning, and is **TO BE CONDEMNED AS A SINFUL THING!**

Well, that makes me think. I suppose, my friends, that is

about as "weighty" as the one he got off last night about Moses. You will remember that he said, "Moses was punished, but NOT condemned for the good thing he had done." I make this point in my argument just here. **TEACHING THE WORD OF GOD IS A GOOD THING.** The place where it is taught is only incidental. It may be in a blacksmith shop, but God requires us to **TEACH IT. GOD NEVER HAS CONDEMNED A MAN FOR DOING GOOD.**

I want to read something else just here,—“Yes, we may meet in a private building or a public one, on the surface of the earth, or in a mine or a cave, or in a stable, shop, or in the open air, and so long as we have the items of worship which he has commanded we are doing what the Lord enjoins.” Page 215 of “The Church of Christ,” by one of these brethren. **THAT IS MY POSITION.** Teach the Bible in a shop, on earth, on the sea, in the air, or **ANYWHERE** that opportunity affords. That is **OUR POSITION,** sir! I want you all to know that we are doing that thing now. It is God’s will that we do just that. I ask, is it wrong to do that? Will a man ever be condemned for doing good?

He said “Yes, Moses was condemned for doing good.” Then he changed it, and says, “Moses was punished for doing good.” Do you see what his claim is equal to? Why he would make God so brutal and unrighteous as to punish an uncondemned man! That is what is being advocated by my excited friend. What do you think of the man who accuses the Almighty One of punishing a man who is **UNCONDEMNED?**

He comes before you with a law of his own making and seeks to compel my brethren and myself to submit to it. His attitude is, “You brethren just say you are opposed to colleges, and we will take you back.” But he can’t take us back; we were never there! We have never been on his side of the fence. You can’t go back to a place where you have never been. I’ll tell what we will do. If you will take down that human law you have made, and which you have espoused and set up without any authority from God, if you will take it away, we will do the coming. Yes, sir, we will not ask you to come an inch! We will do **ALL** the coming, and we will have a happy and a united people. We can easily take the world for Christ. Listen, “The Spirit and the bride say, Come.” God has said of his people. “One shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight.” We will be at the least ten times as strong as we now are. Let us get together and use the Word of God as a standard by which to measure all such things. Take down that divisive human law, I beg you. The law which tells me, “You must do as I say.”

Brethren, I have never said that. Those who stand with me have never said it. Never on the face of the earth. And, aside from the radical ideas mentioned a moment ago, the public knows that the general teaching of my brethren is as I have stated. There was never a representative man among us who taught that you must support the schools, either individually, or as a congregation. We DO NOT say that you must give your money to them. It is a matter of individual choice, and even my friend Carl must know that this is true. You are not compelled by law to do it, and we have never refused fellowship to the man who does not do it.

These folk come to us and say, "We will not fellowship you if you do that." I inquire, who made this law? Who drove the wedge of division here? Who split the log? I declare to you before my God that THEY DID IT. They are responsible for every bit of it. There it is.

This is NOT A MATTER OF DIVINE LAW, but of human opinion. It is a matter of personal liberty, as to whether or not you support such schools, or submit to the iron rule of these men. Nobody among us makes any effort to compel you. You may do as you like about it, and if you do not choose to "like", we will not disfellowship you. You shall not be barred from the Lord's table by us on that account. I shall not censure you for refusing to recognize me as a brother in Christ. That is perfectly all right with me; but Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a vast difference between his thinking a thing is right, and proving it.

Every passage of scripture introduced here tonight has been on my side of the question. Every one that had anything at all to do with the question. There is not a hint in any passage brought, or in any statement of law produced, that says I must be bound by the whims and distorted fancies of brethren anywhere. I am a free born citizen of the Kingdom of Christ. Listen, "Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints" said Paul in Ephesians 2: 19. EQUAL CITIZENS! Who made this man a judge over me? Who set him up so high?—or his brethren? Who set them up as legislators in the kingdom of God? I wonder, sir, "Upon what meat hath Caesar fed, that he should wax so fat."

Why I am amazed and astonished to think that he would come before you with the attitude of the Pharisee and say, "I thank God I am not like other men are, even like this publican." That is what Carl says. His idea, and his argument is crying, "You fellows are digressive." Why are we that? Because we have made arrangements to teach our children the things they need to know to fit them for the eventualities of life, and at the same time see

to it that they are kept under the proper kind of influence, with their faith safeguarded by competent teachers!

I wonder what my friend knows about the teachings of these schools as a matter of actual observation? I have never visited them, but I have talked with many who have. I know what they say about it. The teaching - instruction, given in secular branches there is just as good as can be had anywhere. The school at Nashville, and that at Abilene, Texas, rank well among schools. Listen, my friends, in addition to being capably taught in the secular branches, the student at these schools is taught the word of God.

In these schools the Bible is defended as being true in every part. Students are told that "In the beginning GOD CREATED the heaven and the earth." Not that superstitious idea,— "It happened without anyone to cause it." They are taught that "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." They are taught to believe that the God of this universe is the God of all flesh, and is the Father of mercies, and the Author of all good. They are taught that by the teachers in these schools. That is a thing, sir, that I want to call to your attention.

What fault does my friend find with the schools? Why some of their student papers, — some of their students in an over enthusiastic moment talked about the schools and overstepped the bounds of propriety perhaps. Such faults should be criticized and corrected. But listen, sir, I want to read 1 Corinthians 3:16. "Ye ARE the temple of God." In chapter 1, verse 2, Paul calls them the "Church of God," and in chapter 3, he tells them, "Ye ARE CARNAL AND WALK AS MEN." Some of these brethren were carnal. They were wrong, but Paul was correcting them. He went to them in a spirit of love and constructively pointed out the errors into which they had fallen. This should be done always under like conditions. I ask you, has Carl come here in a spirit of love to point out errors into which I have fallen? Not he! He comes in the spirit of bragadocio, and exhibits the air of an autocrat! He has not exhibited any sign of that love.

There are three rules by which people of this world have been dominated for a long, long time. The first is known as the "Iron Rule." The idea that "might makes right." This rule proposes that because I am the stronger, I will compel you to do as I propose. I have documentary evidence to show that even my friend Carl, and his brethren have practiced that. I mention another rule. The "silver rule." Confucius, the great old Chinese philosopher said, "Do no evil to anyone." But finally, along comes my Lord with the "Golden Rule." It says, "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." Luke 6:31. The first of these

rules was followed by thieves when they set upon the wayfaring man, beat him, and took his belongings. They had the power and might, and wanted to do it, and they did it! It suited them. The next rule was followed by the priest and the Levite, who "passed by on the other side" and did nothing. The golden rule was shown in what the Samaritan did. I ask you, which rule is my friend following? How does what he is doing help the church? Is it a work of construction, or of destruction?

Here is the question that comes up. "Shall I send my child to a school where the Bible is taught?" The Bible says not a word about where our children are to be sent to school. It does say that we are responsible for their training. "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it." Proverbs 22:6. Parents should see to that, sir. If you send yours to a place where infidelity is taught, instead of making provisions to safeguard his faith, that is your matter and business. I shall not attempt to step into your home where I have no rights, and dictate to you the manner in which you shall conduct it. My friend, however, hesitates not to say to me, "My brother, YOU MUST DO AS I WISH about this matter, if you would have fellowship with me." He withholds his endorsement from me simply because I will not submit to his man made law.

I say to you my friends, that the very principle upon which his contention rests, is wrong. I plead with you to remember that I want peace and unity. My brethren want it. We stretch out our hands over the open Book of God and pledge you faithfully that we will follow its every order with diligence, but we dare not resign or give up and surrender our liberty to any man. We will never surrender our liberty to the man who says, "I WILL dictate, and I will legislate where God has not spoken." The idea of legislating,—making laws where God made none is a dangerous thing. Diotrephes was that kind of man, and certainly was wrong.

The apostle does tell us that we should not "go beyond the teaching of Christ." And the Christ bade us "Love one another," and "bear with one another." Paul said, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." My friend says, "Not that, sir, I am going to dispute with every man who will not let me dictate to him, for I am determined to have my way." He is set upon ruling or ruining, and usually he does both if he does either! That is the principle of the thing.

There is another thing I want to mention just now. My friend has made some statements in his closing speech that I want to keep before you. He reached a false conclusion about what Brother Tant said concerning the school. Ladies and Gentlemen, J. D.

Tant is one of the greatest of preachers, one of the finest of men; and a bitter critic of all error. He condemns every sort of wrong. But I'll SIGN MY NAME TO ANYTHING HE SAID about the schools. Tant is on MY side of this question, but if you think—as this man would have you believe, that Brother Tant opposes teaching the Bible in schools, you are badly mistaken. Why, Tant sent every child he had to such a school, and he goes often to visit them and encourage the work they are doing. If he finds some of the teachers in the school in error, he proceeds at once to correct that error by constructive criticism. In that forceful way of his he says, "That is where you are wrong." He lives up to the principle, and Carl cannot find in all Tant's writings a sign of an idea that he opposes the principle of teaching the Bible in school, or of building a school for that purpose. Tant said no such thing as that. I plead with you in the name of all that is honorable and just that you consider this matter fairly.

Where is the blame for the division between my brethren? Where is the responsibility? At whose door does it lay? Is it at my door? I was asked again, as I was last night - - - -

(Time called)

MR KETCHERSIDE: Brother Moderator, I would like to have the time to make one statement. The audience may wonder why I did not tonight introduce the news article appearing in the Springfield paper, which quotes from Mr. McGaughey, minister of South National Church. Mention was made of it last night, but this evening Mr. McGaughey handed me this statement, which declares that the reporter misquoted him. I have desisted from the use of the article lest I might create a wrong impression concerning Mr. McGaughey's position. I thank you.

FRIDAY NIGHT, MARCH 26, 1937.

Prayer by E. M. Zerr of New Castle, Indiana.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: Since the proposition is written on the board, everyone can read it. It is time to commence, and I will not read the proposition. It is now time to begin the speaking. Brother W. Carl Ketcherside, affirmative.

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: I assure you that it is a pleasure tonight to have the opportunity of presenting to you the defence I shall make in behalf of the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Many of the people I see in this audience tonight are known to me by name. It has been a privilege in the past to speak to you the words of Christ's undying love, and in this same hall, I have spoken unto a throng almost this great upon several occasions, preaching under different circumstances, the gospel of God's grace.

I was born in south Missouri in a little miners shack. I have grown to maturity among people such as you are, and relative to the citizens of the Ozarks, let me say that I have always found them friendly and hospitable, and above all else, fair, generous, honest and true. I know that tonight you shall render a decision upon this matter that will be worthwhile when you stand before God's judgment bar in the last great day.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I want you tonight in your imagination, to transfer yourselves from this place to a court room, and imagine that the Church of Christ is upon trial. I want you to see me in the counsel for the defence, and I want you as the audience jury to raise your hand to Heaven, to declare unto yourselves and promise unto God, that without prejudice you will listen to the testimony which shall be produced, weigh the evidence carefully, and render such a decision as will make for eternal life for you, when you leave this world of sorrow, sickness and pain. Sometime, those who are here present are going to be forced to leave this old world, and it may not be long, until that time comes, when we shall step into the chilly brink of the Jordan of death. May God grant we can go knowing we have died in the triumph of a living faith. May we go knowing that there remain no sins unforgiven.

Tonight we are discussing the proposition on the board, and I will read it for you: The erection and maintenance of schools or colleges, such as Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb College, and others of like character, for the purpose of teaching the Bible, and other branches of learning in connection, is contrary to the New Testament, and should be condemned as an innovation in the church."

I want to make this clear tonight! We are NOT TALKING ABOUT PRIVATELY OWNED INSTITUTIONS! We are

not talking about schools that do not exist. We are talking about Colleges SUCH AS THESE TWO specified in the proposition. I proved to you conclusively that these are institutions bleeding the church treasury, taking money from that treasury set aside for the Lord's work, and that point went undenied. My friends, this subject was partially covered last night and when my respondent stood before you and said he didn't believe it was scriptural for colleges to take the church money, he granted then that Abilene Christian College was an unscriptural institution, and should be opposed as an innovation in the church! Mark it down! This debate has already been won. The negative has conceded his mistake, and surrendered his sword.

I am now going to call your attention to the fact that he has said on several occasions that Abilene Christian College was a privately owned college. I have read a few times from J. D. Tant, and the Gentleman on the negative, made the statement, "Old Brother Tant is an honest man, and I accept him as a witness." Mr. Tant has this to say, "You argue we have as much Bible authority to establish a Christian farm or a Christian printing shop, or a Christian goat-ranch as we do a 'Christian college.' You are right, but what troubles me is: If I build up a Christian farm or a Christian goat-ranch, is it scriptural for me to run all over the country and hide behind the gospel in order to beg and ask all my brethren to support all hands I hire to run said farm, because it is a "Christian farm." Why is one Christian farm more entitled to be kept up by the churches of Christ than another? I find at some places that I go, that churches are bound on "twenty-year pledges" to keep up some of our so-called 'Christian colleges'."

Oh, but Brother Porter is going to say, "Brother Ketcherside, I don't favor that kind of a college." What kind do you favor? "I favor a college that is built, owned and controlled by individual Christians." Is there such a college, Brother Porter? Let Tant answer: "F. B. Syrgley takes the position that men have a right to run 'Bible colleges' and teach the Bible as a private enterprise; and while I am just as big a fool as he is, YET I HAVE LOOKED IN VAIN FOR SUCH A BIBLE COLLEGE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST and FAIL TO FIND IT!" Remember this is the man who went to Abilene, lectured on colleges, and persuaded an old Brother Gilbert to donate his property, and thus start Abilene Christian College, the very one we are talking about! He says there is no such college in existence as Porter is talking about. He is your witness (laying the paper on Porter's table), take him! I challenge him to take that and declare I read it wrong! Will he do like he did the other night, and

refuse to read it? Will he be that dishonest this evening? Tant is his witness and he says Tant wouldn't lie. Porter is my witness on that. Well, it's just Tant slapping Porter, that's all! My friend comes before you and talks about an individual institution, and the man who started Abilene Christian College says there is no such thing. There's something rotten in Denmark!

I want to hasten on to note some things said last night, and refer to some scriptures which were positively ignored and left unnoticed. I mentioned among others Acts 20:28; Ephesians 4:16; Colossians 2:10; 2 Timothy 3:16,17 and Ephesians 3:21, and when he stood before you he paid not the least attention to them. Now I want to introduce another, and ask him in all kindness to reply thereto, when his next speech comes.

2 Peter 1:3. Speaking about Jesus Christ, the record says, "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." Everything that pertains to life and godliness is found in this book. EVERYTHING! ALL THINGS! Is there one single thing said in there concerning disciples building a Bible College? I challenge him to find it!

He tries to cloud the issue by saying "Brother Ketcherside does not believe in teaching the Bible in schools." That is positively beside the issue, which is, whether Christians have a right to build such institutions as the proposition specifies. I have written it in large letters on the blackboard, and every time he gets to raving about something beside the true question, I am going to turn and look at the board while he is speaking. I want you to see the difference between what he signed up, and what he is now trying to tell you people. You are too honest to be deluded; you are too wise to be misled. You are going to weigh the evidence very carefully, and I am sure no one is going to succeed in pulling the wool over your eyes. I have met with you in your homes, and thank God for the fact that I know you are sincere.

I pass on to read Ephesians 3:9,10. "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by'- Abilene Christian College? No indeed- 'MIGHT BE KNOWN BY THE CHURCH the manifold wisdom of God.'" Again in connection with this scripture I want to read a statement which was not noticed by my friend last night. It is from J. N. Armstrong, Dean of Bible in Harding College. "Any other institution that sets itself up to teach the word of the Lord or equip and prepare workers for the work of the church is BORN OF PRESUMPTION AND UNBELIEF."

Get that! Don't forget it! The scripture says the wisdom of God is to be known by the church, and the College president says any other institution that attempts to set forth that wisdom is born of presumption and unbelief! Now what, Brother Porter?

I want to show you tonight that the colleges have actually been established to teach the word of the Lord, and prepare workers for the work of the church. This is the bulletin of David Lipscomb College, 1921-22, and I read on page 10, "Its supreme purpose as set forth in the charter shall be **TO TEACH THE BIBLE** as the revealed will of God to man and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and **TO TRAIN THOSE WHO ATTEND IN A PURE BIBLE CHRISTIANITY.**" Now we have it! One of the the presidents said, "Any institution established to teach the Bible, is born of presumption and unbelief," and here is a plain statement that the purpose of David Lipscomb College shall be to teach the Bible. Therefore, David Lipscomb College has been born of presumption and unbelief. Take it, it is your witness (laying it on Porter's desk) and the rest of you watch him, and see if he dares to mention it.

I am going to the next argument I made, that the Bible College exalts itself above the church! Again I present as proof their own documents. I have here a booklet, "Pressing On," published by David Lipscomb College, on page 3, speaking about the establishment of the school, we have this, "This is an imperative necessity. **IN NO OTHER WAY** can we secure the **TRAINED AND CONSECRATED CHRISTIAN LEADERS** so greatly needed." You cannot do that by the word of God, or through the church; in no other way except through David Lipscomb College can we get trained and consecrated Christian leaders. I read on, "It is also necessary in order to keep alive the **SPIRIT AND IDEALS OF APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY.**" You see, according to this the church cannot keep alive apostolic Christianity, but we must be busy building colleges to do that. If that doesn't exalt the colleges above the church, I am sure I do not know what would! Take it as your witness, and see what you do with it.

My third point is, as you recall, that the Bible Colleges exalt men above the rank of plain disciples of Christ. 1 Corinthians 4:6, "That ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up **FOR ONE AGAINST ANOTHER.**" Concerning that I read to you two different items, one in which J. D. Tant said that David Lipscomb and others were exalted above the apostles, and the other from The Babblor, published by David Lipscomb College, January 28, 1937, only three

months ago, in which a great big service honoring their human founder was held at Central Church of Christ, in Nashville. My old Book teaches me that we should not do that.

Now I come to point four. Watch him on this as on the others. He'll stand up tonight and say that I am a dictator, he will accuse me of coming and trying to impress my personal opinions on him, of trying to poke my ideas down his throat and make him swallow them. But he will not answer the questions I am putting to him tonight. You know that he didn't do it last night, and you are ashamed of him. Some of his brethren came to me last night and said, "We are ashamed of Brother Porter tonight. You presented all of those points and he wouldn't even notice them. Why doesn't he deal with your scriptures?" One of his members from Springfield said, "Brother Ketcherside, you know that all our lives we have been taught that the colleges are individually supported institutions, and would not take money from the church treasury, but you offered so much proof to the contrary tonight, that we are convinced of our mistaken belief. But we wanted Brother Porter to answer you. Why didn't he?" It is certain that he did not, and he had better not try it either, because I have a lot more material where that came from.

But the thing that most of you wondered about was my statement regarding the president of Abilene, helping the Methodist school. Brother Porter had quite a lot to say about sending his children to a Methodist school, and then I read to him where this president of his Christian College made a speech in favor of establishing a Methodist school, and even gave a personal subscription to it himself. Why didn't he notice that? He never touched it!

But here's some more for you when you want to notice it. I am going to prove for point number FOUR, that the Bible College inspires pride in worldly institutions. First, I want to read some scriptures. Proverbs 8:13, "The fear of the Lord is to hate evil: PRIDE, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the forward mouth do I hate." Notice that the fear of the Lord is to HATE PRIDE. 1 John 2:16, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world, for he that loveth the world, hath not the love of God in him." Now get this. "For the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the PRIDE OF LIFE, are not of the Father, but of the world." Then I read in Mark 7:22, "Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within and defile the man."

I now hold before you, "Truthseeker," issue of April, 1936, page 1, where we have an article written by J. N. Armstrong, presi-

dent of Harding College. It is entitled, "True Merits of Harding College," and I see this, "Always before we have shown the inspectors through our plant with some anxiety as to their findings, but this time we are eager for them to see, and WITH PRIDE we pointed out the quality of our buildings and our equipment." Then again there is this, "Every Christian in Arkansas may justly be PROUD OF HARDING COLLEGE and her strength." The Book says that pride is evil, and yet the president of the College is proud and wants all Christians to be proud of an earthly and human institution.

I now advance to my point number FIVE. The Bible College and its advocates are responsible for dividing the Body of Christ. I read in Romans, "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith we may edify one another." Get that! Let us follow after the things which make for peace. Is this man following after the things that make for peace? His brethren who are here tonight, are they following after the things that make for peace? Why, Brother Porter stands here this evening convicted of introducing a thing which has brought disgrace to the Church, by its divisive actions. He is defending a thing that saps the church treasury of the Lord's money. This school he is defending, hired a man at a salary of \$4000.00 per year, and expect the churches to support that man; took him out of the evangelistic field and sent him out to raise an endowment fund of one million dollars from the churches in the United States of America. That's the kind of an outfit he is defending, and I proved it by his own brethren!

Brother Porter, don't try to deceive these good people! Don't talk about an individual institution. Don't get up tonight and ask, "If I am a carpenter, why can't I reach the Bible to the man I work with?", and then act as if that is a parallel case with the colleges. Has this man the right to build an institution known as the Neosho Christian Carpenter Shop, Rue Porter, D. D. XYZ President, and let the churches pay a man \$4000.00 per year to run around and beg the brotherhood for a million dollars, so he can teach his workmen the Bible, in that carpenter shop? Has he? Has he the right to establish a goat farm, and beg the churches to support his goats, even though he teaches the Bible to his goat herders and calls it a Christian Goat Farm?

He says it is an individual institution he is defending. He knows better, and when he turns to you people and mentions, "individual institution" I am going to turn around and look at the proposition on the board. Brother Blue will not try to keep me from looking, I am sure. And all of you turn and look at it too.

Keep in mind the issues confronting us this evening, and let it be known that you do not propose to let the fog obscure your vision or your judgment.

Turn with me to Romans 16:17, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences CONTRARY TO THE DOCTRINE which you have learned and avoid them." That is exactly what I am doing in this debate. I thank God for the privilege and opportunity of marking the ones who cause divisions contrary to the word. The record says to avoid them. Now, that doesn't mean that I can't go across the room tonight and shake hands with Brother Porter when I get through. I want him to realize though that when I do that, I am not endorsing his position, I am simply trying to be as friendly as I can. He became angry last night, lost his temper, and called me a Caesar, a pope, a dictator and an autocrat - - he called me about everything but a diplomat and a Democrat! But I say to you now, Brother Porter, that even though you did lose your temper, I am still going to be friendly and exercise the spirit of Christ. I want to lead people closer to the Saviour, and these good people can tell who is presenting facts and who is not. Yes sir, and they are going to do it, too.

My time isn't near up yet, and I have a lot left, so I want to make a few more things stand out. Here is one of them. Let us assume that the college is an individual institution, and that I am his weak brother. Grant now that I am a weaker brother, and I tell him that I cannot endorse his educational society, what is his position? Why he says, "Listen, if you don't like it you can get out!" He is going to have his human organization if it drives every person out of the church, who cannot conscientiously endorse it! The apostle said, "If eating meat offendeth my brother, I'll eat no more meat while the world stands."

My friends, listen! The man who introduces these innovations is guilty of the division which they cause. Would there be a division among us tonight if this thing had not been introduced? The Church of Christ is divided! That is admitted. What is it divided over? The Bible College! Would there be this division then if there never had been a David Lipscomb or Abilene Christian College? You drove the wedge, and you split the log, and it is closing up on your hand tonight, and you are going to get caught in a trap.

Now I present point number SIX. The fruits of the Bible colleges are evil. In Matthew 7:15:20, the Saviour makes a definite statement as to how we may tell who the false teachers are, and I presume that the same measuring stick will apply to all individuals and institutions. He says, "By their fruits ye shall know them." That is the divine system of judgment! "By their fruits ye shall

know them." What are the fruits of the Bible Colleges? The first one, which was started by Alexander Campbell, resulted in the bringing in of the innovations which the Christian Church has espoused. By and by, David Lipscomb conceived the idea of building one, which is the mother of most of those we have mentioned in this discussion. The present Bible colleges are filling the South with a group of men who endorse the "one-man preacher-pastor" idea, ministers who go and settle down over a flock for a stipulated salary, and who assume the prerogatives of the eldership. I am not guessing about that, but J. D. Tant is again my witness.

I want you to hear what he says, and remember that Brother Porter says Tant will not lie about it. Firm Foundation, Tuesday, November 3, 1936, page 2: "I commend with all my heart Brother Showalter's last write-up on the responsibility of Christian colleges. He is now learning what I learned twenty-five years ago. **OUR NEXT APOSTACY AND DIVISION WILL COME BY THE SO-CALLED BIBLE COLLEGES TRYING TO CONTROL THE CHURCH.** Twenty-five years from now no young preacher will think of going out to preach the gospel without first taking a college examination and getting a permit from the board. But I hope God will raise up some great man to lead us back. It may then be said that D. Sommer and Ben Franklin were prophets among us but we did not know it." There he is! He is your witness!

All right, I pass on then and I want to notice another statement from the Apostolic Times. It has been said that the Bible college question is just one that is found in a certain locality, that while there is agitation over it in the north, there is no division in the south. Now this paper is published south of the Mason-Dixon line, in Nashville, Tennessee, and I have here the May, 1936, issue, and I read on page 8: "Do you know or not know, that nothing is Christian, or can enter into the work of the Church of Christ, that was not instituted and set in order by the inspired apostles? If you are willing to do otherwise for the sake of your job, all right; I am not. It is both pitiful and pitiable to think that a man has to go to a Bible college to learn how to preach the gospel. Can you not preach the gospel without going to a Bible college to learn how? Fifty years ago and more, they preached the gospel, for the gospel's sake. They endured privation and hardship. They never preached for money, they preached for souls, and the church grew by leaps and bounds. Today it is 'organization,' 'modernism,' and 'up-to-datism.' Today it is 'keep up with the times.' If you do not know that these things are so, you are not responsible." That is one of your own brethren, and he says you are not a responsible being if you don't

know that! But if you do know it, don't say that you do not. Don't you do it!

I continue reading this article: "He must come from a Bible College with his B. A., M. A., Ph. D., and D. D.,—"don't know what that stands for; maybe it stands for "dumb dogs" but anyway, he must have these things, says the article, and continuing, "having more theology than gospel; teaching men and women to do certain things just because God has not said not to do them, or because God has not told us how to do them. And that is apostolic! Shades of the immortal past!" That sounds as if he were talking about Brother Porter!

Now for some more of it. "I know more than one preacher of the Church of Christ today who is nothing more or less than a parish priest, preaching (something) twice a week, and visiting around among his 'parishioners.' Isn't that the way of a 'parish priest?' I have seen many of them. They want him faultlessly attired, with his hair cut in the latest style, and slicked down with 'Three Flower Brilliantine' oil, before he can 'pass muster' before his congregation. I have heard them comment nicely on seeing the corner of his handkerchief sticking out of the front pocket of his coat; and heard them say, 'Oh, he has such a sweet voice.' He was a college man, manufactured in the 'preacher factory,' that is RIDING THE CHURCHES TO DEATH FOR MONEY." That is your man, and he is from Nashville!

MR. PORTER: May I see that?

MR. KETCHERSIDE: You'll get to see it in a minute. I am not through reading to you yet. Here's some more. "How many poor, needy, destitute widows and orphan children could be taken care of, and how much gospel could be preached in destitute places, where the need is the greatest and the helpers are the fewest; yes, how much gospel could be preached in such places with \$350,000? I have gone through East Tennessee where there are whole counties with not a member of the church in them. There are plenty of ists and ites of all kinds, but not a member of THE CHURCH. Speak to some of them about the Church of Christ and they wouldn't know what you are talking about. Did Jesus say, Go teach all people, or 'Endow a Bible College, to allow its students to become proficient and thoroughly skilled in athletics and college fraternities of all kinds? Again, how much gospel could be preached in destitute places with \$350,000?" There is your witness. You take him!

I am now going to bring him one thing more to wrestle with. I have read from the pen of J. D. Tant, because he is the man who

had much to do with starting Abilene Christian College, he lives down south in the shadow of the Bible colleges, and he is thoroughly conversant with their practices. My respondent accepts him as a legitimate witness, and declares he will not lie. Tant is the man who said that he had looked in vain for an individually owned college and could not find one. He affirmed that Abilene Christian College was a church school, and thus showed the fallacy of my respondent's position.

Now hear him on the fruits of the colleges. "If the time ever comes when my brethren will learn we ARE 'a peculiar people,' and cannot please the Lord trying to ape the sects; and when they learn 'the world by wisdom knows not God,' and that old-time Gospel preaching is all that will save the world; when the Elders are taught to feed the Church of God, and that every church should be a 'Bible College' to teach the word of the Lord; and quit our FOOLISHNESS IN TRYING TO BUILD UP BIG SCHOOLS TO GIVE DEGREES, like the sects around us, it may then be that we will then get back in line with Gospel work, as we did in the long, long ago. Don't forget, brethren, we ARE drifting!" There it is, my friends, and there is an admission that the colleges are bringing about an apostasy from the truth. Porter is defending that kind of a thing!

As I near the conclusion of my address, I want to summarize the things I have presented. I took the position that the church is the only institution, according to the Bible, that has divine authority to teach the word of the Lord. The college adherents and presidents have admitted the truthfulness of that, and further declared that any other institution organized to teach the Bible, is born of presumption and unbelief. The colleges were organized for that purpose, therefore are institutions born of presumption and unbelief. Rue Porter denies that, and there is his signature on the proposition on the board to prove it. But he signed one thing, and is trying to debate another. Bless your soul, Brother Porter, did you think you could come here and pull the wool over the eyes of this people, with your talk about "individual institutions?" I know these people in Ozark. I know what they are thinking, because I have talked to some of them today. I want to ask all of you, and my friends especially not to become angry when our brother offers a personal tirade against me. He may stand up again tonight and call me a Caesar, a pope, a dictator, and an autocrat; no telling what he will call me, but just remember there's no argument in that. And I will come back with my smile, feeling secure and confident that he cannot tear down the arguments I have presented. Watch him and see if he tries!

I have proven that the colleges are responsible for division in the body of Christ; I have proven it is not an individual something; I have shown that these things are bleeding the church to death for money; that they are "preacher factories," sapping the strength of the divine institution. I have proven it by his own men. Everything I have introduced as testimony has come from men whom he endorses, men he says will not lie. I thank you!

MR. PORTER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am sure you have listened with no little degree of pleasure to the splendid speech my friend has made. I did, and if speech making could win a debate, he would have this one won already, for he IS a great speech maker. There is, however, a great difference between making speeches, and teaching the truth. This is illustrated by the story of the two men who were once called upon to recite for the entertainment of the crowd present. One was a noted elocutionist, and the other a simple preacher of the gospel who loved the Lord. When the elocutionist was called upon to give a reading he asked the preacher, "What shall I read?" The preacher replied, "Read the twenty-third Psalm." "I will gladly do it if you will read it afterward," answered the elocutionist, and when the preacher agreed, he arose and recited the psalm with stress and emphasis placed on each word and sentence according to the rules of rhetoric and elocution. It was splendidly done, and at the conclusion there was prolonged applause. Then the preacher read it. When he had finished no cheer or applause came. The elocutionist walked over to the preacher and said, "Sir, I knew the twenty-third psalm; but you knew the Shepherd!" There is a difference, you see.

Ladies and Gentlemen. I have no thought of trying to make you believe that I can make speeches like my friend who is an orator of much ability; but when I come to present an argument, I believe that I know even better than he knows what I have in my mind. I do believe his method of putting into my mouth words which I did not speak, and things which I have expressly said I do not believe, is manifestly unfair. He does not hesitate a moment to tell you and charge me with believing that which I tell you I do not believe!

He openly charges me with dishonesty! He says, "You will not be so dishonest as you were last night." Talk about dignity! Talk of a Christian spirit! Is that the way to exhibit it? If you can lead yourself to believe that he is a mind reader, and that I would stand here before you and my God and deliberately lie about what I believe, I say if you can believe that, you can believe anything!

Before I take up his speech, I want to present the gentleman with some more questions. I want to elicit some more information from him. He has had so much to say about Brother Tant and Armstrong, and has used their writings in an effort to prove a point,

so I inquire of him, "Do you endorse them as loyal gospel preachers?" Do you?

2. Since the time and place for the teaching of God's word is not specified, does not the command to teach *authorize indirectly ANY* time, place, or method that the teacher finds expedient, so he teaches the word only?

3. Since it is *unscriptural* for a school to be supported out of the church treasury, would it also be *unscriptural* to support a religious-secular paper out of the church treasury?

4. Against whom do you charge the sinfulness of Bible schools: (a) The builders? (b) The teachers?, or, (c) The supporters?

5. If sinful practices in the schools make them *unscriptural*, would not the same rule make **ANY OTHER INSTITUTION** *unscriptural* when sin is found in it?

I particularly want an answer to this question. The rule should work both ways, and if it be something that is taught in the school that makes it wrong, then the school is *not wrong* when that thing is not taught! The rule he follows will certainly make **ANY INSTITUTION WRONG** if sin is found in it, even the church itself.

Here are the questions, Brother Carl (handing the paper to Mr. Ketcherside). The matter is now in your hands, and we want you to give it your attention. He has had much to say about questions, and even dared me to answer those he asked of me.

You know that kind of procedure comes with poor grace from a man who treats fair questions as he treated mine last night. I had ten questions typewritten, and read them and gave him a copy of them. What answer does he give to them? Nine times out of the ten, he said, "That is not the question." The other he did not so much as mention. Listen to one of them: "Is it a *sin* to *organize* and operate a school in which nothing is taught other than the natural sciences?" Look at the answer, "**NOT THE QUESTION?**"

I engaged in debate a year ago with a Primitive Baptist minister who answered my ten questions by saying, "It is none of your business." Carl Ketcherside follows exactly the same tactics. He refuses to answer. I want him to know, however, that it is my business as the respondent in this debate, to draw from him such information as will make clear his position. Why my friends, it is altogether possible that if he would give a clear cut answer to these questions, that I would be able to say, "Brother Carl, I too believe just that. Here is my hand on it." I would do that, Ladies and Gentlemen, if he would give an answer that is fair and right. Certainly I would do it. But does he give answer? Nay, verily. He evades them by saying: "That is not the question." He insists that

I shall answer all he asks, and bless his dear heart, we shall attend to him.

I read another of the questions here. "If it be right for Christians to teach the word of God at all, please tell us where and under what circumstances it becomes wrong for him to teach it?" This is the very question involved in our dispute over these schools. Schools are simply places where instruction is given; and they are sometimes called "Christian" because the students are taught the principles of christianity there. "Abilene Christian College:" a school at Abilene, where the Christian religion is taught along with other branches of learning. He objects to the word "Christian," and makes a great "to-do" about it. Why his logic would, if reduced to its final analysis, make every legal act performed over here by Judge or jury, or by any other officer a sinful and unscriptural act! Why? Simply because this happens to be a "Christian" county! (Laughter) It is funny! I don't blame you for laughing at it, but that is the logical conclusion of his so-called argument. I repeat my question here: "Under what circumstances does it become wrong to teach the word of God?"

He charges that I became angry last night and that I said things which reflected upon him. I want to say that I was by no means excited or angry. I was never in a better humor in my life, and it was not the man, but his divisive doctrine that I was flaying.

He wants me to know that when he shook hands with me it was no endorsement of my position on the Bible College! Well, I might say that when I walked over and shook his hand at the close of the first session, I was not endorsing his unscriptural attitude either. I propose to be the personal friend of the man, and we are going to get along personally in spite of our religious difference. Why should we not get together and reason about such things when circumstances make it necessary?

I asked him, "Can a teacher give instructions in morality without teaching the word of God?" The gentleman says, "That is not the question." Ladies and Gentlemen, when a teacher in any kind of a school finds a child practicing immorality, or doing anything which violates the accepted standard of ethics, and the teacher dares to correct it by teaching the erring child what is right, I make the argument and challenge him to meet it, **THE TEACHER AT THAT TIME TEACHES THE WORD OF GOD**, because there is not a single principle in the code of moral conduct but that is derived from the word of God. The position of my friend makes it a sin to teach a child in school that it is wrong to tell a lie! That would be teaching the word of God.

But, by the way, I promised you that I would prove that my

friend also teaches the word of God in schools where the arts and sciences are taught! And ACCEPTS PAY FOR IT, TOO. He preached a baccalaureate sermon right here in Ozark High School and was paid for it out of some kind of a school fund! Yes, HE did it, but it is wrong for US to do likewise! ! Did he preach the word of God? Surely he did. He would not let such an opportunity pass to teach the truth of the gospel there.

That makes me think. He has admitted tonight that it is right to teach the word of God in school. Let me find the note I made of it. Here it is: "It is right to teach the Bible in school, but is wrong to build the school in which to teach it!" That is his position tonight! Look at it. It is all right to teach the Bible in a school so long as it is one built by somebody else! But if WE build a school and teach the Bible in it, it is wrong! Such logic! But it is the logic (?) of my friend. The schools about which we are contending have been built many years. I HAD NO PART IN BUILDING THEM, so, according to his argument I am not guilty of wrong. The builder is the man in error according to him. I insist that it is right to make provisions for doing anything that is right to do!

I asked him last night, and repeat it here, "Would you endorse a man as being loyal if he teaches the Bible in school?" He answers, "That is not the question." But Ladies and Gentlemen, that is one of the questions before him tonight. He does not endorse men as sound if they say the word of God may be taught in school. He disfellowships all such. There are some good men from whom he stands separated tonight, and the barrier between them IS NOT the Bible school. He has brought Daniel Sommer into this again, and a number of others about whom he read items of interest. I want to read some more newsy things also. Daniel Sommer is a grand old patriarch—the sage of Indianapolis—and I speak of him with respect and deference. He was the father of the fight against church owned schools and everyone of these brethren stood foursquare with him until recently, and the thing between them cannot be Brother Sommer's position on the schools. While they were all together, Brother Sommer OPPOSED the church owned schools, and the taking of money from the church treasury for their support, and THESE BRETHREN STOOD WITH HIM THEN. I NOW make his position MINE! I hold in my hand a letter with Brother Sommer's name signed thereto, dated September 19, 1934. He writes: "I still affirm every declaration I ever published concerning the CHURCH COLLEGE, and the so-called Christian Church, and AM STILL CONTENDING PUBLICLY AND PRIVATELY, AGAINST BOTH INSTITUTIONS AS FORMERLY. Therefore I do not hesitate to say that all talk about compromise

on my part with either of those institutions is a **LOW GRADE OF FICTION**, which I think the apostle John would designate by a worse name." Here is the position Brother Sommer occupies **NOW**, and I endorse it.

Carl endorsed that position until recent years, but somebody has **CHANGED POSITIONS**. Daniel Sommer says he stands where he has always stood on this matter. Does he know his own mind?

I feel sorry for any young man who flies into the face of an aged veteran who has preached the gospel for fifty and more years, and will say, "Brother Sommer, you do not know what you believe." Will he accuse this old brother of lying? It is **NOT** Bible schools that came between Brother Sommer and Carl. I have a letter—

MR. KETCHERSIDE: May I see that please? (Porter gives him the letter.)

MR. PORTER: I have a letter in long-hand from Daniel Sommer saying, "You may use this whenever you please, and for whatever it is worth." The extract just read is from a letter Brother Sommer sent to the elders of the church at Nevada, where Carl lives.

I want to read from another letter tonight, because it contains some matter that I want to make a part of this debate. It was written by another worthy brother who stood squarely with these folk until the division came in their own ranks a few years ago,—in 1933 I believe. Verna M. Gilbert writes under date of July 17, 1933, about a consultation held at Des Moines, Iowa. He says, "I met with the elders at Des Moines last Friday, a week ago, (July 7.) We met at the home of one of the elders, Brother Suddeth. All three of my elders were present. A Marshalltown elder, and Brother Blake, and also Carl Ketcherside was present. We were in this meeting from 9:00 a. m. until 1:15 p. m. I stated my position on the college and **PREACHING** question as many as six times. It was finally agreed that my work . . . was scriptural." Now listen, Ladies and Gentlemen, this man Ketcherside says the Bible College is the cause of our troubles, but the man Gilbert, whose veracity cannot be challenged, says, "It was **DEMANDED OF ME, IN ORDER FOR ME TO BE IN FELLOWSHIP WITH THEM, THAT I SHOULD REFUSE TO ENDORSE OR WORK WITH PREACHERS OF THE WESTERN ELEMENT**, or congregations"—Get this!—"or congregations that use and endorse **THOSE PREACHERS**. Some preachers were mentioned by name—Bunn, Scott, and a few others."

Now, J. C. Bunn is among the ablest and best of preachers, and James A. Scott is one of the greatest preachers on the western

coast. I know Brother Scott personally. I had a nice visit with him two weeks ago. Ask Brother Scott the question, "Do you believe in church owned schools, or do you believe in taking money out of the church treasury for their support?" Brother Scott answers readily and before the world, "I do not believe that and never did." But Carl told Verna Gilbert that he must not fellowship such a man as Scott, or I will withdraw MY fellowship from you! There is something other than this school question in Carl's mind!

It is not in reality so much a question of Bible schools as it is a question of LAW! More, A HUMAN LAW, one made by them when they invade the realm of God's sacred silence and dared to speak where God had not spoken! If a man teaches school, it is none of his business or mine. God has not legislated as to our vocation more than to say we should "lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." Neither this man nor myself have the right to say whether or not you shall teach school. Cornelius did not give up his post in the army when he was converted, nor did the Treasurer of Candace the queen relinquish his office, so far as I am informed. God does not bind you to any social or economic calling, nor does he condemn it if it be honorable.

My friend hesitates not to say, "Here is a law that I made, a barrier that I raised, and a line we have drawn, and you dare not cross it! If you do, we will have no fellowship with you. You must repudiate every man unless he stands with us on THIS QUESTION." Why, he is a "close communionist." Like the Baptist preacher who uses his friends from among the Methodists and Holiness to help him through his meeting, and when he "sets the table" at the end of it, he asks "all of like faith and order" to participate. He tells his friends, "We'll work you, but we wont feed you!" My brother is as close as that. He makes my individual support of a Bible College a test of fellowship at the Lord's table. He says I must not only withhold all support from them, but must BELIEVE IT IS WRONG TO HELP THEM! When I tell him as in my first speech on the subject, that I have never seen such a school, or made a speech in one, he still refuses to recognize me as "loyal." That is the principle I am opposing.—Carl, I want that letter back, for it doesn't belong to me.

I call your attention to another thing these folk hold. Here is the Apostolic Review of September 18, 1918, and at that time these brethren were all standing with it. It was the organ through which they expressed themselves fully and freely at the time this item was published. Hear it, "I tell the people that there is no one who reads the Review that will ever backslide." There you are! There is the principle of his position. You may read the Bible every day, and

backslide. BUT if you read the writings of this set of men you will never fall! Shades of Moses and Aaron! Now these men have left that paper and call its editors "digressive." Somebody evidently FELL! Here is the paper, Carl, but I must have it back when you get your copy of the item.

I want to press another point here. All this crowd of folk were together in 1908 when Brother Sommer and Brother Armstrong held their debate. During that discussion Brother Sommer said, "While this subject is before our minds, I now state that I am in favor of all Christians who are competent to teach, but cannot preach effectively, or for some reason cannot leave home to do the work of an evangelist, ENGAGING IN SCHOOL TEACHING, AND TEACHING THEIR PUPILS IN THE BIBLE to the extent that they are able, and may lawfully do so." My friend does not stand with that position now, BUT I DO. My friend apparently takes the side of Brother Armstrong, for he repeatedly reads from him to prove his position. He seems to think Brother Tant is on his side for he continues to read from him. But nothing he can find in the writings of either support his fallen cause. If the context of those items were considered, every one of them is fairly and squarely on my side of the question. Does Carl now endorse Armstrong as a loyal gospel preacher? Will he call J. D. Tant to hold a meeting for him? If he will do that I'll bear half the expense. Remember I did not introduce these men as witnesses. HE is the man who called them, and I want him to endorse them if he will. I do, fully. If he will do it we will be together! Thank God for progress.

I read a statement from the man whom he once recognized as the champion of his cause, and make the position mine. I made his doctrine my doctrine. This stripling comes back and repudiates the man who taught him much and who has forgotten more than either of us will ever know. He cries, "Institutionalism! Organization!" Those words are badly overworked by my friend. What does he know about institutionalism and organization? This assembly is an organization as sure as the word has a meaning. It is a group of people with an officer presiding over it. There are many institutions which are perfectly harmless. My friend is an "institution" himself!

I pass hurriedly on, because I have but six or seven minutes in which to introduce some argument in rebuttal. My friend has challenged and even dared me to read certain verses of scripture. I need not take the time to read them since they have been read, and I assure you that I believe every one of them. I am no infidel. It is really cheap of him to charge me with believing that which I tell you I do not believe. If he can find satisfaction in such breaches

of fairness and courtesy, let him have it. I refuse to practice such tactics.

I now call attention to an advance argument that he may have time to meet it in his closing speech. Note the following facts. I call it my "Synagogue" argument. Jesus taught in a synagogue. Mark 1:21. The centurion BUILT a synagogue, and Jesus commended him for it. Luke 7:5,9. Paul and Barnabas delivered an exhortation in the synagogue, and taught the people there. Acts 17:1,3. They taught TWO CLASSES there, the Jews, and the Greeks. Acts 18:4. He went on to Ephesus and "entered INTO the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews." Acts 18:19. He then agreed to come back later for another TERM OF TEACHING. Acts 18:21. Now while Paul was doing this teaching IN THE SYNAGOGUE, the Lord said, "I AM WITH THEE." Acts 18:10.

I introduce these passages because the Jewish SYNAGOGUE WAS A RELIGIOUS SCHOOL. The highest cyclopedic authorities on the earth so declare. The Americana, Penny, Jewish Encyclopedia, Webster's Twentieth Century Dictionary, and every authority that speaks of the synagogue so affirms. It was established with the consent of the government and was supported by taxation and donations of such individuals as could and would give for its support. Reading, writing, Civil Government, Literature, Talmudic law, and the like were regular courses, and Paul went into such a place and ADDED THE COURSE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TRUTH; AND JESUS SAID, "I AM WITH THEE." Furthermore, Peter says, "He left us an example that we SHOULD FOLLOW in his steps." 1 Pet. 2:21. Paul said, "Be ye FOLLOWERS OF ME, EVEN AS I ALSO AM OF CHRIST." 1 Cor. 11:1. Now I should like my friend to grapple with this plain example of scripture teaching. It is plain and positive, a SCHOOL built and supported by taxation AND donation, and the Lord commended the apostle for entering into it with the gospel. My friend to the contrary notwithstanding. We shall watch for his answer.

Well I pass on to notice other things, as this debate will be over in a very short time now. My brother gets excited in the course of his speech, and runs to the blackboard a time or so and cries out, "Brother Blue can't keep me from pointing to this board." Now Brother Blue cares not a thing about which way he points or looks. Fact is, he just ran out of something to say! He said, "O, I have lots of time yet," but he quit two or three times before his time was called.

He says. "The church in Ozark would not be divided except

for the Bible College." Well, let him tell us what divided the church at Mattoon, Illinois? What caused the division at Shelbyville? Eh? What about divisions in the other places where you fellows are at each other's throats? I ask him again, "WHO PREACHED ABOUT BIBLE COLLEGES IN OZARK?" I challenge him to tell. He knows HE DID IT.

He says, "The fruits of the colleges are bad." My friends, I know quite well that mistakes have been made there. That is the reason Tant, Armstrong, Wallace, and the others whose names have been injected into this debate wrote what they did. They were correcting the errors in the schools. They were using the sword of the spirit as a "pruning hook" and were cutting out the hindering causes. But my friends, the fact that some student, or some member of the faculty erred, is NO PROOF THAT THE SCHOOL ITSELF IS SINFUL. That logic would make the existence of the church wrong! Why? Because there is not a congregation in the whole church but that has some members who fail in their duties. Some of them sin, but that does not make the church itself sinful. Surely he can see that. I am sure his intelligent audience can see it. Remember, IT IS NEVER WRONG TO DO RIGHT, and it is right to teach the word of God anywhere.

In Acts 20:29, the apostle says, "For I know this, that after my departing shall greivous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Those who have read history know only too well that this prophecy of Paul has been fulfilled. Men have done wrong by preaching and teaching things in the church that they should have left alone. Did this make the church itself a sinful thing? Paul wrote the Corinthians, "It hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you." Chapter 1, verse 11. In chapter 3, he says, "You are carnal." But did he by these statements teach that the whole church was doomed and damned? The doctrine of my friend would make it so. His argument is, that when an individual connected with an institution does wrong, the whole membership is condemned along with him that sinned, whether or not the rest have done wrong!

Ladies and Gentlemen, it has been but a few years since a man in this great state, and from one of your neighboring cities, was charged with a serious crime—malfeasance in office. A long drawn out trial was held to determine his guilt or innocence. Did his error make void all the lawful acts he had performed? Did his crime make felons of all other men who were in office with him at the time?

Certainly not. Neither does the fact that some men connected with the schools have erred, prove that the principle upon which the school is founded, is wrong. The principle of teaching the word of God is always right.

I want to read one more passage. He dared me to do it! Acts 19:5. Paul taught in the school of Tyrannus. My friend called this up last night.... (Time called.) Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

MR. KETCHERSIDE'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Porter, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first night on the Orphan Home question, my friend said all he had to say, and repeated it the second night. Last night he evidently gave all he had on the College question, and then some; like the Dutchman's boy, about whom his father said, "You petter pelief he breaches the truth, and a whole lot more."

He handed me some questions all written out. I have written out the answers and will hand them over to him to read in his final speech. He can do that. There they are.

MR. PORTER: That would be unfair.

MODERATOR BLUE: This is an oral discussion and it would be unfair. When you handed him questions, he read them, and it is your place to do that! It is not according to the rules, and what do the people know about it? That is your business—to read them.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: First I wish to say that my brother moderator should always rise, and show respect to the speaker and the audience. Second, that it is allowable to write the answers to questions handed you. One of your greatest debaters told me that he never answered written questions orally, but wrote the answers and handed them to his respondent to read. But that is just with Carl, as he wishes to do.

MODERATOR BLUE: The questions Brother Porter was asked the other night—he came out and answered them. Now do unto others as you would have them do unto you. That is exactly what you wanted him to do. It is unfair to do that. If you want to do that and violate the Golden Rule—go on! You people can see that it is not a written discussion, and he refuses to answer them, and don't want to take up his time. That is what we are here for, is to discuss it now. Why didn't Porter say he didn't want to take up his time, and write out his answers? We have a right to demand that he answer those questions. You should observe the Golden Rule. But if you want to leave it this way, if you don't want to do that, it is all right. The people can see that it is something wrong.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: What about my time which you moderators have used up debating each other?

MODERATOR ROBERTS: We are going to start out new.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: Thank you very much! I passed him some questions. He took his time, and answered them the next night. I will be glad to answer them for him tonight, however, if he decides to be unfair about the rules of debate. I will proceed gladly to answer his questions right now.

1. Since you say that Tant and Armstrong are opposed to Bible colleges, do you endorse them as loyal gospel preachers? I never did say that Armstrong was opposed to Bible Colleges. I have been quoting him as past president of three colleges, and Dean of Bible in one now! What is the matter with my friend? Can he not hear well? I have been telling him that Armstrong is one of his college presidents, so he was in favor of him. As far as Tant is concerned, *sometimes men do not practice what they preach, and Tant very definitely declares he is opposed to colleges such as Abilene Christian College, but he endorses those men who favor those things, I am told. The Book I read, the Bible which I love more than any other book in this world, says, "If any man come and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed, for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds."*

2. Since the time and place for the teaching of God's word is not specified, does not the command to teach authorize indirectly, any time, any place or method, that the teacher finds expedient, so he teaches the word only? Look on the board and read the proposition, then tell us what this has to do with the matter we are discussing, "the erection and maintenance of Bible Colleges."

3. Since you contend that it is unscriptural for a school to be supported out of the church treasury, would it also be unscriptural for a religio-secular paper to be supported out of the church treasury? We are not discussing religious periodicals. I will make an affirmation on that question any time you are ready. Suppose I favored the taking of money from the treasury to support an individual publishing the gospel, and this man proved that was wrong, would that make Abilene Christian College right? He misses the issue a mile or two. You folk can plainly see that if tonight, Brother Porter proved religious publications to be wrong, that would not make Abilene right. Why introduce that? Now remember that any time my worthy respondent wants to take up the paper question, I will take it up with him because I do not write for any paper run by an organization or institution. I do not have stock in any paper in the United States of America. But I will gladly affirm my position on that any time.

4. Against whom do you charge the sinfulness of a Bible school:

(a) The builders? (b) The teachers? or (c) The supporters? Since the thing is unscriptural ALL WHO ENDORSE IT are equally guilty.

5. If the sinful practice on the part of a school makes it unscriptural, would not the same rule make ANY OTHER institution unscriptural when sin is found in it? You are the man who introduced the subject of the grand environment surrounding such schools, and I proved to you by "THE BABBLER" from David Lipscomb College as well as by "THE OPTIMIST" from Abilene Christian College that you misrepresented the situation! However that is not my position and you realize it. You know that this was introduced by me only after you had personally brought before this audience the idea that the schools in Springfield and this territory were not worthy as compared to your church schools. I pass the questions on to you, written out so you can read them!

MODERATOR ROBERTS: They are yours, Carl. Just keep them.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: The last thing we heard from him was about the school of Tyrannus. Acts 19:9 says, "Paul separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school, of one Tyrannus." Evidently my friend is trying to prove, or at least infer, that this school of Tyrannus and the Jewish synagogues are like Abilene Christian College. If he is not trying to prove that why did he bring it up? His reasoning is that since Paul taught in this school therefore we should endorse the so-called Christian colleges. Thinking he might do this, I conceived the idea a few days ago that it might be well for us to write a bulletin for the SCHOOL OF TYRANNUS, and by the logical use of "reductio ad absurdum" to show the fallacy of it! I did that and I assure you that everything written here is copied from bulletins put out by the colleges that Porter is defending, with the exception of the last paragraph. Let's see if you think Paul was teaching in anything like these Christian Colleges.

SCHOOL OF TYRANNUS—EPHESUS, ASIA

Paul of Tarsus, B. A., M. A., Dean of Bible
 Simon Peter, B. S., M. S., Supervisor of Athletics
 Timothy, B. A., M. A., LL.D., Director of Speech and
 Dramatic Arts

This school was at one time a private institution, having been built and financed by Tyrannus and belonging to him. After ten years of successful operation, a movement was inaugurated by members of the Church of Christ in this territory to raise money and buy the school from

Tyrannus, place it in the hands of a new board of trustees, and perpetuate it for the Cause of Christ.

This purchase included all laboratory and class room equipment as well as dormitory supplies and pianos. There are said to be 64 pianos on the campus. The Administration building is a three-story brick building with hardwood floors. Here are twenty-one class rooms where Paul and Silas teach chemistry, physics, biology, and home economics. In addition there are offices, lockers, supply rooms and toilets.

There is a new brick gymnasium with considerable physical education equipment. One of the most interesting things on the School of Tyrannus campus is a beautiful swimming pool with tile floor, showers, and all conveniences.

Included in the physical training course which is under the supervision of Simon Peter, there will be offered tumbling, gymnastics, basketball, tennis, golf, and track. The School of Tyrannus Wildcats who had a very successful football season last year, are ably coached by the Apostle James. It is a grand sight to see these noble Christian young men, some of whom are preacher students, go out on the gridiron and knock their opponents cold in the name of "Jesus Christ." One of the school yells which was written by Aquilla and Pricilla to teach the way of truth more perfectly, is

Hobble Gobble! Razzle Dazzle!

Sis - Boom - -Bah!

We are Christians !!!

Rah! Rah! Rah!

If you would believe my respondent, Paul was teaching in a school like that, Ladies and Gentlemen, because he seeks to justify Abilene Christian College by reference to the School of Tyrannus. You can see how absurd that is.

I want to notice what the word "school" means, as used in Acts 19:9. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon says it comes from the Greek "skolee," which means "freedom from labor, leisure." A place where there is leisure for anything, a school." You see, the root meaning of the word is "freedom from labor, leisure." This was not a school like my friend talks about, where everyone is busy all the time and they make them work; but a place of leisure, a loitering place like the city park or the court room over there, and Paul took advantage of the fact that men assembled there every day, to teach them. You

I read from Green's Lexicon: "Skolee—freedom from occupation; later, ease, leisure, a school." The Twentieth Century New Testament translates it thus: "So Paul left them, and withdrew his disciples, and gave daily addresses in the lecture-hall of Tyrannus." Weymouth's Translation reads, "So Paul left them and taking with him those that were disciples, held discussions daily in Tyrannus' lecture-hall." I am now going to read from Vol. 2, page 205, of the Jameson-Faussett-Brown Commentary on the Bible, which specializes on translating from the original. It says, "Disputing (discoursing or discussing) daily in the school (or lecture-hall) of one Tyrannus."

And to think that Brother Porter introduced that here tonight to try and make you believe that the Apostle Paul taught in and sanctioned such colleges as the proposition mentions. He has inferred from this passage in the scripture that the apostle would endorse such schools as Abilene Christian College and David Lipscomb College, with their theatricals and dramatic arts. I am going to tell you right now that to take a position like that is to stand in very opposition to the eternal truth in God's word; and this man knows that there is no place in the Bible that gives any individual the authority to run around over the country and beg churches for money to erect and maintain these modern colleges. Nowhere in the Bible, and he knows that! If he didn't know it, I will excuse his ignorance. But if he did know it, I want to know what God is going to do with him in the last day.

You people are sensible. You are the jury tonight. In imagination you raised your hand to High Heaven and promised you would give an absolutely fair decision on this matter. He stands before you charged and guilty of introducing something not pertaining to this discussion at all and trying to palm it off on the public as being equivalent with the colleges he is attempting to defend. Brother Porter, may the Father above have mercy upon you! I didn't think you would do a thing like that. I trust that after this you will stay with the question on the board.

I will pass on. He talked about an elocutionist and an old preacher. He said when the elocutionist spoke all applauded; but when the old preacher had finished they were silent. Well, friends, last night while this gentleman was on the floor his crowd applauded loudly, and that has been the only demonstration thus far. I judge, then, that he is the elocutionist and I am the old preacher. Thank you! He is the man who knew the 23rd Psalm; I am the man who knew the Shepherd. You did not know when you applauded him that you were applauding an elocutionist, did you? (Laughter and

applause.) Gentlemen Moderators, I am going to have to insist that the audience remain quiet as possible.

MODERATOR ROBERTS: Let everyone keep quiet, please.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: This is a serious matter with me. The Church of Christ is divided here tonight, people. It lies bleeding and broken in the City of Ozark. I am here pleading for the Body of Christ. I hope we do not have any more of these outbursts. Bless your souls, some of you preachers who have been showing a lack of dignity, I pray God to have mercy upon you. We are not here to see who can win this debate. I am not here to beat this man, but I am here pleading that we all may uphold the institution which the Savior purchased with the crimson stream that flowed from his side. Let's not have any more demonstrations like that! You are not at Abilene Christian College at a football game, but here where we are talking about the Church of the Master. Let's show due reverence.

Well, the gentleman read a lot of letters, didn't he? Did you note how many of them pertained to the issue on the blackboard? Not a one of them! He even said the question that divided us was not the college question. This man stood before you the first night of the debate and said that there was a difference between the two of us, and between the groups of brethren we represented, and you remember that he told you more than once that the things dividing us were expressed in these propositions. Now he declares that these are not the things over which we are divided. He has certainly changed his mind in the last four nights.

He had something to say about J. C. Bunn and the stand which Bunn takes. My friends, Brother Bunn has meant as much, or more to me perhaps, than any preacher of the gospel in the United States of America, tonight. He announced my first appointment for me at the conclusion of one of his meetings, and when he said, "If you will come back one month from tonight you will have the privilege of hearing Brother Carl Ketcherside," I thought he was mistaken. Only twelve at the time, I said, "Brother Bunn, you must have meant my father." But he replied, "No I didn't. I meant you, son." I wasn't out of my first year of High School but I did my best. Three years after I started to preach the gospel, it was Brother Bunn who preached the truth with such force as to lead my mother from the Lutheran faith. I can see that little creek tonight in my memory, and I recall how the tears streamed down my cheeks when I saw Brother Bunn place the dearest one on earth to me beneath the water and raise her to walk in newness of life. The whole world seemed brighter and even the birds sang their joyful song more brightly. But before God, people, when that same bro-

ther stood in Springfield only 16 miles from here and told me, "Carl, we need not longer fight these innovations and we can safely go with them," I had to separate from him. I loved him as much as I have ever loved any man. I would perhaps not be here tonight defending the word of God, had it not been for his kindness; and perhaps my mother might be still placing her trust in the commandments of men, had it not been for his winning way and his manner of presenting the love of Christ. But all of these things are as nothing when a man turns his back upon the revelation of God's will and the faith which he so nobly proclaimed before.

I tell you Brother Porter, as I tell this audience tonight, I shall ever be like Abraham Lincoln: "I'll stand with any man who stands right. I'll stand with him as long as he stands right, and I'll part from him when he goes wrong." You have paid glowing tribute to Daniel Sommer, the man who has taught me most of what I know about these issues. Side by side, we fought for the truth of God until he started to endorse the position that my respondent endorses by fraternizing and fellowshiping with those men who have tried to "sell the Church of Christ down the river." I have been opposing him since the day that the paper of which he is Senior Editor offered a compromise with those things which he has always opposed. I will continue to oppose such action with every drop of blood in my body, though personally he is still dear to me. My sacred obligation is to my God and not to any man upon this earth. Brother Sommer has oftentimes remarked how he was the oldest and I was the youngest preacher in the brotherhood. He stood with his arm about my shoulder and mentioned the fact lovingly when he was last in my humble home. I have a letter in my briefcase which he wrote to me and wherein he said that he wanted me to prepare to take his place when he had crossed the dusky river. I think he said that he was about my age when Benjamin Franklin said the same to him. But when he espoused the position, by his actions if not by his words, that this man occupies tonight, I had to break the bond between us because my Book says, "If any man bring not this doctrine, bid him not Godspeed."

My Savior said that if any man should love father, mother, sister, brother, or his own life more than him, he was not worthy of him. Brother Porter, my Savior said that it was necessary for a man to leave all and follow HIM to be one of his disciples. True these things have cost me heartache and bitter tears, and my prayers have gone up at night as I have kneeled there in the blackness of night when I was unable to sleep for worry over the condition of our broken brotherhood. But I say to you people tonight that it is my earnest trust and prayer to God that if a half century from this time

should find me spared and back upon this platform, I may be proclaiming the same gospel as I preach tonight. I pray that such may be true. But these things are not your particular concern, are not a part of the issue and not relevant to the matter before us. Why did my friend introduce them? Here is the subject under discussion, the thing we are dealing with tonight (pointing to blackboard.)

My people, I come before you this evening with the realization that the situation has changed since a few nights ago. Four nights ago I met my respondent at the door and we shook hands for the first time. He was smiling and friendly that night. You remember that he stood before you and in reference to me said, "Carl is a good boy and I have heard of his good work." I am not questioning his honesty, am not questioning his veracity in those utterances. But last night the situation changed and the same man stood before this audience with the beautiful picture of love which he painted forgotten. And after he had drawn such a wonderful work of art upon the human minds here present, I saw him dip his brush into the inkpot of despair and anger and blot out the picture which he had painted, and stab love dead at his feet. I saw him as he forsook his plea for unity, and in wonderment beheld as he left the desire for fellowship which he so glowingly and eloquently expressed, and made of it all a desert waste, leaving only the new made graves of faith and hope.

I thought as I remembered the man who said three nights ago, "He is a good boy," that surely it is not possible that this is the same man who, standing here so soon after, points a finger of scorn and says, "There sits a dictator, a Caesar, a pope, and an autocrat." Brother Porter, I can forgive you for that. In the spirit of the Master who hung twitching upon the tree and cried, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do," I forgive you. In the spirit of the loving Savior who in the garden of Gethsemane declared, "Not my will, oh God, but thine be done!" I can forgive you. I know that His faithfulness to the Father cost him suffering, anguish, friends; yes, cost him everything in this world, but he was willing to endure. I count all these things but dross that I might serve my Christ.

But the thing uppermost in my mind tonight, oh People, and I would to God that I possessed the power and ability of expression that my brother here seems to have in his more fluent moments, so that I might paint for you the sentiment that wells up from the depths of my soul tonight—is the broken condition of the Church of the Living God! Oh, God of Heaven! gaze down tonight upon this scene of division and cruel strife and help us to know, Father, how terrible it is that those who claim to be disciples of Christ and lovers of the Master should be forced to meet as we have here to

debate and discuss the things which have rent the Church asunder. Still, we must face the fact that tonight the Church in this beautiful little city is divided, and we are called upon to stand here and present to you people the differences between the two groups. I stand here pleading for the Church alone; my friend comes affirming the scripturalty of other institutions.

He says that these foreign bodies are upon an equality with God's church. I say they are not! I have presented my points to prove my contention but not one time in his speeches has he paid heed to my arguments. I introduced his own brethren and proved the falsity of his stand by those whom he acknowledges as worthy, honest, true, and pure. I pointed out by those men that any institution established to do a part of the work of the Church was born of presumption and unbelief. I then showed that Abilene Christian College was established for that purpose, and I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if that man noticed the argument? Did he take up the point and show I was wrong in my deductions or had misrepresented? You know that he did not. What did he do? He made an attack upon me personally, like a politician, because he could not defend his own doctrine!

Relative to such tactics, I am going to read to you a statement by one of the greatest psychologists in the United States. I read from "HUMAN CONDUCT," by Charles Clinton Peters, A. M., Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Education in Ohio Wesleyan University, Chapter on Pitfalls of Reasoning, pages 136-137. "An argument which does not squarely meet the issue is called, technically, by the rather formidable name, 'Ignoratio Elenchi'—that is, ignoring the point at issue. If you wish a simpler name you may call it the Fallacy of Irrelevant Conclusion. This fallacy is frequently committed. It is a COMMON RESORT OF A MAN WHO MUST DEFEND A WEAK CASE. An attorney who is unable to convict a prisoner on the basis of the evidence may try to move the jury to an adverse judgment by picturing the awfulness of the crime with which he is charged. A candidate for office, instead of arguing his own fitness, or describing his policies, will rest his case upon a bitter attack on his opponent. An attorney is said to have handed the barrister a brief marked, "No case; abuse the plaintiff's attorney." A speaker who lacks the solid stuff to carry conviction will, in clever substitution, jolly the audience. A boy who has dishonored himself will justify his error by observing that other fellows do the same. A girl, charged by another with improper conduct, will reply, 'You're just as bad.' Or **INSTEAD OF GIVING PROOF OF ANY POINT, ONE WILL APPEAL TO AUTHORITY, OR TO PITY, OR TO POPULAR PRE-**

JUDICE. All of these arguments make no effort to establish the conclusion which the situation would require. They are about something altogether different, and win their way only by the DISHONEST EXPEDIENT OF TURNING ATTENTION FROM THE POINT AT ISSUE."

I did not say that! I did not, but it was Charles Clinton Peters, writing on the *fallacies of human reasoning*. I submit to you, that this man in his speech last night lacked the solid stuff to carry conviction, and for that reason made his attack upon me. Brother Porter, again I tell you, I can forgive you that. From the depths of my heart I say to you as I go from this place tonight, there is not one bit of hatred, not one bit of envy, not one bit of anger in my heart towards you. Brother Porter is old enough to be my father, and to him I am only a boy, and I am glad of that. But I thank my God, that as a boy, I can come to you tonight and plead for that institution established by the Son of God. And when the smoke of this verbal battle has wafted away, and the noise of conflict has ceased, the great thing which you people must settle is this: which of us has presented to you the word of God, the word of truth? Again I take my position, Ladies and Gentlemen, firmly against the church colleges, because I know those things are unscriptural. You must choose between the position of this man, and that of myself.

Now, he contends that if you send your boys and girls to the schools in Springfield, maintained by the State Teachers College system, you are guilty of rushing them into an environment, where they will be fortunate to escape the burning depths of hell. The time may yet come, friends, when such men may attempt to take the liberty of education from your hands. The time may come when such freedom might be wrenched from your hands, and they will build not only colleges, but high schools, grade schools, and elementary schools as well, and beg the brotherhood for money to teach a kindergarten, in opposition to the state. The idea seems to be to use the Lord's money to build a fence around their schools to keep the devil away from their children.

When I went to Topeka high school, I walked home past another school, an imposing institution with a great iron fence surrounding it. A priest strolled back and forth as a guard to keep away the "evil" influences of the Protestant world. I felt sorry for the boys and girls who played always inside of the enclosure. Now I understand that in one of the southern states a group of brethren have built up, in the Church of Christ, a school teaching all grades from kindergarten to High School, and they are taking their children and putting them in the school. The state system is not

enough, and they seek to unite state and church with a denominational school, teaching secular subjects.

Our brother seeks to ridicule the school system in vogue here, but I tell you that I know most of the students in the school in Ozark. I have met them and talked to them, yes, dozens of them. I know the gentleman who is at the head of your schools, and he informs me that out of all those men and women who have graduated from the Ozark schools since 1891, only two have ever spent a night in jail. A wonderful record to contemplate, and yet this man would have you believe that the schools are turning out reprobates and infidels, and the only hope is to send your boys and girls away from home to a church supported institution.

As I bring my part of this discussion to a close, Ladies and Gentlemen, I deem it unwise for me to conclude without these final remarks, and this prayer. May God have mercy upon those who have divided the body of Christ by threatening to place upon it the shackles and bonds of slavery which would bind us to institutions separate and apart from the Church of Christ. God knows we love those brethren. I am looking into the faces of brethren now, who once were the best friends I had. One after another of them, in the days of yore has said, "We appreciated your sermon tonight." I tell you, brethren, before God, I wish it were possible for us to work together, but friends, if in order for us to work together, it becomes necessary to lay down our Christian liberty, and subscribe to the things which have been offered by my respondent, that time shall never come. But when the time comes, Brother Porter, that you and those who stand with you take your stand firm upon the Book, and upon the solid Rock of Ages, Jesus Christ, we are going to be ready for you.

In conclusion, may God's blessings rest upon all, upon Brother Porter and upon you, my audience. Remember that as a jury, you should give Brother Porter your very best attention. I plead with you to hear him carefully, and do not just listen to me. Weigh the testimony he offers and be fair to him! See if he refutes the points I made, see if he takes the six of them, one by one, and refutes the arguments and scriptures given to substantiate them. I want you to do that, Ladies and Gentlemen. Listen to him closely, and remember that when it is all over, and:

"The shouting and the tumult dies,
 The captains and the kings depart,
 Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
 An humble and a contrite heart.
 Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
 Lest we forget! Lest we forget!

MR PORTER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Brother Ketcherside, and Ladies and Gentlemen: In thirty more minutes this debate will be a matter of history. Thirty minutes from now you will have the sum total of argument which we as disputants have seen fit to present concerning the matters upon which we differ. I am delighted to know that you have listened so attentively throughout, and the splendid manner in which you have conducted yourselves is greatly appreciated.

We, as gentlemen should, entered into an agreement to debate certain differences, and one of the rules of honorable controversy is "Since truth and not victory is the object of debate," every one of us should apply ourselves in that direction. I am glad to hear Brother Carl say that truth and not victory is what he is after. I know that I have never sought anything other than the truth in any debate. I know that I have no other desire than to find the truth in this one. I wrote Carl when we arranged this debate that at the least, one half of it would be conducted on a high plane and as a Christian gentleman should conduct himself. I call you to record this moment, and God to witness, that I have played the part of a Christian just as far as my knowledge of Christianity allows. I love the man who opposes me here! I am not opposed to him, but to the principles he holds. I am not warring against persons, but against what I honestly consider false principles. That is the thing I am fighting.

So far as my part of this is concerned, I am just as anxious as any man in the world could be, and am as ready as any man can be to enter into peace and have unity within and among the divided groups of brethren. I pray for peace, but, my friends, I want peace upon a basis which God will accept. The Church over which my Lord is head is the chief object of my devotion, next to the Lord himself. With David I say, "Let my right hand forget her cunning. Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." I must defend God's truth for His glory and honor and by the authority of the Lord who died for me.

I appreciated Carl's appeal to you to honor the Lord. I go just as far as my ability enables me and endorse that principle. I have preached in more meetings within this section than most any man. I think about forty meetings within a radius of forty miles, and hundreds of people have heard me. However, Ladies and Gentlemen, I tell you this night that my friend cannot find a single

person in the number who ever heard me speak from the pulpit here or elsewhere a single word about this divisive thing. He knows this to be true if he has made investigation, and if it had been possible to do so he would have brought the charge on the floor. No man living or dead ever heard me contending for a principle other than the plain truth. These matters of personal opinion I leave alone. I preach Christ! Who is it that brings these matters up before the undivided congregations and causes division? What man and which crowd of us did it at Ozark? Some man came along and preached them here and caused division, **BUT IT WAS NOT I!** It was not any of those who stand with me, sir! None of them stand convicted of such a thing. **WE ARE NOT TO BLAME FOR THE DIVISION IN OZARK.**

I don't blame Carl for claiming honesty. Certainly I give him credit for honestly believing the thing he does to be right, else he would not practice it. I would not accuse him of hypocrisy. He says, "I believed it and preached it." He believed that he ought to preach these human opinions and **DID IT!** That is the thing that happened here and the citizenry of this country know it is so. Then he comes before you and accuses me saying, "Brother Porter is the man who drove the wedge." But I ask, what is the wedge? Who drove that wedge? Ladies and Gentlemen, I insist again tonight with the greatest degree of sincerity I am capable of exhibiting, and before my God who shall judge me in righteousness at the last day, I **DID NOT DO IT,** and **THAT MAN DID!** You folk know it and know I am telling you the truth. Charlie Boyd knows it—(addressing Moderator Roberts) I beg pardon. I did not intend to mention the name of another man. He is an honorable man and I love him. I leave that matter just there.

I now call your attention to some other things. He began and ended his speech by accusing me of unfairness because I asked him to answer some questions. He wanted me to read the answers he had written and thus make a speech for him! That was the most unfair thing I ever heard of a debator doing. I tell you that a man is hard pressed when he asks his respondent to make an argument for him. It puts him in a peculiar situation. Let him answer the questions or let them pass as pleases him! It is, or was, his matter; but instead of answering them he read some extracts from a bulletin about the equipment of Harding College and called that an argument! He tried to make it appear to you that it was wrong to have such a school because it has some good equipment! It is, he tells me, a well equipped school. So what?

He talks about the absurdity of things. He read about the school of Tyrannus. Now I had made no argument upon that pass-

age. He is the man who introduced it. I barely mentioned it as I closed my last speech. He gives a long list of authorities as to the meaning of the word "skolee" as used in the passage. Some of them say it means a "place of leisure." Certainly it sometimes means that. He reads others who define it as "a lecture hall." But they ALL SAY IT MEANS SCHOOL, and it was so translated by the greatest group of scholars ever assembled together. Paul preached THERE, and, Ladies and Gentlemen, that group of men who translated that word for us say it means "school," s-c-h-o-o-l. I wonder what word this man would use if he wanted a word that meant school. Scripture says school, but it does not mean it! It really meant "a loafing place," according to my friend. I wish he had told us what word the apostle would have used if he had meant school. Isn't it a pity the translators did not have some wise man such as he to help them interpret and translate this word? Isn't it a pitiful thing? All this for nothing, too, for I had not used it. He is the fellow that made the argument upon it and dared me even to read it. He cannot squeal about a trap now for he set it and I was the man who threw it and it makes his toes ache!

Another thing he said: "I will excuse Brother Porter's ignorance about that. He doesn't know anything." My! He knows ALL ABOUT IT! He will excuse my ignorance, but HE will fix it all up!

He talks about the applause last night. He thinks that needs to be explained, too. I wonder what he would have done anyway, if they had told him plainly that it was not I they were applauding? The burst of applause came while he was on the floor and while Joe Blue was talking. It was Brother Blue's witticism that was first responsible for it. It was not that they wanted to applaud me, or what I had said. His misapplication of that is simply out of place—altogether out of place.

He talked about some of the preachers and pointed over to this side of the house and said they "showed a lack of dignity." "A lack of dignity!" Now it may be true that we don't know much about dignity. I don't know much about it myself. He, however, knows everything and should have told us. Maybe we could learn if we were taught! He cannot do that, though, because this is a place of public instruction, hence a school, and if he should teach us about dignity at the same time he teaches the word of God he would be getting out of his place! He would be "unscriptural!" That is the thing he is advocating.

He raves about the letters I introduced. Now we know that he piled up papers and letters in his first speech and stacked them on my desk and said, "There is your witness." He read from these

fellows—good men, too, and I love them. They are men who want to see the schools kept pure. Schools to which they send their children and which they support, they want kept free from everything that is bad. These good brethren have criticized, fought against, and tried to drive out of these schools any error that had crept in. In a great measure they have succeeded. But my friend reads their criticism of errors in the school and tries to turn it against the school itself. He wanted me to re-read the passages but you see how the shoe begins to pinch when I read from others. I read the names of J. C. Bunn and Daniel Sommer, and Carl comes along and does the least and cheapest thing in the world in the way of criticism. He charges these men who are giants when compared with him of changing face even though they deny it. It is his autocratic attitude toward such men that I want to criticize. He talks with apparent tenderness and love about J. C. Bunn and I noted it down exactly as he spoke it: "Brother Bunn said 'Carl the time has come, we can no longer oppose these innovations.'" Brother Bunn never meant any such thing as Carl says he said. I am confident that Brother Bunn said no such thing but that Carl's statement was simply a slip of the tongue. Brother Bunn may have said, "We can no longer oppose these things which you call innovations." J. C. Bunn DID NOT SAY he would not oppose an innovation. Surely that is not the case.

Carl then tells us about Daniel Sommer, the grand old patriarch of Indiana. He tells how Brother Sommer put his arms around him and said, "I want my mantle to fall upon your shoulders. I am the oldest preacher and you are the youngest." Finally he said, "Brother Sommer departed from the faith and now occupies the position of Brother Porter." All right, I want Brother Sommer to talk now. You have heard what Carl says about it, but Daniel Sommer says, under date of September 19, 1934, "I still affirm every declaration I ever published concerning the Church College and the so-called Christian church, and I am still contending against both institutions as formerly. Therefore, I do not hesitate to say that all talk about compromise on my part with either of these institutions IS A LOW GRADE OF FICTION, which I think the Apostle John would designate by a worse name."

Daniel Sommer says, "I have NOT CHANGED!" Carl says, "Brother Sommer, you HAVE CHANGED!" Carl throws that into the face of this venerable brother. Ladies and Gentlemen. I am not falsely accusing him but am simply reminding you that this man Ketcherside had the temerity to come before you tonight and criticize—even question—the veracity of one who has lived four score years, and has preached the gospel more years than Carl

has lived! The veteran writes a letter and signs his name thereto and says, "I have not changed my position." Which of the two will you believe? The man against whom the accusation is brought or the accuser? In the courts of the United States of America an accused man is counted innocent until he is proved guilty. Where is the proof of this claim? You, my friends, must believe one or the other. One charges, "You did." The other says, "I did not." They are against each other like this, X. The position one occupies is my position. Carl stood with him on that position until a few years ago. Now he does not! I want you to consider this question, **WHO CHANGED?** Where was the change brought about? Daniel Sommer says, "I have not changed." "I still hold the very thing I have always contended for; everything I ever published concerning it I still hold."

Now I want you to go back with me to the statement from the book once more. Here is what Daniel Sommer published a way back yonder, and what he says he is still contending for; and remember that Carl stood with him upon this position in the early days of his ministry. Then he put his arms around him and loved him and said, "I expect you to take my place," and **CARL STOOD WITH HIM THEN.** Daniel Sommer, what was your position at that time with reference to Bible Schools, and as their chief opposer? He said, "If Alexander Campbell had been desirous only of assisting his brothers and sisters in educating their children aright, he could have established a good school without pompous, foolish, worldly titles, And while this matter is before our minds, I now state I **AM IN FAVOR OF ALL CHRISTIANS WHO ARE COMPETENT TO TEACH,** but who cannot preach the gospel effectively, and who cannot for some reason leave home to do the work of an evangelist, **ENGAGING IN SCHOOL TEACHING, AND TEACHING THEIR PUPILS THE BIBLE,** to the extent they may lawfully do so."

In 1908, Daniel Sommer said, "This is my position." In 1934, he writes, "I have not changed." Carl stood with him then, and until 1932 or 1933, when their division came about. Now they are divided. Who is to blame? Who has changed? I insist that you all get the point and ask again for emphasis, **WHO CHANGED?**

He comes now and accuses me of changing my attitude since the first night of the debate. He tells of my talking about how I loved him, and how I met him at the door. I have not changed a bit in the world. I have met as nearly every one of you as I could, and with a smile. He, too, had a big broad smile at the first, but it has come to be a poor effort at a grin now, and it took a forced effort as sure as the world to bring that out last night. No, I haven't

changed. He simply said those things to plead for your sympathy. At least, I suppose that is what it is for, for it isn't argument.

He read a two or three page article from Dr. Charles Clinton Peters, a noted Doctor, and good reading it was, too. But it proves nothing for him. He read it after telling you that schools established for the purpose of teaching boys and girls the things that are right, are wrong! Yet he read from a product of such a school! I did not check the place where this man Peters was educated, but it was a school where the Bible is taught—whether Harvard or Yale. Dr. Peters was graduated from one of the GREAT schools of the world, and it was a RELIGIOUS SCHOOL. My friend is compelled to use a product of such a school to have something in the debate that looks like an argument. The product of an unscriptural school to boot! Ladies and Gentlemen, he says that an unscriptural institution sends forth an unscriptural product, and read from Matthew 7 about the tree bringing forth evil fruit. I have no time to go into this extract further because it needs no notice.

He accuses me of condemning you for sending your children to the public schools. I said no such thing. There is no man living who ever heard me say such was wrong. Who heard me say it was evil to send them to such schools? Or where is the man who heard me say they must be sent to such schools as Abilene Christian College or David Lipscomb College? No man ever heard me say you must do it. I made no such law, sir. My brethren have made no such law. We insist that it is a better place for the young Christian, because the influence is better! In many of our state schools in this country the doctrine of evolution is taught.

But Carl says, "The product of the Ozark schools for the past few years has been of such a high quality that only two students have ever been arrested." That is fine. I wonder how many of those who came out of the Christian Colleges in the same number of years are in the penitentiary? Why didn't he say something about them if he wanted to make a comparison? I have a letter written by a prison warden some three or four years ago which tells me that out of more than 2000 people in that institution there was not a single member of the Church of Christ. Since that time, however, I understand that a few who had been members of the Church of Christ were convicted and are now in prison there. So much for that.

About stealing from the treasury. He accuses us of being thieves by saying we steal money from the treasury of the Lord. I feel sorry for the man who makes such an unwarranted statement. I told you plainly, and Carl KNEW IT, that I opposed the thing he calls robbing the treasury. I am as bitterly opposed to such a thing

as he is. He only cheapens himself by such unutterably unreasonable charges. Some churches without proper instructions have possibly done such things, but he charges that such a mistake makes the whole institution wrong! I never before heard of such a lack of reason as he exhibits here. A man is hard up for something to say when he says that. He then says, "If it becomes necessary to subscribe to the schools in order to have peace, we will never have it." Carl, it is by no means necessary for you to subscribe to the schools. There are hundreds of brethren on every side of them that have not subscribed to them, and who even hold opinions similar to his own; but they have enough love for the Lord to refuse to allow their opinions to be made tests of fellowship like my brother here has done.

The reason we are apart tonight is not so much because I support the college, or because he opposes it, as it is, but because I happen to be a friend to the idea of teaching the Bible in school. That, sir, is the idea. He is the man who raised up the wall of separation. He and his brethren are guilty of that. He is their representative and in that sense I accuse him and convict him of the responsibility. Upon that principle of teaching the Bible in school he says, "If you do that I will not fellowship you." Even if I fellowship the man who does teach it, he refuses to fellowship me! I have never heard of such a thing before in my life.

My Lord died that men and women might be saved, and the Church was established for the purpose of teaching the plan of salvation. The schools under dispute were not established for that purpose, but to teach the arts and sciences, such as mathematics and grammar, and the teacher in such a school may, with the permission of the board of directors, take time to gather the students together and, as a Christian, teach them the pure word of God. That is the point of the proposition. That is the thing I plead for.

I am pleading for peace and unity. I come in the name of my Lord and say to him as I have from the very first, that I have never in all my ministry made a single statement from any pulpit asking for money for any school on the earth. I have to make no concession when I ask him to take my hand upon that ground and let us be at peace. I have never spoken for a school of this nature anywhere, yet he will not take my hand. He is unwilling to sit with me at the table of the Lord and partake with me of the emblems of our Lord's broken body and shed blood. Why? Simply because I will not come up at his demand and say I hate and despise the idea of teaching the Bible in school! That is his reason for dis-fellowshipping me. I will not accept his opinion as a law!

Does he make lodge membership a test of fellowship? I wonder if he does. There are a few men who make pipe-smoking and tobacco-

chewing a test of fellowship. Another few make the place of assembly a test of fellowship. A few folk out in California refuse to participate in the observance of the Lord's supper unless they are upstairs! They read in the Bible where Paul met with the brethren at Troas "in an upper room," and therefore we must do likewise. There is no consistency in these radical positions. Take a man's opinion and make it a law? That is the very thing I am fighting against here. In any matter of faith I will go as far as Carl will go. In any matter where out Lord has spoken I go as far as any living man to DO THAT. But in matters of human opinion I refuse to be bound.

Come not to me, Ladies and Gentlemen—tell me not that the Lord Jesus came into this world to die for men and to set up the Church with himself as it's head, and that he put the apostles in it and filled them with the Spirit to guide them into all truth, and that after their teaching was completed he meant for this man to add to the law thus revealed! Our brother comes to us saying, "I know the Lord made no mention of this matter, but I DO. These are matters of private opinion, but I FEAR NOT 'TO LEGISLATE.'" That is the attitude of our brother, Ladies and Gentlemen. That is what he proposes. We MUST LET HIM BIND HIS OPINION UPON US in order to have peace with him! Those who stand with him would force us! The guilt and responsibility for this division rests upon their shoulders. They, and not us are to blame. I pray God from the depths of my soul for mercy upon them. He lets these things hold him from brethren who love him dearly. I hope he learns better for he is a fine boy. What a power for good he would be if he would leave these untaught questions alone. He could go out and preach the gospel with that almost matchless power he has, and with his fearlessness and courage like Peter had, he could learn to be logical like Paul, and make converts by the multitudes.

But what does he do? Does he go out and establish new congregations? No, it is sad to relate, but he goes to places like Ozark where the brethren are at peace and preaches this untaught matter. He says, "You folk are to be condemned unless you take a position against supporting Orphan Homes and Colleges where the Bible is taught." That is what he is doing. That is the unenviable position my friend occupies tonight. I have not done that. My brethren have never made that a test of fellowship, but HE DOES, and acknowledges it before you all!

Oh yes, those questions of mine. I have time to notice them and the answers he gave to them. I asked him whether or not he would take Tant and Armstrong as loyal gospel preachers. He

introduced them and used their testimony, and he answers, "Armstrong does not oppose the Colleges and Tant does not practice what he preaches." I tell you I would never introduce a man as a witness if I believed that about him. The idea of introducing a witness to prove a point and turning around and impeaching him! I never knew a debator before who would treat his witnesses so.

But comes another. "I never said that I did not oppose those men." No, he didn't say that but he brought them as witnesses and turned on the one and said, "He doesn't practice what he preaches." That kind of witness never helps him any. If I should press him, I wonder what he would say of the other witnesses he introduced? Would he admit as much about them?

I asked him, "Since the place for teaching God's word is not specified, does not the command to teach authorize him indirectly to teach at any time, place, or by any method the teacher finds expedient, so long as he teaches the word only?" He answered by saying, "You just look at that blackboard and see." That's answering it, isn't it? When I was affirming, and he brought questions to me and said, "Answer them," I did. When I brought questions to him last night, he cried, "That is not the question." Ten times he said it! I gave him five questions tonight and he answers by saying, "Look at the blackboard."

I asked him if, since it was unscriptural to support a school out of the Church treasury, would it also be unscriptural to support a religio-secular paper out of the treasury? Does he answer it? Wonderful is his answer, "We are not discussing papers." True enough we are not discussing papers as such but principles; and when I brought a parallel case and asked him to take a position he refuses. He knows that whatever justifies the one will justify the other, and if he knows that, he realizes that the same verse in God's word that justifies the existence of the one authorizes the existence of the other. But he says, "We are not discussing that."

Again, "Against whom do you charge the sinfulness of a Bible school, (1) the builders? (2) the teachers? or (3) the supporters? If I got his answers right, all are unscriptural! I think I got it right. But this repudiates the position he took in a former speech when he said it was right to teach in the school, and I wrote it down and emphasized it by underscoring, "Right to teach the Bible in schools, but wrong to build the school in which to teach it." In his first speech he put the guilt upon the builders; but in the last, when he found his "feet in it," he said, "The whole thing is wrong." Well, I guess he was just excited a little. That's all.

And the last question. "If the sinful practice on the part of the school makes it unscriptural, would——"

(Time called.)

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The debate is over. May God bless every one of you. Carl, I want to shake your hand as a manifestation of my friendliness toward you. I love you, and will be your friend as long as we live.

MR. KETCHERSIDE: Thank you, and I appreciate greatly the opportunity of discussing these issues with you, and hope that the time will soon come when all of God's people may be one in Christ.

THE END