

The Rogers - Baker Debate

ON

Dispensationalism



# The Rogers - Baker Debate

ON

## Dispensationalism

Held At

ROGERS SPRINGS, TENNESSEE

August 31--September 5, 1953

Between

BILL L. ROGERS, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

And

B. A. BAKER, GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

Tape Recorded

Transcribed by Bill L. Rogers

PUBLISHED BY L. D. WILLIS

Tupelo, Mississippi

Copyrighted 1954  
by  
Bill L. Rogers

## INTRODUCTION

The Rogers-Baker debate was held at Rogers Springs, Tennessee August 31 through September 5, 1953. A large tent was placed immediately in front of the building belonging to the Church of Christ and a public address system was installed to carry the messages to the overflowing crowds.

Mr. B. A. Baker, Sr., for seventeen years Pastor of the Berean Bible Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan represented the Grace Bible Church. The Church of Christ selected Bill L. Rogers, Minister of the Graggland Circle Church of Christ in Memphis, Tennessee to represent them. Mr. Elmer Shaver of Middleton, Tennessee served as moderator for Mr. Baker. Mr. Byron Davis, Minister of the Church of Christ in Selmer, Tennessee served in this capacity for Mr. Rogers.

Good order prevailed throughout. Though the speakers pressed the issue and each contended earnestly for what he believed to be the truth, they were kind and courteous and parted the best of friends. The audiences, estimated about five hundred each evening, listened carefully to both speakers and the debate closed without a demonstration of any kind from the audience. Several states were represented and a great many preachers were in attendance each night.

The speeches were tape recorded and according to the agreement of all concerned were transcribed for publication. The speeches appear exactly as delivered orally except for a few minor grammatical changes.

We send the debate forth in this more permanent form with the fervent prayer that it may be used for the advancement of the Cause of Christ and to the glory of Him Who doeth all things well.

—The Publishers

## PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE

1—The Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and since that time alien sinners are justified by faith alone.

B. A. Baker, Affirms

Bill L. Rogers, Denies

2—The Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and that water baptism to the penitent believer is for (to obtain) the remission of alien sins.

Bill L. Rogers, Affirms

B. A. Baker, Denies

3—The Scriptures teach that the Kingdom of Christ was established (or set up) on the first Pentecost after our Lord's resurrection, and that Christ now reigns on David's throne.

Bill L. Rogers, Affirms

B. A. Baker, Denies

4—The Scriptures teach that the Kingdom of Christ will be established (or set up) after the Second Coming of Christ, and that He will reign for one thousand years on David's throne in Jerusalem.

B. A. Baker, Affirms

Bill L. Rogers, Denies

## THE DISPUTANTS AGREE

(1) This shall be a six nights' debate. Two hours will be given to the discussion each night; each speaker having two thirty-minute speeches each night. Two sessions will be given to the first proposition; two sessions will be given to the second proposition; one session will be given to each of the last propositions.

(2) Each disputant shall select his own moderator. The work of the moderators will be to keep time and order.

(3) The disputants agree to be governed by "Hedge's Rules of Debate."

(4) There will be no demonstrations from the audience.

(5) The debate shall be published in book form as soon as publication can be arranged. It is agreed that each disputant may check the manuscripts for correctness.

Signed: Bill L. Rogers

B. A. Baker

The agreement for publication of the debate was signed by both disputants, both moderators, by the Elders of the Church of Christ, and by the leaders of the Grace Bible Church.

## HEDGE'S RULES OF DEBATE

Rule I. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.

Rule II. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and desire for the truth, with himself, and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong and his adversary in the right.

Rule III. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

Rule IV. Personal reflections on an adversary should in no instance be indulged.

Rule V. No one has a right to accuse his adversary of indirect motives.

Rule VI. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

Rule VII. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by the arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning, by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

Rule VIII. That in the final negative no new matter shall be introduced. (Elements of Logick, Stereotype Edition, Boston: Published by Hilliard, Gray and Company, 1835, pp. 157-162.)





August 31—September 1

Proposition 1: The Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and since that time alien sinners are justified by faith alone.

B. A. Baker, Sr., Affirms

Bill L. Rogers, Denies

### BAKER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

(Mr. Baker is introduced by Mr. Elmer Shaver.)

Thank you, Elmer. And we are indeed happy to be here tonight to present to you what the Bible teaches, and what the Bible declares, and that the Bible alone is our text book.

When I was Pastor of the First Church of Christ in Danville, Illinois, I spent a good deal of time studying the Campbell-Rice Debate. I went even to the grave of Alexander Campbell; saw many of the brethren down there, talked with them about some of the things that were written in the days of those great debates, when men believed what they preached and when men preached what they believed.

When I read this proposition: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent," I said, "That is exactly what I am looking for, and I'm going to abide by that all the days of my ministry." From that day until this I have read the Bible believing that the Bible alone can give to us the Mind of God, and reveal to us the will of God, and that we should accept it because of what God says, and not because of what some man says.

We believe in the Book of Ephesians, in the fourth chapter, that God has given to us the unity of the Spirit that is to be kept in the bond of peace. This is what the Word of God teaches, Ephesians chapter four, beginning with verse 1: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the calling wherewith ye were called. With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." And I lay emphasis upon those words, "the unity of the Spirit"—not the unity of man, not the unity of the flesh, but the unity of the Spirit. And in this Unity of the Spirit there is "one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Now in this Unity of Spirit, we

have the Mind of God revealed for the members of the Body of Christ in this administration of the grace of God that was committed to the apostle to the Gentiles, the apostle Paul.

Paul was not one of the twelve apostles. Paul was chosen and separated after the twelve apostles had been sent forth by the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul was sent forth by the Son of God after he has ascended to heaven and had sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. Paul was commissioned after the resurrection and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ to the heavenlies up over every principality and power and dominion. So Paul's authority comes from the Risen Christ, and his message was one of revelation—not communication. For he was not taught of man, nor was he taught of men, but received his message by direct revelation. And according to Romans, chapter eleven, was the apostle to the Gentiles, or in Romans 15, a "minister" for the Gentiles offering up the Gentiles according the grace of God that was committed unto him. The apostle Paul declares in Eph. 3, verse 1: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles." Not the Jews, not Israel, but for you Gentiles. "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward." Notice Paul's statement in Eph. 3:2, that unto Paul was committed the dispensation of the grace of God for the Gentiles, and how that by revelation He made known unto Paul the Mystery, or the Sacred Secret, for the Gentiles. Paul has written thirteen letters that bear his name. The apostle has written more than any other apostle.

Peter, James, and John did not write, as the apostle Paul wrote, to the Gentiles. To Paul's writing we must go for God's message for the dispensation of the grace of God to the Gentiles. To the apostle Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, the apostle by the Lord's command, not the apostle of man or of men, but by the will of God, preaching a message of revelation that was hid in God, not made known in ages or generations past. To the apostle Paul we must go, and to Paul alone for the expression, "the Church which is Christ's Body." And again to this statement of Romans, chapter four, where the apostle Paul tells us that Abraham was not justified by works, but was justified by faith. "And to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness." To the apostle Paul we go for this message that we are not justified by our faith

alone, but by the "faith of the Son of God who loved us and gave Himself for us." And the apostle Paul declared that we are justified by faith of Jesus Christ the Son of God after He was raised from the dead and became the head of the Church the Body.

First of all, I would like to call your attention to what the apostle Paul tells us in the Book of Ephesians as to what the "Church" is. Made up of justified men, justified freely by God's grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.

In the Book of Galatians, chapter two, verses 7-9 the Holy Spirit declared that unto Paul was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision; and unto Peter, James, and John the gospel of the circumcision. Examine your Bibles and you will find God speaks and that to Peter, James, and John was committed the gospel of the circumcision, and to Paul the gospel of uncircumcision. Read it, Gal. 2:7-9! Now the Body of Christ is made up of saved men and women. "For by grace were ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."

What is the Body of Christ? In the Book of Ephesians, chapter one, twenty-second verse: "He (that is, the Father) hath put all things under His feet (that is, Christ's feet) and gave Him (Christ) to be head over all things to the Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." This is God's definition of the Church. It's the fulness of Christ, and is full of Christ. All we need and all we have is in the Lord Jesus Christ the Eternal Son of God, the Lord of Glory, and the Prince of life. For if we believe in verbal inspiration, and that God hath spoken to us in his Word, we dare not turn one written word aside, but study all in the light of Paul's revelation. In Paul's writings God gives to us His message for this administration of the grace of God. That's why he has written thirteen letters, and in those thirteen letters God's message for the nations and the members of the Body of Christ. The Body of Christ then, is the fulness of Christ and he is the Head of the Church, the Body, the glorified Son of God. The fulness of Christ is found in the Book of Colossians. For we are called in one Body, and we are told in the Book of Colossians that Christ is "all and in all." He is all in all. The Lord Jesus Christ is our all. And when the Lord Jesus Christ is our all, then we believe that God has provided every thing in the Lord Jesus Christ that we need for salvation, for hope, for calling, for position. Col. 3:11.

In the Book of Ephesians, second chapter, we have God's definition again of the Church. We are told in verse 15: "Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make of himself of the twain (of the Jew and Gentile) ONE NEW MAN (the Body of Christ is a NEW man)." "If any man be in Christ he is a new Creation." And this is a NEW man. The Holy Spirit directs our mind to this new man.. Then we are told in verse 16: "That he might reconcile both (Jew and Gentile) unto God in ONE Body." And in Christ there is neither "Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female; we are all one in the Lord Jesus Christ." We are accepted "in the beloved One" and complete in the Lord Jesus Christ. He is our all. It's Christ's glory that we are interested in tonight, as the Head of the Church, the Body, the glorified Son of God, the one mediator between God and man at the right hand of the Father.

We read in the Book of Ephesians, in the third chapter, that the Church is called a "joint-Body." In Eph. 3:6 we are told by the Holy Spirit through Paul that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, joint-heirs, of the same Body. The word "same" in the Greek is **sussoma**—a joint-Body, a Body in which there are Jews and Gentiles. And where they are all in one Spirit baptized into one Body, and made to drink into one Spirit. Those who are in the Body of Christ are justified by grace through faith, are justified by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. They are justified freely, that is, without a cause, and as a free gift of God's precious Love.

Then in the Book of Ephesians, not only is the Body called a joint-Body, but we are told that there is one Body. Not many denominations, "one Body." And if a man is not in that one Body, in that one Church, he's lost! And if he is not in that Church He's not joined to Christ, He's not a member of Christ, and he certainly cannot enter into that heavenly place where we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ. "There is one hope, there is one Body, there is one Church," and that Church is the Church of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the fulness, all that we need is in Christ. "Who is made unto us Redemption"; Christ is made unto us holiness; Christ is made unto us justification; Christ is made unto us sanctification; Christ is our all! WE are accepted in the beloved One. We are justified by the gospel of the grace of God---

the free gift of God's love in the person of his sinless Son, the one sacrifice for sin.

Then we are told in the Book of Ephesians and in the fifth chapter, verse 30 that "we are members of His Body." WE are not going to be, we are, right now, members of His Body, joined to Christ, one Spirit. Members of the Body of Christ of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the head. We are members of His Body and this is the Church which is the fulness of Christ in which men are justified by grace.

The Bible teaches that James wrote to the twelve tribes scattered abroad. The Bible teaches, and in the first chapter of the Book of James You'll find it: "James to the twelve tribes scattered abroad." In Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile. We are both justified by grace and through faith, through the revelations that were committed to the apostle Paul, by the ascended, and glorified, and magnified Son of God. I want you to notice how we magnify the Savior the Spotless One; the One altogether lovely, separate from sinners, and undefiled. The Lord our Head and we members of his precious Body, and the Lord Jesus Christ the light in that Body and justified by His faith, and we are redeemed by His blood.

Then notice in the Book of Ephesians and in verse 32: "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." The Church of the MYSTERY, not the Church of prophecy, but a Church of MYSTERY—or a Sacred Secret. Notice I am reading again from the Bible: "This is a great MYSTERY." A great secret, that was committed to the apostle Paul. Then I'd like to call your attention to Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 12:13: (And again this is Paul's testimony to the members of the Body of Christ, this is how we get into that Body), "As the Body is one, and hath many members and all the members of that one Body being many are one Body, so also is Christ." Christ has ONE BODY. We are members of Christ. We are joined to Christ. We are baptized into Christ, baptized into his death. We are one with Christ. He is the fulness of God, and we are his fulness in the Body of Christ. Notice in verse 13: "For by one Spirit . . ." and I again call your attention to the word by. It's "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." And notice this part of the statement: "Whether we be bond or free; whether we be Jews or Gentiles," we have all one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one

Body, one head, and we're all justified in the Body of Christ by grace, freely without merit, because of what the Lamb of God did when he cried, "It is finished" on that sacred cross on that place of the skull.

Then I'd like to call your attention again to this twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, verse 27: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." And again I'd like to call your attention to the sixth chapter of 1 Corinthians and show you what we are members of. Members of Christ, members of His Body, Joined to Christ, Joined to the Head, One with Christ, Washed and Redeemed, justified because of what the wonderful Savior did on that place of the skull and when God raised Him from the dead and set Him up above all principalities and powers and when he became the Head of the Church which is the Body of Christ. In 1 Cor. 6:15: "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ. Shall I then take the members of Christ?" Notice our Bodies are members of Christ, justified believers, justified by grace, and justified by faith. "For by grace were ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast. We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God has before ordained that we should walk in them."

Then let me call your attention to verse 16. "What, know ye not, that he which is joined to a harlot is one body, for the two saith He shall be one flesh," but he that is joined unto the Lord. We are joined unto the Lord, members of his Body, members of his flesh and of his bone. We are one with the Lord Jesus Christ. Dead with Him; buried with Him, risen with Him; seated with Him at the right hand of God, and complete in all the will of God, according to Colossians, chapter two.

Then let me call your attention in my closing word to the tenth chapter 1 Cor. in the sixteenth and seventeenth verses: "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" And again, the apostle Paul emphasises that the Body of this administration is the Body of Christ, and that every man in that Church has been redeemed. We are one Body, and one loaf in the Lord Jesus Christ. And every time we break bread we say, "We are members one of another—we are members of the Lord Jesus Christ." Joined to Christ and one with the Son of God!

Then I have one text more that I'd like to close with, 1 Corinthians, in the first chapter, verses 30 and 31: "Of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Notice, Christ is made unto us righteousness—to be redeemed by a righteousness of God without the law. Justified FREELY by God's grace. Again in Romans, chapter four: "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will impute righteousness without works. Now the righteousness of God without the law is made manifest." These are God's inspired Word. They are not mine, they are the words of God's Sacred Book. God Hath Spoken! In this administration of Grace men are justified by grace and faith alone. Only the apostle Paul preaches that, teaches that, sets it forth in his written ministry. And may God help us to see it by the grace of God!

In summing up my remarks I would just like to call your attention to Romans, chapter four in closing. Just to read it "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh NOT (this is God speaking), but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, (notice that word ungodly), his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also described the blessedness of the man, unto who God imputeth righteousness without works, saying Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." I close there and in my rebuttal will show that my dear Pastor who is going to follow will have to call your attention to what Paul says concerning the truth of the Body of Christ, if he is going to reveal the truth of that one Body and Christ the one Head.

### ROGERS' FIRST NEGATIVE

Worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I certainly think that I have a wonderful privilege in being here tonight to engage in this honorable discussion with

my opponent. I'm grateful for the splendid audience we have assembled, and for the interest you're evidencing already this early in the debate.

I'm certainly glad to meet and know my opponent. I want to say here that I have only the kindest feelings toward him. I will not be angry with him in the debate; I'll not be angry with his people. I came here, of course, to discuss the Bible—to investigate the Book of God, and to try to find out just exactly what the Bible teaches on the propositions that have been signed. I intend to be a gentleman in my part of the debate, and be just as fair as I possibly know how to be. I don't intend to speak ugly to my opponent or about him, or those with whom he is associated. Now when I say that, that doesn't mean these issues are not going to be pressed, or that the battle is not going to be hard fought. We didn't come here for a battle of roses or for a thing of that nature. We came here to discuss the Bible and to see exactly what the Bible teaches.

I'd like to suggest to you that my work in this debate is, first of all, to follow my opponent and investigate the arguments that he brings forth to see whether or not they prove the proposition that he has affirmed. I also have in mind bringing out any contradiction that he might make to Dispensationalism in general, for we are here to meet Dispensationalism. And any time that he might make an argument that will contradict some statement of that school of thought, then certainly it is my obligation to point it out.

I have a criticism to make of my opponent. I'm sorely disappointed in the speech that he made. I had anticipated better things of him. He read the proposition (or his moderator did) that "the Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and since that time man is justified by faith alone." We listened to about twenty-four or twenty-five minutes of speech that didn't have a bit more relation to that proposition than "a goose nest has to the North Pole"! He hasn't come anywhere near touching the proposition. He hasn't endeavoured to prove it! He hasn't made one single argument that looks like it might favor proving the proposition he has affirmed. Why, he got up and read about the Church, and various other things, but not one single time has he read where the Bible says (and he says he's going to speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent)—and not one single verse did



he read that says this dispensation began with Paul. And hell leave this debate Saturday night without reading that verse because it's not in the Book of God.

I'd like to say here that I believe every verse that my opponent has read. I allow no man to have a deeper faith in the Book of God than I have, or a higher hope in the promises there revealed than is in my heart. But Mr. Baker hasn't read one verse that teaches the proposition under consideration. He didn't even make an argument upon any verse that he did read that would favor that.

Now then, before I pass to an investigation of the things that he has said I have some negative arguments that I wish to present.

First of all, we realize that Peter began to preach upon the first day of Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and I suppose that this man will admit that some Church was established at that time. Some Church was established. We realize that Saul of Tarsus began to fight that Church, and to persecute it with all the power of his being. Now in Gal. 1:23 the Bible says that after Saul was converted the Churches in Judea did not know him by face, "only they heard say that he that once persecuted us NOW PREACHES the faith THAT HE ONCE DESTROYED!" Now what is Paul preaching? He is preaching the faith that he destroyed! My opponent gets up and says, "No, that's not right. He's preaching something 'brand new'—altogether different. It's not exactly like the one preached back there; not like it in any sense of the word." Paul says that the Churches in Judea did not recognize him by face, but they had "heard say he that persecuted us now preaches the faith that he once destroyed." Now Paul is preaching the Gospel that he one time fought. I'll ask my opponent: "What gospel was he fighting?" What gospel was it that he was fighting when he was persecuting the Church of God and laying it waste? Just exactly what was it that he was fighting? Why Paul says, "I preach that!" And the Churches in Judea heard that "I was preaching the faith that I once destroyed." That is, of course, contrary to the doctrine my opponent is preaching. He says that Paul started out with something "brand new" and was not like that which he persecuted at all. But the Bible says that he was persecuting the faith, and afterwards he preached the very same thing that he persecuted. Now let's see the man deal with it!

Now, let us notice something else. In Acts 9:1-2 the Bible says that Saul went to Damascus, and he went there to persecute any that were "of the Way." Those that were "of the Way" Paul endeavoured to persecute. Then we find also in Acts 19:8-9 that Paul was at Ephesus, reasoned concerning the kingdom of God and certain ones there spake "evil concerning the Way." And in verse 23 the Bible says that "no small stir arose about the Way." Well now, what is it that Paul is preaching? Why he is preaching the Way! What did Paul persecute? He persecuted the Way! And that's exactly what Paul is preaching, the thing he was fighting. He is preaching the very thing that he was endeavouring to overthrow.

Then passing to another point, I remember that in Acts 23:4 Paul said, "I persecuted THIS Way." Why, this man here (indicating Mr. Baker) thinks that the Way Paul persecuted ceased! But Paul, when he stood here, said, "I persecuted THIS WAY." It was still "this Way" when Paul was preaching. And he said, "I persecuted THIS WAY unto death." Paul was a member of it. And he said in Acts 24:14: "I confess unto this one thing that after THE WAY which they call a sect so serve I the God of our Fathers." Why, he persecuted the Way, but in the very "Way that I persecuted I preach the faith that I once destroyed." What will the man do with it? What is he going to say? Paul says that he preached the faith that he once destroyed; that he fought the Way, that he preached the Way; that he served God in the Way! Now then, let's see what he does with it.

Now, let's notice something else. This man may say, "Well he did preach it for a time, but he quit preaching it." Well, I have an answer for that too. For the Bible says Acts 26:21-22: "I continue unto this day saying nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come, how that the Christ should suffer, and rise from the dead the third day, and should bring light both to the people and to the Gentiles." Now Paul says that he preached that at Damascus (verse 18) and at Jerusalem and through out all the country of Judea, "teaching men that they should repent and turn to God, and do works worthy of repentance" (verse 19). Then he said, "I continue." How long, Paul? "Until right now. I'm still preaching it, I continue unto this day." And that's as late as Acts 26.

We turn from there to the twenty-eighth chapter of Acts.

You will remember that Paul rebuked the Jews that would not accept his gospel concerning the kingdom that he had preached (verse 23), and he said: "Be it known unto you that THIS salvation (the very same one that he had preached to the Jews)—THIS SALVATION will be sent unto the Gentiles they will also hear." Now this man (Mr. Baker) and his brethren teach that just before that, in verse 27 God drew the line, that after that time the gospel of the kingdom was not to be preached. But you'll remember, starting at verse 30 in preaching "this Way" and "this salvation" unto the Gentiles Paul suggested there that he would preach (and did preach) for two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and that he testified concerning the kingdom of God and the name of the Son of God. Now this man (Mr. Baker) thinks that he stopped. But the Bible says that he preached the faith that he once destroyed; that he was IN the very Way that he was persecuting, and that he continued in that way. Even in Acts 26 and after we come to the twenty-eighth chapter of Acts and verse 28 we find him preaching the same. Now, let Mr. Baker tell us when it stopped. Oh, yes! He thinks he finds it stopped somewhere before that, but I found out that it didn't stop.

Now, I have some questions for my worthy opponent and we'll appreciate it if he'll deal with them—if he'll answer the various things we have in mind for him. I'll hand him a copy of them so that he may read them with me as I go along. (Hands Mr. Baker type-written questions). I expect him, of course, to answer these questions—take them up one by one and to deal with them because every question that is germane to the issue should be discussed.

1. Unto what gospel was Paul separated?
2. Did Peter's gospel anticipate the national acceptance of Jesus as Messiah by Israel?
3. What was Paul's message to the Jews during his early ministry?
4. When Paul preached the "gospel of the Kingdom" did he preach the same thing that Peter preached?
5. Is the "great salvation" which was spoken first by the Lord, different from the "word of reconciliation"?
6. If Paul preached two gospels during his early ministry—one to the Jews, another to the Gentiles—what would he have done if preaching to a mixed audience? (You know that these folk think that Paul preached one thing to the Jews, and that he preached something else alto-

gether different to the Gentiles. Now I can find in the Bible where Paul preached to a mixed audience—one with both Jews and Gentiles in it. I want to know just exactly what course would Paul have followed. Would he turn to the Jews and say, "If you repent, God will give you the kingdom;" and then turn around and say to the Gentiles, "I know that's not so, but I've got to keep the Jews fooled just as long as I can!"" Is that the thing that Paul would have had to preach? I want to know just exactly what he would have preached if he had been preaching to a mixed audience!

7. Is the preaching of the cross a part of the Mystery?
8. Was Saul saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching, or the Pentecostal gospel?
9. Were signs ever performed in connection with the preaching of the gospel of Grace?
10. What kind of faith does Paul say "avails" in Gal. 5:6?
11. Is man saved now by a living faith or by a dead faith?
12. Is faith without works dead?
13. Is "faith alone" faith without works?
14. Was Cornelius saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching or under "the gospel of grace"?

Now we want those questions answered. We don't want him to use his "forgettery" when he comes to those, because they are very pertinent to the issue that we are discussing.

We come now to the speech that he has made.

He spoke about being "Pastor of the First Church of Christ." Do you mean you were "Pastor" of the Church of Christ, or the Church of Christ Scientist? Make yourself just a little bit clearer on that. I just wonder if he'd infer (or mean) by that he was one time a member of the Church of the Lord—the same one that I'M a member of? And that he left the Church that I'm a member of and went off with the Dispensationalists? That seems to be the thing that he is getting over, but he had enough judgment to put it "First Church of Christ," and that makes me wonder.

But he says where the "Bible speaks he speaks, and where the Bible is silent he is silent." Well, why didn't you read a verse that says this dispensation began with Paul? You say you speak where the Bible speaks, and that you are silent where the Bible is silent, I find that the Bible is silent on that point, and you got up and affirmed it! Why you ought to realize that there's not a verse in God's Book that says this

dispensation began with Paul! It's not there, and this man will not find it if he had six nights, or fourteen nights, or twenty nights. He just cannot find it!

He says he accepts the Bible. Well we'll see what he does with these verses where Paul says that he preached faith that he once destroyed, and that he was a member of the very Way that he persecuted.

Then, he spoke of the Unity of the Spirit. He said: "There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in all" (Eph. 4:4-6); therefore, since there is one Body, and one hope, and one baptism, and all these things; therefore, this dispensation began with Paul! There's not any logic at all in that. Where did you get that conclusion? Your therefore is not deducible! It just will not work to read some passage that says something altogether foreign to the issue and say, "That proves it!"

That reminds me of the time I was debating a man who was affirming the "Baptist Church is Scriptural in origin, name doctrine, and practice," and he got up and made his argument to prove it that Enoch was the seventh from Adam! Now doesn't that prove it! Why that's just as "logical" as what this man is doing. He gets up and says, "there's one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord one faith and one baptism, one God and Father of all," and since all these things are true it started since Paul's conversion! Where does he get his argument? Where does he get his conclusion? Why it's not in the passage. I believe that passage with all my heart. It says there is "one Body." Yes, Mr. Baker, but the question we are interested in tonight is, When did that one body begin? When did it commence? We want to know about that.

He says that Paul was not one of the twelve apostles. Well, he was just like the rest of them! If you want to deny it we can debate that out too. You'll remember that Paul says: "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me" (Gal. 1:17). He speaks of those that were apostles before him; just in the same sense that he was. Then I turn from there to 1 Cor. 9:5 where Paul says, "Do I not have a right to lead about a wife that is a believer, just like the other (or the rest) of the apostles, and Cephas?" So he was just like the REST of them! If he wasn't, then how could

Paul say, "I have a right to lead about a wife just like the rest"—if he was different from them? Mr. Baker, you'll have to come and do some better debating. You'll have to come and bring some arguments that are pertinent to the proposition under discussion.

But Mr. Baker thinks that because Jesus appointed Paul after the resurrection, then he's a great deal different from the twelve. Let us see about that. I remember another man that was appointed an apostle after Jesus arose from the dead, yes, and after he ascended! Don't you remember in Acts 1:26 the Bible says that the apostles "cast their lots, the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles!" Why, I realize that Matthias saw the Lord while He was upon the earth, but he was not made an apostle, he was not appointed an apostle until after Christ arose from the dead and ascended to heaven. So he got it (apostleship) just like Paul did. He need not think there is any difference there. He need not think there is something extraordinary about Paul. I realize that Paul had a special work among Gentiles. But there's a great deal of difference between a special work and an exclusive work. Paul was not the exclusive apostle to the Gentiles (Mk. 16:15); and there's not a verse in God's Book that says it!

But he says that Paul says in Gal. 1:11: "I make known unto you, brethren the gospel which was preached of me, that I did not receive it of man nor was I taught it, but it came to me by revelation of Jesus Christ." Now here is something that these men are failing to see: Paul says that the gospel, "That I preached, I did not get it from man—and I never was taught it." Now he commences right there to prove that he never was taught what he preached. If the thing that he preached was altogether different from what anybody else preached, why would he have to prove that he wasn't TAUGHT IT? The thing that he was preaching was exactly the same thing that other people were preaching, so the people were apt to say, "Why, he got his from those apostles over there." Paul says, "That's not right. I DO preach the same faith that I once destroyed. It's just like that, but I was not taught it." Then he says, after saying, "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me," that after three years he spent fifteen days, but that's not long enough to learn anything about the Bible—not long enough to learn anything about the gospel of the Son of God as it has been reveal-

ed. So Paul says he wasn't taught it. How did he prove it? By proving that he didn't have time to have it taught to him. He didn't even go to the apostles, but God revealed it to him directly. What was it? The same faith that he once destroyed. Not any difference in it, not at all. If it was DIFFERENT, Paul would not necessarily have to prove that he wasn't taught it because everybody would know it. Everybody would know it automatically.

But he said that Paul was "THE apostle to the Gentiles" (Rom. 11:13). If you will consult the Revised Version, you'll find that Paul said, "I am AN apostle to the Gentiles." He was not the EXCLUSIVE apostle to the Gentiles. He was AN apostle to the Gentiles. And that "an" is used in almost every instance.

But my opponent said that a "dispensation was given unto PAUL" (Eph. 3:). The word dispensation here does not refer to a period of time as you have in your proposition. (And you ought to have defined the terms of your proposition). But that term dispensation as used there (in proposition) refers to a period of time; here it refers to a stewardship. "A stewardship has been intrusted unto me" (1 Cor. 9:17)—the same word in the Greek. Now we need to understand that Paul says: "It is given unto me to dispense the gospel to those that are lost, especially to the Gentiles." Now that is the dispensation of the grace of God that was given unto Paul. The man has not made his argument on Ephesians 3. If he doesn't make it, I'll make it for him and answer it in my next speech. They have an argument based on Ephesians 3 that just will not stand the acid test. It just will not stand it. For some reason he did not make it. He started out, then backed up and stopped. So if he doesn't make it, I'll make it in my next, and then I'll answer it.

But he said that there was a "Mystery that was a Sacred Secret." Why don't you just go ahead and say, "I mean by that that it was unpropheesied?" You know these men say the God of heaven prophesied concerning the Kingdom, but there is no prophecy concerning the Church of the Son of God, the Body of Christ—the Church that we are members of. That's all in the world he means by his "Sacred Secret." I realize that it was a mystery; that it was kept hidden; that it was a secret from times eternal, but here is the point: Is his definition of the terms "hidden" "secret," or "mystery",—is that a scriptural definition? I deny it! I say that it ISN'T.

When he comes up and makes an argument on it I'll prove that it isn't. The term "mystery" doesn't mean that it hasn't been revealed. Paul said in 2 Thess. 2:7, "The MYSTERY of lawlessness doth already work." And in verse 5 he said: "Don't you remember that while I was with you I told you these things?" Why, they had been TOLD about it, but he said, "It's a MYSTERY." Why? Because they did not thoroughly understand it or comprehend it. And when he makes his argument on the word "mystery" or if he denies that this dispensation of grace has been prophesied of, we'll have something to debate about.

But he referred to Rom. 4:4-5: "To him that worketh NOT, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness." And he thinks by that, that Paul meant "faith alone." If you will go back to Rom. 3 you'll find that Paul had said in verse 21, "But now a righteousness of God has been revealed (in the Gospel, 1:16-17) apart from the law, being witnessed (or testified to) by the law and the prophets." And after suggesting that, he said in verse 28, "We reckon therefore; that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law." So the "works" that Paul has in mind in Romans 4:4-5 are the works of the law. He's not referring to the works of the gospel, for even "Paul's gospel" demanded obedience. Rom. 1:1-2: "Paul—separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures." And in verse 5 Paul says this gospel was given unto him "for the OBEDIENCE OF FAITH AMONG all nations." In Rom. 2:4-5 the Bible says that certain ones will treasure up for themselves wrath "in the day of wrath at the righteous revelation of the judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his WORKS." Why, that's not faith alone. And in verse 16 it says that Judgment will be "according to MY GOSPEL!" Certainly, certain ones are going to be judged by the gospel. But in that verse (5) it says they are going to be judged according to their works. This man is not going to deal with these Scriptures. You wait and see. Then in Romans 6:17-18 Paul declares: "God be thanked that ye obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered you, being THEN made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness."

My opponent said that in Gal. 2:16 we are justified by the "faith of Christ." Yes, but it is "not by the works of the law." In Gal. 5:6, in the very same book that he is quoting



from, Paul had this to say: "In Christ Jesus neither doth circumcision avail anything nor uncircumcision, but faith that WORKS BY LOVE." Is that faith alone? Paul says the faith that avails is the faith that WORKS, and faith that works by (or through) LOVE. Certainly that's involved.

Then to Gal. 2:7-9. He said that Paul had the gospel of uncircumcision committed unto him, and Cephas, James, and John had the gospel of the circumcision committed unto them. Certainly so. But the Bible does not say that this gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul exclusively. That's your argument. Let us notice also that Paul said in Romans 1:16: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for IT is the power of God unto salvation; to everyone that believeth, to the JEW first and also unto the Greek." That was ONE gospel for JEW and GENTILE! There is ONE gospel for BOTH of them. The "gospel of the circumcision" referred to the idea that Peter, James and John were to preach the gospel to the JEW. And the "gospel of the uncircumcision" referred to the fact that Paul was to preach the gospel to the Gentile. It does not mean that there were two different gospels. The gospel that Paul had here (Gal. 2:7-9) he said in verse 23 of chapter one was "the faith that he once destroyed."

Then he referred to Eph. 2:8-9: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast." And he says that we have to go to Paul and Paul alone or that doctrine. Why, that's not so! We need to understand that here Paul is not talking about the works of the gospel, for in Gal. 5:6 he insists that those are necessary. Let us notice something else. In Rom. 2:4 we find that we are to "OBEY the gospel." In Gal. 5:6 it is "faith that WORKS by LOVE." Heb. 5:8-9, "He became unto all them that OBEY him the author of eternal salvation." And in Rom. 6:16-18 we find that we are made free when we OBEY FROM the heart the form of doctrine delivered. Paul does not say (in Eph. 2:8 or any other passage) that it is by faith alone. He doesn't indicate that at all.

Then he referred to Eph. 1:22 where Paul says that Christ is "the Head of the Body, the Church." Now then, the question is: When did that Church begin? When did that Body begin? In verse 19 the Bible says, speaking of the great power of God, "Which he wrought in Christ when He raised him from from the dead, and made Him to sit at His own right hand in heavenly places, far above all rule and might and

dominion and every name that is named not only in this world, but that which is to come. And he gave him to be head over all things, to the Church, which is His Body." WHEN? When he raised Him from the dead and made him to sit at his own right hand in the heavenly places. But in Acts 2:36 Peter said: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ this Jesus whom ye have Crucified." And in verse 34 he said: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, he hath poured forth what ye now see and hear." The Bible says that when He was seated at God's right hand God made him the head of the Church. But we find in Acts 2 that Jesus was seated on God's right hand on Pentecost. Therefore, Jesus was the head of the Church at that time. And it didn't start with Paul, or sometimes after that (Pentecost), but the Bible teaches that it started there. And that answers that argument completely.

But he says that "Christ is our all in all." Yes, I understand that. I realize that "Christ is our all and in all," but that doesn't prove that we have a new dispensation that began with Paul, and that we are justified by faith alone. No, that's not akin to it.

Then he says that God made of the Jews and Gentiles one NEW man (Eph. 2:16). And he meant by that, apparently, and seemed to think that since Paul wrote it and said "it's New" at the time he wrote that it never had been known before. But Paul said in Heb. 10:19: "Having therefore, brethren boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by the NEW and living way." Why, that way was NEW even in the days that Hebrews was written. Now when was it made. When He died on the cross. "Through the veil, that is, to say his flesh," the Bible says. And it is NEW then. So he (Mr. Baker) would think that no one knew anything about salvation until the book of Hebrews was written, which was, I suppose, a long time after this (the Book of Ephesians).

But he says that he is preaching the glorified Son of God, and that Paul preached the glorified Son of God. Yes, and Peter did too! Acts 2:36 he said: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ this Jesus Whom ye crucified." In Acts 5:30 he says that "God exalted Him with His right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins." The Bible says that He was exalted; that He was the glorified head of the Church even in the days that Peter preached.

Then he came and said that there is a "Joint-Body." (Eph. 3:6). Yes, but WHEN did that Body commence?

And he referred to 1 Cor. 12 and said that those in the Body are justified by grace through faith. Yes, I believe that with all my heart, but not by faith ALONE. And this verse doesn't say it and there's not any other verse that says it!

But he says that there is one Body, and the person that isn't in that one Body is lost. I agree heartily with that, but I deny that it started with the days of Paul.

Again he said that Christ is our all in all. I believe that, but it doesn't prove his proposition.

He referred to Eph. 5:30. "We are members of His Body." Yes, but WHEN DID THE Body begin? That's the question.

He says that James wrote to the twelve tribes scattered abroad. I suppose that he thought that he would get around James' works in that (Jas. 2:14-26). It won't "work." For in James 2:1: "Brethren hold not the FAITH OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WITH RESPECT OF PERSONS." And that was during the days of miracles and he said (to the sick) you "call for the ELDERS OF THE CHURCH" (Jas. 5:14). So it was to the members of the CHURCH AMONG those scattered abroad. It won't do you any good to talk about the twelve tribes there in the Book of James.

Eph. 5:32 he referred to the "mystery." He meant by that that it wasn't prophesied of. I'll deal with that thoroughly later on.

But he said 1 Cor. 12:13 indicates how we get into the Body—that we are baptized by the Spirit. And he said the word "by" is en (Gr.). Yes, I don't know what your position is, but I want to ask you: WHAT IS THE ELEMENT THAT WE ARE BAPTIZED IN TO GET INTO THE BODY? Your brethren teach that the Spirit is the administrator. Well, Jesus baptized (Jno. 4:1-2) when His disciples baptized. And that is the only way the Spirit of God would baptize—when the disciples baptize. But you tell us WHAT a person is baptized in when he gets into the Body. Anyway the baptism that puts us into the Body is the one that we OBEY FROM the heart, and Spirit baptism is a promise to be received and not a command to be obeyed. (Rom. 6:3-4, 16-18). We'll debate that further later on.

But he says that in 1 Cor. 12:27 there is one Body, and that we are joined to Christ. Yes, but I affirm still that no passage he has read says that the one Body began after Saul

was converted. The Bible says that Saul "laid waste the Church," that he "persecuted the Church" (1 Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:14). What is the Church? It is the Body of Christ. And just because Paul used some peculiar language referring to it doesn't indicate that it wasn't here before.

But he referred to the "Communion of the blood and body of the Son of God." That refers to the Lord's Supper. I still agree that there is one Body, but that still doesn't prove his proposition.

He quotes: "Of Him are ye in Christ" (1 Cor. 1:30). Yes, but are we in Christ unconditionally by God? Does God put us into Christ unconditionally? That's the question. Or is it by faith only? That's the thing he's affirming.

And then he referred to Abraham. And he said that he would read Rom. 4. We need to realize that in Rom. 4:12 the Bible says that we who would be the sons of Abraham "MUST walk in the STEPS (that's plural) of that faith of our Father Abraham." What did he do? James 2:23-24 "Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar." Why, the Bible says that he was justified by faith without works, and that he was justified by works. There's no contradiction. Paul referred to the works of the law; and James to an obedient faith. I thank you Ladies and Gentlemen.

(Time called.)

## BAKER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

In the Book of Ephesians, chapter three, and verse 1, this is what God says: "For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles." Now God said that. Then he said: "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given ME to youward." Now, would you want a clearer statement than that? "Unto ME," said Paul. Notice it again: "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given ME TO YOU-WARD."

Now, our Pastor didn't tell you that Peter didn't have one baptism. Peter had two. And in the Book of Ephesians, one. Peter was baptized in Spirit, and then Peter had already been baptized by John's baptism. How is it that Peter had two baptisms, and that Peter was not re-baptized after the Lord Jesus gave the Commission? and that Peter was not baptized "into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," that Peter had two baptisms? Now, which one of

those two baptisms did Peter have that placed him (if he was) in the Church which is Christ's Body? If Peter had two baptisms, a Spirit baptism, and already had water baptism, and was baptized by John (or by the Lord, whichever way you'd rather it should be), but he was baptized before the Great Commission was given. And when he was baptized before the Great Commission was given, the Church, which is Christ's Body, was not there! The Lord chose those twelve apostles and Matthias was qualified. Matthias was there when Jesus was baptized, for he could not have been appointed by these apostles if he did not meet the requirements. And Matthias met the requirements, but Paul could not meet the requirements because Paul was not there when Jesus was baptized. If you'll look, in the choosing of Matthias, the Bible says he was numbered with the twelve. And in 1 Cor. 15:5 Paul says "He was seen of the twelve." "And last of all he was seen of me (now listen) as one born out of due time" (v.8). Notice, Paul was "born out of due time."

Now again, in Ephesians 3. Let me call your attention to the "I's" and the "me's" and the "my's". "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles. If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward. How that by revelation. . ." Now if Paul had the same gospel that Peter had, why did the Lord have to teach him? Why didn't Peter teach him? or James teach him? or John teach him? Why did the Lord have to give him a special revelation, and no one else that special revelation? Paul was not chosen like Matthias was chosen. Saul was chosen by the Lord Himself. For he said "Saul, Saul, why persecute thou ME?" He was persecuting Christ, and when he was persecuting Christ he was persecuting those brethren.

Remember in our early message we said that the Body of Christ can be found only in Paul's epistles? And you notice that our opponent did not give you one reference where anyone ever called the Church, "the Church which is Christ's Body" but Paul! ONLY Paul says, "The Church which is Christ's Body." There are other Churches in the Bible, but only Paul calls the Church "the Church which is Christ's Body."

Now listen to What he (Paul) says: "How that by revelation he made known unto ME the mystery (or the Sacred Secret)." "Unto ME!" "the Mystery!" What was the Mystery? The gospel? No. "Christ died for our sins according

to the Scripture, and was buried, and on the third day arose from the dead." That's not the mystery. Why does Paul say "the MYSTERY"? What is that Mystery that the apostle Paul is talking about? You'll notice on the day of Pentecost there was no "joint-Body." To have a "joint-Body" you'll have to have Jew and Gentile joined together. But there were no Gentiles saved until Peter preached to Cornelius in the tenth chapter of the Book of Acts. And in the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Acts Peter said "that by my mouth the Gentiles (for the first time) heard the gospel" that he preached. And Cornelius was saved. Cornelius was the FIRST Gentile saved under Peter.

God visited the Gentiles for the first time under Peter in the tenth of Acts. How are you going to have a JOINT-Body when you don't have Gentiles saved? Until you have Jews AND Gentiles you can't have a JOINT-BODY.

Then again, in Ephesians 3 Paul says in verse 4: "Whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." What is the Mystery of Christ? The gospel? That Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture? The gospel of our salvation? That's not the Mystery. I never said it was. That's the gospel of our salvation. It was the Mystery that was revealed to Paul that was "hid in God."

He (Rogers) said "hid" does not mean "hid." But notice how Paul says in his word (again, God is speaking): "Which in other generations (or ages) was not made known unto the sons of men." What was it that was not made known unto the sons of men? that was just now revealed unto the apostle Paul? "WAS NOT MADE KNOWN UNTO THE SONS OF MEN!" You remember what Paul said in 1 Corinthians, chapter two? Let me read it to you, concerning this Mystery that was committed to Paul by Christ the Son of God. In 1 Cor. 2 Paul says in verse 7: "But we speak the Mystery (the wisdom of God) in a Mystery.—We speak the wisdom of God in a Mystery—even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world (or ages) for our glory. Which none of the princes of this age knew, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory."

Let me read, again, what Paul says in Colossians 1:24: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His Body's sake (my flesh, for His Body's sake), which is the Church: whereof I am made a minister, according to the dis-

Page 22

pensation of God which is given to me for YOU, (Now again it was committed to Paul "for you"), to fulfil (to complete) the word of God; even the Mystery which hath been HID from ages and from generations, but is now made manifest to his saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this Mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ among you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect (mature, complete) in Christ Jesus."

Let me again bring your attention to Ephesians 3. Paul cannot lie. He is speaking under Inspiration. "That the Gentiles should be joint-heirs, of a joint-Body, and joint-partakers of His promise in the gospel, whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto Me by the effectual working of his power. Unto ME, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles (notice this) the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all see what is the administration of the secret." What is the administration of the secret? What is it that Paul is talking about here? "To make all see it and understand it?" Then he goes on, and he says in this letter, "From the beginning of the ages—from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Why does Paul always emphasize that his message is associated with a Mystery or a Sacred Secret?

Then, our opponent, remember, did not point out that Paul was not justified by grace—and grace alone. I know Paul was baptized to wash away his sins. I know Paul was saved under the Pentecostal administration. He had to be saved in that administration, before God could separate him.

Then remember what the Holy Spirit said in Acts, chapter thirteen, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them." Paul's gospel was not given all at one time. It was given on the installment. His messages came through his letters, through his written ministry, those thirteen letters that were written to you that you might know the will of God.

In Ephesians 4: "One Lord, one faith, and one baptism." That's a baptism into the one Body in one Spirit. That's what the Spirit of God says, "In one Spirit." Now, what baptism did Peter have on the day of Pentecost? was he baptized in Spirit? was Peter baptized for the remission of his sins after

the Commission of our Lord, when the Lord Jesus Christ commissioned those twelve men? was he re-baptized?

Then, let me call your attention to what he said. "There's only one message," he said, "in the Book of Acts." Let me show you that that's not so. In Acts, chapter twenty-one, let me call your attention to where we have TWO distinct messages. These are God's words; they are not mine. Verse 18: "And the day following Paul went in with us unto James"—(He's up there in Jerusalem). He (Rogers) says it doesn't make any difference whether James wrote to the twelve tribes or not. It makes all the difference in the world what kind of a letter you receive if it's not addressed to you. If it's addressed to the twelve tribes, then let the twelve tribes scattered abroad have it! Peter ministered to the Jews. God tells us in Gal. 2:7-9 that Peter, James, and John went to the circumcision. Why, then, should James not write to the twelve tribes. We're not the twelve tribes. In Christ there's neither Jew nor Gentile. We're ONE in Christ. There is no national salvation for Israel in this administration of God's grace. God is dealing with Jew and Gentile on the grounds of grace. When did God begin that?

He said, "When did the Church, the Body of Christ, begin?" And he admits that Peter had two baptisms, and that Peter was not baptized by water into the Body of Christ. He has to admit that. Peter was baptized when there was a former administration, and there was no Body when Peter was baptized, under John's baptism. Did John's baptism put anyone into the Body? What puts a man into the Body? Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus? Is it baptism in Holy Spirit? What baptism puts a man into the Body of Christ? What baptism is it today that makes us one with the Lord Jesus Christ? Again I ask my opponent to answer these questions. When was Peter baptized? How did Peter get into the Body? and When was Peter put into the Body? by what baptism? Eph. 4 says: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." There can't be two; there can't be divers, there can't be many, there can only be ONE baptism that puts a man into the Body of Christ. And WHICH baptism put Peter into the Body of Christ? I ask my opponent. If Peter was NOT baptized into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit after the Commission was given, then how did he get in? I want my opponent to answer that question in our debate tonight.

Now let me call your attention to Acts 21:19, "And when



he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. And when they heard it they glorified the Lord, (now notice this) and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law." (That's what James said.) He said that Paul said that we're NOT justified by the works of the law. We are not under law, but under grace. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness. And by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight. Why is James, then, saying here that they are "all zealous of the law"? If they were not under law, why did James say they are "all zealous of the law"? Now the apostle Paul is speaking here to James. If Paul and James had the same message how came that James had some that were under the law? Let me read it again. "Thou seest, brother how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charge with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law." Did Paul preach the law to the Gentiles? Were the Gentiles under the Law? were they under grace? were they made free? were they dead to the law?

Listen to what James tells Paul: (If Paul and James had the same message, then listen to this), verse 25: "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication." Now one was under the law and the other didn't have to do it. Why? Why did the Jews have to be zealous of the law? have vows upon them? when the apostle Paul said "if a man is justified by the deeds of the Law then Christ is died in vain?" Why did Paul say we are not under law, but under grace? why do we go to PAUL for that?—that we're not under law, but under grace? I'd like to have someone quote it from someone else

in the Scripture, that we're not under law—that we're justified by grace through faith and not the works of the law.

Again, in Gal. 2:7-9, there ARE two statements there that are Holy Spirit-breathed. Listen to these words again. Don't listen to me. Put your attention to what you have in your Bible. Don't listen to any man. Listen to what God says in this Sacred Book and you won't go wrong. In Galatians, chapter two, verses 7-9, listen to these verses now. And you listen for yourself, not from what I'm telling you, but listen for yourself now. If Paul and Peter were preaching the same thing then why did one have the "gospel of the circumcision," and the other the "gospel of the uncircumcision?" Is circumcision and uncircumcision the same thing? were the twelve tribes circumcised? was James preaching in Acts 21 circumcision? Then how came that the apostle Paul in this text makes it plain that he had the gospel of the UNCIRCUMCISION. I didn't say that. God said that. That's God's Word. Listen to it again. I'm not giving you man's word, not any Denomination's word, but God's Word. Listen to it. Verse 5: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person.)" I'm glad of that. It's only men that are saved by believing God trusting in His Word. God is no respecter of persons. He doesn't recognize reverence. He recognizes only sinners that believe Him, and who are trusting in his precious Book. He's not any respecter of persons. But listen: "Those who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: but contrariwise, (they didn't add ANYTHING TO Paul) but contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me."

He said we should follow Abraham. In Circumcision? Does he want me to go back to Gen. 17 and follow Abraham in circumcision? No! He knows I've got to go back before Abraham was circumcised to be justified by faith. When was Abraham justified? It wasn't under the law. Abraham was not a Jew. When was Abraham justified? He never saw the law that God gave to the children of Israel. When did Abraham believe God? What did Abraham do? Abraham was no Jew; Abraham was not under the law, the law of Moses. That law

came 430 years after God made his covenant with Abraham. We don't follow Abraham in circumcision; we follow him when he was justified by faith alone, without circumcision, without the works of the law, when all that Abraham did was to believe God and start for the land of promise. The gospel of the circumcision goes back to Gen. 17. The gospel of uncircumcision goes back to Abraham in Gen. 12 where God called him and justified him without works. The twelve tribes are linked up with Abraham in circumcision; and we are linked up to Christ with a circumcision not made with hands, but saved by grace and through faith—without any of the works of the law; without any of the works of the flesh. We are saved by believing the gospel that "Christ died for our sins, and was buried, and on the third day arose from the dead."

My Bible teaches me that Peter had the gospel of the circumcision. That's why he preached on the day of Pentecost to "all the house of Israel." Why did he preach to all the house of Israel? Why didn't he preach to the Gentile. Go to Acts 10; go to Acts 15, find out when God opened the door to the Gentile. How are you going to have a JOINT-Body when you don't have any Jews (on the day of Pentecost) joined to any Gentiles, and joined to Christ? how do you get into the Body? Let me ask you the question? Well, you say, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Is that how Peter got in? James got in? John got in? Ask the question yourself. How did they get in the Body of Christ, if they were in. You've got to answer that! You've got to tell me how to get into that Body. I say that it's in one Spirit that we're all baptized into one Body. That's what Paul says. And the apostle Paul was saved, and baptized for the remission of sins, before he ever wrote his epistles. You've got to go to Paul's written ministry to find God's message for the Gentiles today. There you'll find grace, and grace alone emphasized in Paul's written ministry.

Then let me call your attention again, not to what I say. (God help you, if you can convince me that I'm wrong, I'll be glad to say that I'm wrong. But I want God's Word.) I don't want to be convinced by some man or group of men. I did that once, and I'm not going to do it again. I'm going to believe God, and what God says in His Word and that word rightly divided. I don't keep the law. I don't circumcise my children. I don't do anything they did in the Old Testament. I've eliminated that whole thing from the program of God.

On what authority do I have to do it? If I go back to Gen. 17 have I got a right to do it? When God gave that covenant to Abraham and his seed. I'm the seed of Abraham. Must I enter that covenant? It's unto Abraham and his seed. Are there two kinds of seed? God made a covenant with Abraham, and He said it's for you and your seed after their generation. I'm the seed of Abraham. I was baptized into Christ, and when I was baptized into Christ I was baptized into the Seed of Abraham. And Christ is the Seed of Abraham. He's my ail! Everything that I need is in Christ, tonight. Everything that I glory of is in Christ. He's my all! And I don't want him to be less than that in the gospel of the grace of God.

Again I ask the question (and everyone of you must answer it), when did Peter get into that Body? Ask yourself the question. Was Peter re-baptized like those in the nineteenth of Acts. Why did Paul re-baptize those who were baptized by John's baptism? Why did Paul demand that they be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus? Please answer the question if you will. When! and How! did Peter get into the Body? He wants to know when the Body began. I'd like to know how and when Peter got into that Body. Maybe he can tell me tonight how he got in.

Then I call your attention to this Gal. 2:7-9 when they gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. Who were Paul and Barnabas? In Acts 14:14 Barnabas became an apostle. Was he one of the twelve? Or, Did God have a new order of apostles? Did Paul have new apostles? Read the Book of Thessalonians and see that Silas is called an apostle there. Was he one of the twelve? Was Barnabas one of the twelve? No. The twelve apostles are going to sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. And God's going to keep that twelve together. Go to Revelation. There are twelve foundation stones. God keeps the twelve apostles together. And he keeps Paul ministering the gospel of the grace of God to the members of the Heavenly Calling, the Body of Christ.

I urge you tonight to ask yourself one question: "How did Peter get into the Body of Christ?" He had to get in there somehow. Was it his Spirit baptism that put him in? When he was Baptized in Holy Spirit was he baptized into the Body? In John's day, when Jesus was baptizing with John's baptism (although he baptized not, but His disciples did the baptizing

for him), let me ask you the question, Were they in the Body? When did Peter get into the Body? I ask my opponent to answer that tonight.

## ROGERS' SECOND NEGATIVE

Worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm happy to be before you again to reply to the speech that you have just listened to. I notice that Mr. Baker referred to me in his first speech, and also in his second, as being a "Pastor." You know that the Bible teaches that in order for a man to be a Pastor in New Testament times he had to have "children that believe" (1 Tim. 3: Tit. 1). I have a little boy that is ten months old, but I don't think he believes. So I'm not a Pastor, I'm not an Elder. Just call me "Mr. Rogers" and that will be sufficient. I'm not a Pastor in any sense of the word.

But, by the way, before I go into his speech, did you notice how well he forgot? This man didn't come here to answer arguments! He came here to preach sermons. He didn't come to debate; he came to make speeches. He hasn't taken a single note since the debate commenced. Now Mr. Baker, if you're going to debate me in this discussion you'll have to take some notes and go to work. We didn't come here just to make pretty speeches and to talk. We came here to investigate everything that is brought up. You haven't referred to anything that I brought up except incidentally. Now you need to get you a pencil and a piece of paper and take notes upon the things that are said, and investigate them and show to this audience where I'm wrong—or admit that you're wrong one. That's your work in this debate. Now, if you have memory enough just to sit down and take the things that are said and get up and answer them (or attempt to answer them), then that's all right. But if you have the memory you haven't exercised it in this last speech! You used your forgettery there.

What did my opponent say about Gal. 1:23? Not one single time did he quote that "Paul preached the faith that he once destroyed!" Why? He's the man that "speaks where the Bible speaks, and he's silent where the Bible is silent." Now the Bible speaks there, Mr. Baker. Yes, the Bible speaks there, but HE DOESN'T! Yes, the BIBLE speaks in Gal. 1:23, but friend Baker DOESN'T, WHEN it comes to that. Paul said he persecuted "THIS Way"—the very Way that he serv-

ed God in. What does my opponent say about it? He doesn't say. He uses his "forgettery". Now you just wonder WHY? Why doesn't he deal with these things?

Not only that, but I proved that Paul CONTINUED preaching the very same thing that he started. Yet my opponent says that he "speaks where the Bible speaks." Well, why don't you "speak" about this? Why won't you deal with it? Why won't you investigate it and prove that it doesn't conflict with your proposition. That's the work that you've undertaken.

And we need to also remember that after Acts 28:28—a long time (two years) after this man say the "gospel of grace" was preached and the "gospel of the kingdom" had stopped—Paul was STILL preaching the "gospel of the kingdom." Yes, but he teaches that it had stopped! Well Luke says that it CONTINUED. Now he speaks, but he doesn't speak where the Bible speaks! He's silent, but not where the Bible is! You'll have to beat that, Mr. Baker. We came here to debate we didn't come here to play.

Then he came to the proposition, finally, and made the extended argument on Ephesians 3:1-10. I'll deal with the questions in just a moment, but why didn't you deal with the question? You know the rules of honorable controversy say that every question and every argument that is introduced must be dealt with. What's my opponent done? You know, he observed the Passover tonight. He just "passed over" the questions that I asked him. Now that's a fine way to handle questions—IF the man that's asking them doesn't press the issue. But if I weren't going to press the issue, I'd go back to Memphis or I wouldn't have come. I came up here to have a religious discussion. I didn't come to make "fair speeches" and talk pretty. Now, why hasn't the man dealt with the question? You just figure it out for yourself. Just why is it that we can't get him to answer. Why is it that he "observes the passover?" He refuses to answer the questions that are asked! Well, I'll show you why in just a moment. But first I'll deal with his speech, and then I'll get to that.

I think that there are some rather interesting things that came up in this last speech.

He quoted Paul: "If so be that ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God that was given unto ME." Yes, Paul said that it was "given unto ME;" therefore, it wasn't given to anybody else. This man does just exactly what most

of his other brethren do on the subject of faith. They read where the Bible says that a man is saved "by faith," and they come along and stick the word "only" in it. And they are not silent where the Bible is silent. They put something else in. Now what did this man do? He comes along and makes it like this: "this dispensation of the grace of God was committed to me—and to ME ONLY!" Yes, but it doesn't say that, does it, Mr. Baker? Paul says it was "given unto ME," but WHERE does it say to "ME ONLY?" Oh, yes! You speak where the Bible DOESN'T speak! You put something in there that's not in the Book of God. It's not there, ladies and gentlemen. He can't find it. That's the reason he's not looking. And he's not anticipating answering any arguments either.

But he said it was made known to Paul by revelation. And he wanted to know why Peter did not teach him. Well, you might ask Paul that! For one reason, Paul was an apostle and God gave it to him directly. But, by the way, on that word "teaching:" Why didn't you deal with the argument that I made from Gal. 1 where Paul said that "it came to me by revelation,—it wasn't taught to me," and then proved it by showing that he didn't have time to go up to Jerusalem to have it taught to him? Why didn't you mention that? You observed the passover there. But he's a man that always speaks where the Bible speaks. He's not going to steal the motto! He's not going to get it!

Then he said, "Peter had TWO baptisms; one in water and one in Spirit." One was administered by John the Baptist; the other, of course, was administered by Christ. And he wanted to know why he was not re-baptized. Well, because he was prepared. John came to prepare a people for the Lord (Lk. 1:17). And whenever they were prepared, upon the day of Pentecost when the Spirit entered into that group then they became the Body of Christ. But he wants to know how in the world Peter got there. Well, I'd like to suggest that Holy Spirit baptism didn't put them there. No, indeed! There's not a verse in God's Word that suggests that Spirit Baptism puts a man into Christ. This man does not believe that a man is baptized in the Spirit in order to get into Christ. His position is (if he takes the position of his brethren, J. C. O'Hair and Mr. Cornelius Stam) that the Holy Spirit is the one that does the baptizing. And I asked him what the element is. He never even mentioned it. I pointed out that the Spirit might baptize by having His disciples to do it. But will you please

tell us, Sir, what is the element? You don't believe that Holy Spirit baptism (as an element) inducts one into Christ. You don't believe that; your brethren do not believe that; and I have your books here in my brief where they suggest that that's not true. I know exactly what these men teach. They do not teach that. And his position here in saying that we are baptized by the Spirit, he means by that that the Spirit is the administrator, that the Holy Spirit is the One that does the baptizing. And the Spirit is NOT THE element. But in Acts 2 where Peter was baptized, the Holy Spirit is the element. And they're not at all parallel. If you want to know how they got there, you might read 1 Cor. 12:28 where the Bible says that God "set them in the Church—God set them in the Church." That's the way they got in.

But he said Matthias was there with Jesus all the while, and that he was, of course, not like Saul. Where I drew the parallel was that his appointment was after Christ ascended. What did you say about that? I realize that Matthias was with the Lord from the "baptism of John all the days the Lord went in and out" among them even to the ascension of Christ (Acts 1:21-22). But nevertheless, the Bible says that it was after the ascension of Christ (Acts 1:9-11); and, therefore, he was appointed just like Paul was in that sense. That's the point that I made.

But he says Paul was not qualified. No. But the Bible says in Acts 26:14: "For to this END have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a WITNESS of the things wherein thou HAST SEEN me, and of the things wherein I WILL APPEAR unto thee."

He said that "Saul was chosen by the Lord." Why, he inferred by that that Matthias wasn't. He's drawing a contrast now, between Matthias and Saul. And he says, "Why Saul was chosen by the Lord." Why, don't you know that the Bible says that the apostles prayed, and said, "And THOU LORD, Who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one whom thou has chosen to take this place in this ministry from which Judas by transgression fell that he might go to his own place . . . and they cast their lots, the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." (Acts 1:24-26). Now, here is the point: the Bible says that they called on the Lord and said, "Show us the one YOU have CHOSEN." Mr. Baker, here, says, "Oh, No! He's not like Paul, the Lord didn't choose him, he was chosen by the apos-



ties!" That's just the difference between this man here, Mr. Baker, and the Word of God. The Bible indicates the fact that GOD chose this man. Prov. 16:33: "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord." You're not going to get around that point.

But he says no one calls the Church "the Body of Christ" before that time. No. But I find where it's called "the Church." And the Bible says that "the Church is the Body." So if we find the Church, we find the Body. Just because Paul used some particular term, or some definite term, in discussing the Church Baker thinks that proves that it's something different. Why don't you go all the way with Mr. E. W. Bullinger, and find where he speaks of "the Body of Christ," and "the Bride of Christ," and make two or three different things out of it? Or find "the Church of Christ" and the "Church of God" and make two out of it just because you find two different expressions there. They are but two expressions for the same thing.

But, you'll remember that in his first speech he said that if we're in the Body of Christ, we're in Christ. To be joined unto Christ is to be in the Church, to be in the Body. But when Saul was persecuting the Church the Lord appeared to him and said, "Saul, why do you persecute me?" They were already in the Lord. You, apparently, think they were not, but they were in the Church, and the Lord said, "Why do you persecute ME?" So they were in the Lord just like Paul was.

Then he said that there was a "mystery" involved. And I noted carefully to be sure (I have these books as I have suggested), and these men just will not quote all the Bible. You know their quotations are like the modern bathing suits. They start late and wind up early! (Laughter). That won't work in this debate. It just will not work! He stopped his quotation just a mite too soon! He said, when he spoke of the dispensation of God that "was given to me to youward. Which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men (PERIOD)." That's where he stopped. DOES PAUL STOP THERE? Eh? Does Paul stop there? You went ahead and read almost the rest of the chapter, but didn't even refer to that part of it! Now why didn't you read it? You know what it says? It says it was not "revealed AS it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit." You know that word as is an adverb. It means "to the same extent, or in equal degree." Certainly, it was not formerly revealed "to

the same extent and in equal degree as it was revealed unto the apostles (that's plural) and prophets by the Spirit." But WHY did you stop? Paul didn't say that it wasn't revealed and then stop, but he said it wasn't revealed AS it's revealed now. It wasn't revealed to the same extent and in equal degree. You reckon why Mr. Baker stopped? I know why, and you ought to be able to figure it out! He never did read it.

But Paul was not the EXCLUSIVE minister of this dispensation of grace, for the Bible says that it was "revealed unto His holy apostles (plural) and prophets in the Spirit." Now, here's one that might make him sick—I don't know! But he's always opposed to Peter having anything to do with the "mystery." Oh, yes! He can't stand for Peter to have anything to do with the mystery! But in 1 Cor. 2:21-22 Paul says, "Let no one glory in man." (There were certain ones that were glorying in MEN). "For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or CEPHAS (that's Peter)." Well, who are these men, Paul? In 1 Cor. 4:1 he said: "Let a man account of US (Paul, CEPHAS, and Apollos), as of ministers of Christ, and STEWARDS of the MYSTERIES OF GOD." Oh, Yes! Peter was in there too, you know! But this man doesn't think so. We find where Peter was there, we find Paul there, we find Apollos there. And the Bible says (and Paul is doing the writing), "Let a man so account of us (Peter, Paul and Apollos)—account of US! as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the MYSTERIES OF GOD!" Why, he thinks Peter never even knew about the mystery, never even got a hint of it. But PAUL says he was a steward. And the word Steward means that it had been given unto him to dispense unto other people. Oh, yes, we are getting into some interesting things.

But he said there was no "joint-Body" on Pentecost. Well the Body was there that became the joint-Body when the Gentiles were brought in. It's the same Body with the exception that it did not have Gentiles in it as such.

Then, let us notice something else. In Acts 2:38-39, and Peter is doing the preaching on the day of Pentecost, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the Promise is unto YOU and your CHILDREN, and ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him." Now I don't deny that revelation came and that God gave His Book, gradually. I'm not denying that. I wouldn't affirm that Peter thoroughly

understood what he said. Sometimes inspired men did not understand what they said. But STILL, upon this day of Pentecost, Peter said that "this gospel which I preach and the promise involved, is unto YOU (that's to the JEWS), and to your children (your POSTERITY), and to ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF." Well, who are they. Eph. 2:11-17 says the GENTILES are those "afar off," and the JEWS are those "that are near." Peter said that his gospel was for those near (the Jews) and those afar off (the Gentiles). My opponent says, "Now, that's not right."

In Acts 3:25 the Bible says: "Ye are the children of the prophets and the covenant which God made with Abraham saying, in thee shall ALL the families of the earth be blessed. And unto you FIRST (God sent it first to the Jews. I said that Peter might not have understood, but nevertheless he said it was for ALL FAMILIES, EVERY person in all the world is included)—unto you FIRST (that implies that it's to go next to somebody else) God sent His Servant to turn everyone of you from your iniquities." Now we can see that the Bible had in mind even from the day of Pentecost forward that the gospel that Peter preached was for both Jews and Gentiles.

He said Cornelius was saved first (Acts 10). I agree with that. But I asked you a question and you haven't dealt with it; as to whether he was saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching, or by the gospel of grace as you call it.

But he says Rogers said "hid" doesn't mean "hid." Rogers didn't say any such thing! I said "hid" does not mean what YOU say it means. I said "hid" doesn't mean unprophesied of or unfortold. In Luke 18:31-34 the Bible says that Jesus told his disciples the things that were "written in the prophets"—that he must be delivered unto the Gentiles, he spit upon and mistreated, that he would be killed and after the third day rise again. The Bible says that this is written in the prophets; the Lord told them about it. But in verse 34 it says "They understood not the things, and this saying was HID." Jesus said "it is written in the Prophets; I tell you NOW." Yet he said "It's Hidden!" Why was it HID. Because they don't understand it. Mr. Baker, here, affirms that the word "hid" means that it never had been told before, that it was unprophesied of. We can see from Luke 18:31-34 that that's not true. Jesus said, "It's written in the prophets; I tell you about it," but still it's "hidden." Why? Because

they don't understand it. And the Bible says, "Neither perceived they these things." (verse 34). They didn't know what he was talking about, so they were hidden. I didn't say the word "hid" doesn't mean "hid"; I said that it doesn't mean what Mr. Baker said it means. And he won't find anything in the Bible that looks like what he teaches either.

Then he said in 1 Cor. 2:7 the Bible speaks of the mystery. Yes, and I'm not saying that a mystery is not a mystery. But I am saying that a "mystery" is NOT what YOU say it is! Why? Because you say that a mystery means a thing that never has been foretold. But in Eph. 5:32, after Paul had told about the relationship that obtains between Christ and the Church, he said, "This mystery is great, but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church." He had already started at verse 22 and written down to verse 32 telling how the Church is related to Christ. Then he said, "This is a mystery. It's great. But I SPEAK (had already done it) in regard of Christ and of the Church." Baker says, "Now if it's a mystery, it never was spoken."

Moreover, in 2 Thess. 2:7 and 5 the Bible says: "The MYSTERY of lawlessness doth already work." And "Don't you remember that while I was with you I TOLD you these things." You haven't answered the arguments that I advanced; you didn't even notice them.

But he said that the Gentiles were to be saved [as joint-heirs in the joint-Body] there's the catch. Yes, that the Gentiles were to be saved (in the joint-Body, the Church) was not prophesied of in the Old Testament. Do you want to take it back? In Acts 13:46 the Bible says that the Jews would not accept the preaching of Paul, and that they blasphemed. Then Paul said: "Seeing you count yourselves unworthy of eternal life (this man thinks Paul was preaching a (temporal) kingdom to them. Paul preached "eternal life.")—Seeing that you count yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. FOR (why are you doing it, Paul?) FOR so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee a light for the GENTILES, THAT thou shouldest be for salvation unto the UTTERMOST PART OF THE EARTH." Why, we find that the GENTILES were to enjoy salvation. Under whose preaching? Paul's! Now, Paul said, "I'm going to turn from the Jews to the Gentiles." Why? "FOR so hath the Lord commanded us." Where? Isa. 49:6. Here's the prophecy. What

does it say? "I have set the light for the GENTILES." Yes, it was prophesied Mr. Baker.

In Rom. 15:9 Paul says that "Jesus Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that he might confirm the promises made of God unto the Fathers, and that it might be fulfilled which was written (Oh, yes. Something's written. Well, what is it?): Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name." Yes, it's there—that Jesus would praise God through the Gentiles. When the Church praises God, Christ is praising God through the Church. Thus the Bible says in Heb. 2:12: "I . . . will praise thee in the church." The Bible says the He would praise God in the Church; but that he would praise Him through the Gentiles; therefore, the Gentiles were to be in the Church. Yes, it's prophesied of.

And in Acts 26: 21-22 Paul says: "I stand unto this day saying (or declaring) NOTHING but what Moses and the Prophets did say should come." This man says, "Oh, yes, Paul you are saying something else." Paul says I "say NOTHING but what Moses and the prophets did say should come." What's that, Paul? "That the Christ should suffer (Baker says that's prophesied of. Yes, and there's something else prophesied of) AND that he should rise from the dead, AND that he should proclaim light BOTH to the people (that means the Jews), and to the GENTILES." The same Bible that says that it was prophesied that Jesus would die, says also that he would proclaim light to the Gentiles. Now do you (Mr. Baker) believe that? You "speak where the Bible speaks.", and you're "silent where the Bible is silent." And the Bible says that this very thing came to pass. And Paul says, "I spake nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come—that Jesus would die and be raised from the dead and proclaim light both to the Jew and the Gentiles." This man says, "Paul, You're wrong! I know that it was prophesied that Jesus would die, and that the Jews might be saved, but when you get on the Gentiles you're on forbidden territory! For when I define mystery or hidden I make it mean that's not so." And, therefore, it's Mr. Baker or Mr. Paul. Now which one are you going to accept? Yes, it was prophesied of.

Then he came to verse 8 of Eph. 3 and spoke of the "unsearchable riches of Christ." Some translations would give

that the "incomprehensible riches of Christ." It doesn't mean that it wasn't prophesied of. It doesn't say it, and it doesn't mean it!

But did you ever hear a man make a break like he made a moment ago? He said that Paul was not saved by grace! I never heard the like in my life! Did you ever hear the beat? That Paul wasn't saved by grace! Pshaw! You can get your pencil out, for I'd like for you to refer to this tomorrow. Yes, he said Paul wasn't justified by grace. (I wish I had a piece of crayon. I think I have one here). Paul said in 2 Tim. 1:9: "Who saved US (do you think Paul was included in that?)—Who saved us, and called US with a holy calling: not according to our works, but by the GRACE (he says, 'It's not so, Paul.' But Paul says it was by the GRACE) which God purposed before times eternal." Paul says that "God saved US." How? "NOT ACCORDING TO WORKS"—"NOT ACCORDING TO WORKS, but His Grace!" In Rom. 5:1 he said: "(we) being justified by faith." (Rogers uses blackboard). Now look at it. When we tie these two passages together we have Paul saying that he was justified by faith, not only that, but here (2 Tim. 1:9) he says he was justified by Grace, and that it is not of Works.

#### Blackboard Diagram

BY GRACE ... THROUGH FAITH ... NOT OF WORKS (2 Tim. 1:9; Rom. 5:1). (referring to blackboard): Now Paul said he enjoyed that, and he has admitted that Paul was saved under PENTECOSTAL PREACHING! The VERY thing that Peter preached on Pentecost. So then, Pentecostal preaching, Mr. Baker, as you have admitted, is "salvation by grace through faith, and that not of works." That happened on Pentecost! Even my worthy opponent has admitted it. For he says that Saul was saved (according to Acts 22:16) under the terms of Pentecostal preaching. But he said never before the days of Paul do you find anything like that. You know his proposition says that salvation like that happened AFTER the conversion of Saul. It doesn't say it started with it, but AFTER the conversion of Saul. Do you wish you hadn't said it? Or, do you want to take it back? You said that Saul wasn't saved by grace. But Paul says, "God saved US." How? "By grace, through faith, and that not of works." And that (not of works) doesn't mean not obeying the gospel either. Now if Paul could be saved by grace through faith and not of

works, and have to be "baptized to wash away his sins;" why couldn't I be, Mr. Baker? I'll have you a question on this tomorrow night. I don't anticipate your answering, but I'm going to ask it anyway. Yes, if Paul could be baptized to wash away his sins and still be saved by grace through faith and not of works, then why couldn't I be? Do you suppose he'll ever answer that one? He'll observe the passover from here 'till Saturday night.

He said the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them." Yes, he was going to send them to the Gentiles, but that doesn't prove that the work was exclusively to them.

Then he referred to 1 Cor. 12:13 that we "are baptized IN one Spirit." Why won't you tell us what the element is that the Spirit uses to baptize in. Or do you think that the Holy Spirit is the element? Do you mean that we're baptized "in the Holy Spirit" like the apostles were on Pentecost? Is that your meaning? Is that exactly what you mean? Now I'm only wanting to find out, because I want to know which end to take hold of! It's going to hurt either way. (Laughter). I don't know how to lighten the punch. I don't know how to keep it from hurting, but I want to be sure that I get hold of the right end of the lash! I would like to know just exactly what he has in mind. Do you mean that the Spirit is the administrator? Or, do you mean that the Holy Spirit is the element in which a man is baptized? I called his attention to the fact that Holy Spirit baptism is a promise (Acts 1:5). Now a promise is a thing received. But in obeying the gospel, we are baptized "into Christ" (Rom. 6:3-4, .16-18). But when we "obey from the heart the form of doctrine," this man must admit that we are baptized into Jesus Christ. But that's a thing we OBEY, not a thing we RECEIVE; therefore, not Spirit baptism—if he's talking about the Spirit being the element. If he means that the Holy Spirit is the administrator, I will admit that the Holy Spirit baptizes people today when the disciples do it, or through them, even as the Bible says that "Jesus baptized not, but His disciples." Jesus baptized, but he did it when His disciples baptized. Now the Holy Spirit may be the administrator in that sense, and if that's what he means I want him to say it? And if he means that the Spirit is the element in which we are baptized, I want him to say that.

But, he said that James wrote his Letter to the "twelve

tribes." Well, it was to those that were in the Church; to those who had "the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ." You never did mention these two passages: James 2:1: "Hold not (brethren) the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons." And in James 5:16 (I called his attention a moment ago that this was in the age of miracles) and (to the sick) James said: "Call for the Elders of the CHURCH." "Call for the Elders of the Church." Who is he writing to? Do you think some old reprobate Jew was to call the "Elders of the Church?" Pshaw! There's something bad wrong! Why, this man is quibbling upon that point. I doubt not that he's sincere, but he's just mistaken. That's all there is to it.

But he said that James taught that the Jews ought to be zealous for the law. James didn't do any such thing! Then he turned around and proved that Paul went in with the four men that had made the vow and did the same thing that James did (Acts 21:19-26). Well, how does that prove that they taught something different—if Paul did exactly what James did? Why, Paul said, "I became all things to all men that I if by any means might gain some." (1 Cor. 9:22). Why, certainly, Paul did observe some of the things of the law, not because they were in the law, but that he might teach them better. That's not parallel at all with water baptism, and we'll get to that just a little bit later.

But he thought that James taught them to keep the law. He said if they were not under the law, why were they zealous of the Law? He said "they had to be zealous of the law." It doesn't say any such thing. James said they "are," but where does it say they "had to be"? Eh? He "speaks where the Bible speaks!" Well, where does it say that? It doesn't say it. I know it doesn't say it. My opponent knows it! Not anybody knows it any better than he does. The Bible does NOT say that they "had to be zealous of the law."

Then he said there were two gospels—one of circumcision, one of uncircumcision. And he wanted to know if circumcision is the same as uncircumcision. Mr. Baker, did you not know that when Paul uses those terms, the "circumcision" means the Jew, and the "uncircumcision" means the Gentiles? Did you ever read Eph. 2? You start at verse 11 and Paul makes very clear that the Gentiles are called "uncircumcision," and the Jews are called the "circumcision." It doesn't mean they had two gospels—one for the Jew and one for the Gentile. There are, rather, two groups of men, one went to the



Jew and one to the Gentiles. And the "gospel of the circumcision was committed unto Peter, James and John" means that Peter, James and John were to preach the gospel to the Jew, and that Paul was to preach the gospel to the Gentile. What gospel? "I am not ashamed of the GOSPEL OF CHRIST, for IT (It, not they) is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek."

Then He said that I said we should follow Abraham. No. He misunderstood me. I said that PAUL said in Rom. 4:12 that we must "walk in the STEPS of that faith of our father Abraham." That means we have a living, obedient faith, as in Heb. 11:8: "By faith Abraham OBEYED to go out into a place which he should after receive for and inheritance." He said that Abraham was justified "by faith alone." Do you want to wind it up? Do you want to just stop it now? THAT VERSE IS NOT IN THE BIBLE! He's "speaking where the Bible DOESN'T speak." It's NOT THERE. Why, Paul says that he was justified by faith without the works of the law, (Rom. 3:28; 4:1-2) but does that say that he was justified without any works? James says that he was justified by works (Jas. 2:21-23). Paul says that he was justified by faith without works. If you'll understand that Paul refers to the law of Moses, and James refers to the working of an obedient faith you can see the difference. Now you see if he comes up and reads where Abraham was "justified by faith alone."

He said, "Why not preach to the Gentiles in Acts 2?" (Time called). Well, my time is up, and I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

### BAKER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Last night as we closed our debate, the debate was closed with a misquotation. The quotation that he gave us last night was that I said that men are justified by grace and through faith, and that Paul was not, or that Paul was saved by grace. I said last night that Paul was not saved—not justified—by faith alone and grace. I stated that the apostle Paul was saved under the Pentecostal administration, and that the apostle Paul was saved while the gospel of the circumcision was being preached. I stated that the apostle Paul received, by revelation, after he was saved the gospel of the grace of God for the Gentiles, and that the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles began with his ministry as is written in our Bibles.

We called your attention to the fact that when Paul was saved he was baptized to wash away his sins. And in Acts 22:16, the apostle Paul giving his testimony, tell us that he was baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus to wash away his sins. We know that the apostle Paul did not receive his message of salvation for the Gentiles all at one time, that Paul's gospel came in his written ministry.

We said last night that the apostle Paul, and the apostle Paul alone, in his epistles sets forth the truth of the one Body, and that we are in that one Body by being baptized in one Spirit into that one Body.

You'll remember that we stated that the apostle Paul was saved, and then he was separated. He was saved in Acts 9. How could Paul preach the revelations that were given to him after he was saved if he didn't even have them? The apostle Paul received his revelations of the Lord from heaven after he was saved. Paul did not receive all of his revelations at one time. He wrote thirteen epistles. And we affirmed that in those thirteen epistles the apostle Paul gives to us God's Divine order for the Church, the Body of Christ, in this administration of grace.

We have affirmed that no where else in any of the other epistles, written by Peter, James, or John, do we find one reference to the Church which is Christ's Body, not one reference that Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church the Body of Christ. We have said that Paul and Paul alone received that revelation from the Lord Jesus Christ.

- In the Book of Galatians, in the first chapter, we are told by the apostle Paul that he did preach the faith that he once destroyed. "The faith that he once destroyed." He did not believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ out from among the dead, nor that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. But when the Lord met him on the road to Damascus, the Risen Christ called him by name and said, "Saul, Saul, Why persecutest thou me? He said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And the Lord sent Ananias to him to tell him what to do, that devout Jew. That Jew that was under the law—God sent him to administer unto the apostle Paul who was yet Saul of Tarsus and was not as yet Paul the apostle to the Gentiles. How could Paul preach the gospel of the uncircumcision if he didn't have it? Paul received it after he was saved.

And in Gal. 1:23 we read: "They (the believers in Jerusalem; the Church in which Peter, James, and John were pillars;

the Church of God that Paul wasted; and the Church of God that Paul hated; the Church of God that the apostle Paul opposed) heard only that he which persecuted us in times past now preaches the faith that he once destroyed, and they glorified God in me." Then in the second chapter Paul says: "Fourteen years after . . ." Here's a new time element. Paul said, "I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also." Paul went up to Jerusalem by revelation. The Lord told him to go there and communicate unto them "that gospel that I preach among the Gentiles, but privately before them which are of reputation"—that's Peter, and James, and John—"lest by any means I had run, or should run in vain. But neither Titus with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, and that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage. To whom we gave place by way of subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel, (the gospel of Christ, the gospel of God, the gospel of our salvation) might continue with me. But of those who seemed to be somewhat (Peter, James, and John), (whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person)—for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference"—that's in the conference in the fifteenth of Acts—they added nothing to Paul, but just the opposite is true. "But contrariwise when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto Peter." You'll notice the statement of the Holy Spirit. That the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto Paul. And the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto Peter. "For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me for the Gentiles. And when James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship that we should go to the heathen, and they to the circumcision."

Now Paul had the gospel of the uncircumcision. And God sent Paul to the Gentiles with this gospel of uncircumcision. Now I'd like to submit to you tonight why I affirm that the gospel of the uncircumcision is the gospel of the grace of God, the gospel of Christ, the gospel of our salvation, and that it was given to Paul by Divine revelation; and that the gospel of

uncircumcision is the gospel that Paul preached to the nations.

You say, "Wherein lies the difference?" The gospel of the circumcision goes back to Genesis 17. God made a covenant with Abraham in Gen. 17. That covenant was in effect and in force until Paul received the gospel of uncircumcision. The gospel of uncircumcision gives to us the right to be saved and justified without circumcision. And the gospel of the uncircumcision is the gospel that we are circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands. And that we are the circumcision that worship God in the spirit and have no confidence in the flesh. The gospel of the uncircumcision was for the apostle Paul's ministry. And he preached that and taught that in his written ministry.

Now I'd like to call your attention to some of these differences for last night, you'll remember, we made this statement that Paul was the beginning of a new order of apostles. In Acts 13 the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me (the Holy Spirit said it) Barnabas and Paul." Separate him from what; and separate to what? The Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." He had preached the faith that he once destroyed, but now he was going to preach the gospel of the uncircumcision, the gospel of the grace of God for the Gentiles.

I'd like to call your attention to the statement that we closed with last night as Brother Rogers was giving to us the fourth chapter of the Book of Romans. You'll remember that he said that we are to follow Abraham. And then he went from Romans, chapter 4, to the Book of James. And the Book of James was written by James to the twelve tribes scattered abroad. We have said that that's a nation. When you have twelve tribes you have a nation. And the gospel of the circumcision has to do with that nation. The gospel of the uncircumcision is for Jews and Gentiles saved in this administration of the grace of God. And both Jew and Gentiles are free from the law, from circumcision, and from the works of the flesh.

I affirm that in Romans, chapter 4, the apostle Paul says in the gospel of the uncircumcision that Abraham was justified by faith. "And Abraham believed God, and God reckoned Abraham righteous." Now God did that before Abraham received the covenant of circumcision. Abraham believed God. Abraham was not a Jew; Abraham did not live under the law. Abraham lived before the law was given. Therefore Abraham did not have the works of the law. Then Abraham received the covenant of circumcision. And when Abraham

received the covenant of circumcision then he was linked up with that circumcised seed. And from Genesis, chapter 17, until Paul received the gospel of the uncircumcision the covenant of circumcision was in effect.

In Acts 15 there were Judaizing teachers which said, "Except the Gentile be circumcised he cannot be saved." It was not yet settled. But when Paul went up to Jerusalem by revelation to communicate unto them the gospel of the uncircumcision, the gospel that he preached among the Gentiles, he said he took Titus with him, and Titus was not compelled to be circumcised because his gospel is a gospel of grace without circumcision, without the works of the law, and without the works of the flesh. The gospel of uncircumcision is found in Romans 4: "What shall we then say, that Abraham our father as pertaining to the flesh hath found? For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." Abraham was not justified by any works. Not the works of the law, for the law was not there. The law came through Moses. And Abraham never lived under the law of Moses. Therefore, Abraham could not be justified before he was circumcised by any work of the flesh, but he was justified by the grace of God.

You'll notice in Romans 4: "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." Now in the Book of James, where we have the gospel of the circumcision, we have the opposite. In the Book of James we are told in the second chapter that Abraham was "justified by works." But Paul said that he was not justified by works. James said that he was justified by works. Paul writes concerning Abraham's faith before he was circumcised. James writes to the twelve tribes. That's the nation of Israel. They have the covenant of circumcision. And in writing to the twelve tribes James preaches, teaches, the gospel of the circumcision. Now you can't say there is no difference for Abraham in circumcision is the father of a nation. And Abraham in uncircumcision is the one that we are to follow.

Paul says in the Book of Romans, and Mr. Rogers called your attention to it last night, when he said we are to "walk the steps of the faith of our father Abraham." But WHERE in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham? WHERE are we to walk in Abraham's steps? Those steps that Abraham took BEFORE he was circumcised. He was saved by believing God, and justified without works.

In the gospel of the grace of God we are not under law, but we are under grace. In the Book of James, we have the "law" over and over again mentioned by James. James says in chapter 2, verse 8, "If ye fulfil the Royal law according to the Scriptures, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect of persons ye commit sin and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit adultery yet dost not kill thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. For ye shall have judgment without mercy to him that showeth no mercy, and mercy rejoiceth against judgment."

Then James says, "Faith without works is dead." James is writing to those that were under law. I called your attention last night to what James said in Acts 21, when he urged even Paul in Jerusalem, in that Church of God in Jerusalem, urged Paul to take a Jewish vow, and that Paul should convince the Jews that he himself kept the law. How could Paul go up to Jerusalem and keep the law, if the law was not in effect in Jerusalem? When they went to Jerusalem there were the ceremonies. And the apostle Paul recognizes that Peter, James, and John had the gospel of the circumcision, but when Paul writes the Book of Galatians he says, "If a man is circumcised Christ shall profit him nothing." Paul tells us that "circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation." The apostle Paul tell us that in the gospel of the grace of God it's to him that "worketh not." James says, "Faith without works is dead." James says, "Faith alone cannot save." James tells us that works are necessary. Because James is writing to those who have received the gospel of the circumcision and the covenant of circumcision.

Abraham, in the Book of James, is our father justified by works. How could Abraham NOT be justified by works in Romans, and be justified by works in the Book of James? The Book of James is written to the Jew; to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, to a nation. And God said to Abraham, "I will make of you a great nation." A nation they became. And later God added to the covenant of circumcision the law of Moses. And in the law of Moses circumcision was required. We're not under law. The law was never given to the Gentile. We are saved without the works of the law. We do not have

anything to do with Abraham in circumcision as far as our works are concerned. We are not under law; we are under grace. And in the gospel of uncircumcision Paul says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." (Tit. 3:5).

I'd like to call your attention to another statement in the Book of Acts, to what Peter said along these same lines. We read in the Book of Acts and in the fifteenth chapter these words: "We shall be saved through grace even as they." "We shall be saved through grace even as they." Peter speaking: "We shall be saved through grace." Now notice this statement that we have in this fifteenth chapter of the Book of Acts. Peter is here referring to the gospel that he had; the gospel that was committed unto him; the gospel of the circumcision. What was that gospel?

In Acts the tenth chapter we have these words, where Cornelius was saved, verse 34: "Then Peter opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Paul says to the members of the Body of Christ, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." Paul says in the Book of Romans, "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly." And in the apostle Paul's Book of Ephesians: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Christ is the end of the law for righteousness in the gospel of the grace of God, in the gospel of uncircumcision, in the gospel where we follow Abraham in uncircumcision, where he was justified by faith.

And again I affirm that there ARE two gospels with two different messages. They are opposite messages. Unless we see that there are two gospels: the gospel of the circumcision and the gospel of the uncircumcision, we see in the Word of God a contradiction. We would have one verse saying that a man is saved by works of righteousness, and the other saying that we are NOT saved by works of righteousness. I affirm that there are two gospels, and that to the apostle Paul the members of the Body of Christ go back—to Paul's separation in Acts 13. And in Paul's written ministry we have God's program for the Body of Christ today.

## ROGERS' THIRD NEGATIVE

Mr. Baker, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm certainly happy that I have the privilege of being here again tonight to respond to the arguments that my opponent has made.

I think the interest is picking up just a little bit and my opponent seems to be getting down to work just a little bit better than he was last night. We're certainly indeed grateful for that.

The first thing that I wish to do is to hand my opponent a list of questions. You know he doesn't answer questions, but we'll see why in just a moment. The questions:

1. What Church did you refer to last night when you said you were formerly Pastor of the First Church of Christ?

You know it has been said, I understand, that Mr. Baker was formerly a member of the Church that I'm a member of. At least that's the impression that has been made upon me. Now, if that's true I'd like to know about it, and if it's not true I'd like to know about it. But if it is true, I'd like to say here that one time Judas Iscariot was a disciple of the Lord, but he betrayed Him. One time Benedict Arnold was a citizen of the United States, but he became a traitor. One time Hymenaeus and Philetus were disciples of the Lord, but Paul said they "erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." (2 Tim. 2:17-18). So if Mr. Baker were to prove that he one time was a member of the Church of the Son of God—all in the world he would do in proving that would be that he had apostatized just like Judas did, and these other men that we have referred to.

2. Since you claim to speak where the Bible speaks and that you are silent where the Bible is silent, Where does the Bible say (1) that man is justified by faith alone?

He signed his name to the proposition that the Scriptures teach that that man is justified by faith alone. Last night he tried to "steal our thunder" by saying that he speaks where the Bible speaks, and that he is silent where the Bible is silent. Well, now then, where does the Bible say that men are justified by faith alone? Do you know where it is? Do you know



of any verse in the Book of God that says that man is justified by faith alone? I challenge you, every inch of you from "top to bottom from crown-lock to bunion," to find it. It's just not in God's Book. And there's not any body that knows it any better than my opponent! But let us notice that he has affirmed that he speaks where the Bible speaks, and that he is silent where the Bible is silent. Let us ask him another question:

(2) Where does the Bible say that we are saved by grace alone? Last night this man affirmed that a man is saved by grace alone. And in that same connection (I'll deal with it again in just a moment) he insisted that if he's wrong, then he'll confess it. Well, he's wrong about it, now we'll see if he'll confess it. Just WHERE does the BIBLE say that we are justified by grace alone?

(3) Where does the Bible say that this dispensation began after the conversion of Saul? Just WHERE IS THAT?

3. If Saul could be baptized to wash away his sins (Acts 22:16), and his salvation be by grace through faith and not of works (Rom. 5:1; 2 Tim. 1:9), Why can not any one else be baptized to wash away his sins and his salvation be by grace through faith and not of works?

He affirms if anyone is now baptized to wash away his sins, that that's not salvation "by grace through faith." He admitted last night that Paul was baptized to wash away his sins, and I pointed out where Paul says that he was saved "by grace through faith and not of works." Now we've proven that Saul was saved under Pentecostal preaching—by grace through faith and not of works. (I'll deal with what he called a mis-quotation in just a minute).

4. Does any writer of the Bible call the Lord's Supper the "Communion of the blood . . . and body of Christ" besides Paul?

He said last night that since Paul was the only writer of the Bible that spoke about the "Body of Christ," that then that Body must have commenced with him. Well, Paul is the only writer that speaks of the Lord's Supper as being the "communion of the body . . . and blood of the Lord." Did the Lord's Supper begin with Paul? I'd like for him to tell us. If he does, he's going to get into trouble. If he says it did not begin with Paul, then Paul may use a peculiar expression concerning a thing that did not necessarily begin with him.

5. Was the Lord's Supper not instituted until after Saul was converted?

6. Do you teach that people are baptized in the Holy Spirit today as the apostles were on Pentecost?

He has affirmed, of course, that man is baptized by the Holy Spirit today. But he does not tell us exactly what he means by that. Now this question is asked for the purpose of bringing him out upon that point.

7. If you teach that "by one Spirit we were all baptized into one Body" in 1 Cor. 12:13 means that the Spirit does the baptizing, what is the element used by the Spirit?

8. Was Matthias appointed an apostle before or after the ascension of Christ?

9. Do you believe with Paul that people today must "walk in the steps of that faith" of our father Abraham?

10. Do you teach people today to follow Abraham in circumcision?

Now, he'll not answer those questions, but I'll show you why in just a moment. We'll get to that right now.

You'll remember that upon last evening the first thing that my opponent was supposed to do was to define the terms of the proposition. He signed his name to an agreement that he would read his proposition and define the terms of it. That's the first rule that he agreed to. And yet he has made three speeches upon this proposition and not one word of definition has he given yet. Mr. Baker, why did you do that? Why have you violated the very first rule that you agreed to? You have flatly and completely refused to define the terms of the proposition when the very agreement that you signed is that you'll do that very thing. Now, you ought to do that even tonight before you close your last speech.

But let us notice why it is that my opponent has dodged the questions. He has flatly refused to answer them. I think that last night Mr. Baker realized that if he did answer the questions he'd wish he hadn't, and now then since he didn't I think he's going wish that he had!

### MY FIRST LIST OF QUESTIONS

1. Unto what gospel was Paul separated?

He quoted the thirteenth chapter of Acts a few moments ago: "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them." And he said that separation was

to preach the gospel of the Son of God. Did you not say that? (Mr. Baker shakes his head negatively.) The gospel of the grace of God? (Mr. Baker agrees, nodding in the affirmative). Is that right? You'll shake on it—that that's the gospel of the grace of God that Paul was separated to preach? Now he agreed! He's agreed that Paul was separated to preach the gospel of the grace of God! Well let's see about that. Rom. 1:1-5: "Paul, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy Scriptures." But this man sitting right here (indicating Baker) says it never was prophesied. That the gospel that Paul was separated unto never was prophesied! Do you want to take it back? Now he says that Paul was separated to preach the gospel of grace; Paul says he was separated to preach the gospel of God, so they're one and the same thing. And since Paul was separated to preach the gospel that was prophesied of, then the gospel of grace was prophesied of! Wish you hadn't said it? Want to take it back? That's the reason the man is not answering the questions. He knows better than to answer them!

When a false teacher gets under fire, the best thing that he can do is to dodge the questions if the man that's asking them doesn't press the issue. Now that's the reason he refuses to answer them. He knows if he says Paul was separated to preach the gospel of grace, then Paul says it was prophesied of. If he says he was separated to some other gospel, why then, of course, he's going to find something different all together (from what he teaches). So we find that Paul was separated to preach that gospel which was prophesied of. And we can give him more on that if he'd like it.

2. Did Peter's gospel anticipate the national acceptance of Jesus as Messiah by Israel?

These fellows have a right pretty theory—if you don't read the Bible. But here is the theory that they have: They think that Jesus came to establish an earthly kingdom; that the Jews rejected him and nailed him to the cross. Then starting on the day of Pentecost they started preaching the "gospel of circumcision," as Peter preached it. And then for a number of years, possibly for six or eight, somewhere along there, they preached that and endeavored to get all national Israel to accept the gospel of God—to accept the gospel of the kingdom. And the promise was, according to these men (I know the Bible doesn't say it), that if they would repent

God would immediately send Jesus back and he would establish an earthly, temporal kingdom. Now the Bible doesn't say anything about Christ coming back to establish an earthly, temporal kingdom. But they say that national Israel was to repent. Mr. Cornelius Stam say in his book (I can give the very page if he wants it) that national acceptance of Jesus as Messiah by Israel was anticipated. Yet in Acts 2:40, in that very first gospel sermon that was preached in the name of Jesus Christ, Peter said to his auditors, "Save yourselves FROM this untoward generation." Why he didn't think they were all going to repent, and thus "the kingdom" be ushered in. He said, "Save yourself FROM this crooked generation." According to this man's theory he ought to have said, "Save yourselves WITH it." Now that's the reason he's not talking—he doesn't want his theory exposed. Then he can go around and say, "I'll tell you, brethren and sisters, if I'd introduced this Rogers couldn't have answered it." That's the reason he isn't introducing them; he's saving them to have something to lean on when he leaves the debate.

3. What was Paul's message to the Jews during his early ministry?

Was it the gospel of the kingdom? Will you please tell me, Was it the "gospel of the Kingdom?" Was it the "gospel of grace"? Or, Was it "both"? You're not answering, and you know why!

But I can tell you what it was. Immediately after the Holy Spirit said, "separate me Barnabas and Saul," he went to Antioch in Pisidia and spoke unto them and said, "Brethren, children of the stock of Abraham ... to you is the word of this salvation sent." This man thinks a kingdom was sent to them, an earthly temporal kingdom. But Paul said, "The word of this salvation is sent unto you."

And in verse 39 he tells what it is: "Through this man is proclaimed unto you the remission of sins." He (Mr. Baker) thinks it was a temporal kingdom. Now Peter had already preached the "remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Paul is preaching the same thing and says, "Through this man is proclaimed the REMISSION OF SINS: and by Him everyone that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

In verses 43 and 44 the Bible says that certain ones followed them, they were about to accept the things that Paul was preaching, and Paul and Barnabas encouraged them to re-

main in "the grace of God." He was preaching the gospel of grace. Now if he had said that he was preaching the gospel of the kingdom, I would have pointed out that he was preaching the gospel of grace; that he was preaching salvation, remission in the name of Jesus Christ.

Then you'll remember that when the Jews rejected that, Paul said, "Seeing you count yourselves unworthy of eternal life (not unworthy of an earthly kingdom, but seeing you count yourselves unworthy of ETERNAL LIFE), lo, we turn to the Gentiles . . . And when the Gentiles heard this (the very thing that Paul said— 'As they heard this' the Revised Version says) they were glad, and glorified the word of God: and as many as were ordained (or as some translations say, disposed) to eternal life believed." The Jews rejected what the Gentiles accepted. Well, what did the Gentiles accept? They accepted salvation; they accepted eternal life. Mr. Baker thinks that the Jew rejected a temporal kingdom. That's just the difference between Bert Baker and the Word of God! You can't believe both of them.

4. When Paul preached the "gospel of the kingdom" did he preach the same thing that Peter preached?

He doesn't have the courage; he doesn't have the fortitude to step out on this platform and answer the question. And I'll tell you why! He knows better. He knows better than to answer the question. He knows that he does not believe that Paul preached exactly the same thing about the Kingdom that Peter did. He doesn't believe that! I'll just say that, and we'll see what he says about it. He can deny it if he wants to. He's a grown man, above twenty-one years old. But I'll tell you that he doesn't believe that Paul preached the same thing that Peter did. Wait and see if he comes to the platform and tells us that he does.

But if Paul didn't preach the same thing that Peter did, how can he say that he did preach the same thing that the twelve preached in Gal. 1:23? But he WILL NOT say that Paul preached the same thing that Peter preached. If he does, he'll disagree with the most outstanding brethren that he has. He's not going to come to it.

5. Is the "great salvation" which was spoken first by the Lord, different from the "word of reconciliation"?

Well, he won't tell us. Here's why: In Heb. 2 the "great salvation" spoken of there started with the Lord, and he knows it's the Great Commission. And he thinks we ought to get

away from that; we ought to leave it; we ought not to have anything to do with that any more. But in Heb. 2:1-2 the Bible say, "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that we have heard lest haply we should let them slip." And the very thing that Paul was afraid these men would let slip is the Great Commission. He (Baker) says, "You'd better let it slip. You'd better turn it loose. Get away from it just as quick as you can!" That's the difference between Baker and Paul. Paul says, "Don't let it slip." Some translations say, "Lest you should drift away from it." If we take the two translations together we have Paul saying, "Don't get away from the Great Commission, and don't let it get away from you!" Mr. Baker says, "Get away from it just as quick as you can. That's under another dispensation." Now that's the reason the man isn't answering questions. He's not in the question answering mood.

7. Is the preaching of the cross a part of the mystery? Well he's afraid to say "Yes;" and he's afraid to say "NO". If he says "yes," we can point out that the cross was a thing that was prophesied of; and, therefore, the mystery was prophesied of. If he says that it isn't a part of the mystery, Paul said, "I preach the cross of Jesus Christ." Yet Paul preached the mystery, and they're the same you see. So he just doesn't answer. He takes what he thinks is the easy route.

6. But he said, you'll remember, in his last speech that there were two gospels. He said that these were opposed one to the other; they were different. Well, what did you tell us Paul would do if speaking to a mixed audience? Would he tell the Jews, "The Lord is going to return and build a temporal kingdom," and then turn around and tell the Gentiles, "I know that's not so, but I've got to keep the Jews fooled just as long as I can"? Now is that what he would have to do? Just what would Paul have done? You haven't answered that; you haven't dealt with it. Why don't you take the questions and answer them? The rules of debate say that you're obligated to do that, and you signed upon your honor to answer these things.

8. Was Saul saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching? He answered that one by saying that he was.

9. Were signs ever performed in connection with the preaching of the gospel of grace?

You know, these Dispensationalists amuse me. They're

about the most illogical people in their arguments I've ever seen. Here's the way they reason: In Mark 16:16 Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:17 says, "These signs shall accompany them that believe." Now, since signs were to accompany the baptism; the signs ceased, therefore the baptism ceased! Now that's the "reasoning" that they have. But you know the Bible says in Rom. 15:18-19; 2 Cor. 12:12 and other passages, that miracles accompanied the preaching of the gospel of grace. Now let's follow their reasoning. Miracles accompanied the gospel of grace; the miracles ceased; therefore, the gospel of grace ceased! That's according to these Dispensational preachers. That's the most ridiculous, absurd, silly argument I ever heard! And I'm not trying to cast reflection upon my opponent. But it's just ridiculous. It's so absurd it's not funny, it's sickening that a man will take a position like that. That's the reason he's not answering.

You know some time these men will bring a bottle of poison, and they'll say, "This man ought to drink it if he's going to follow Mk. 16:16, for these signs were to accompany that." Well they were to accompany faith in the same way. The Bible says, "These signs shall follow them that BELIEVE!" Not just baptism only, but faith too you see. And he (Baker) has believing so I guess he'd have to drink his own poison. Don't you? What do you think about it?

But, if the miracles ceasing proves that the baptism ceased, then why does not the miracles ceasing prove that the gospel of grace ceased? You see why he's not answering — he knows that he'd better not come to the issue. Have you had a debate on this before? (Laughter). I believe he has and found out that it won't do to answer questions.

10. What kind of faith does Paul say avails in Gal. 5:6?

He won't even read the passage! Paul says in Gal. 5:6: "In Christ Jesus neither doth circumcision avail anything nor uncircumcision, but FAITH (faith alone? No! What else?) —faith that WORK BY LOVE." I asked you last night and you never did tell us: Is that faith alone? Is it? The Bible says that the faith that avails is the faith that WORKS. Do you know how that's spelled? That's faith that WORKS by love. Can you add? We have something else that's involved. It's NOT faith alone. This man says it is. Paul says, "The gospel that I preach, and the faith that I declare avails is the faith that works." This man comes along and says it's faith

alone, faith without anything. You can't accept what Paul says and what Baker says. You're going to have to give up one of them.

11. Is man saved now by a living faith or by a dead faith?

He won't say. The Bible says, James 2, that "faith without works is dead." That was true when James wrote it, and it's still true. And I'll tell you right now, I'd just as soon to try to ride a dead horse from here to Middleton as to try to ride a dead faith from here to heaven. You'd get just as far one way as you would the other. Yet this man says you get there (heaven) by faith alone. And James says, "Faith is dead being alone." He's trying to ride a dead faith to heaven. It just won't work. You can't goad him; you can't punch him; you can't spur him enough to make him move. It's dead.

12. Faith without works is dead—the Bible says so.

13. Is "Faith alone" faith without works? Is it? James says it is.

14. You never did tell us, Was Cornelius saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching? Is that exactly the same thing that Peter preached on Pentecost? Or, is it something that Paul preached to the Gentiles? Or, is it just a mixture? You tell us about that when you come to the platform.

But I want to notice one or two things that I didn't have opportunity to get to last night. (And I'll answer all that he says before this second session shall close, or my second speech shall close tonight).

He asked the question, Why did Peter not preach to the Gentiles in Acts 2? Well, he did in a sense. The Bible says that at Jerusalem there were sojourners there "both Jews and proselytes." (v. 10). Do you know what a proselyte is? He's a Gentile that has accepted the Jews religion. But he's still a Gentile. He is a GENTILE that has accepted the JEWS RELIGION. So there were Gentiles there, and he did preach to them.

Moreover, YOU never did tell us why Peter preached to the Jews, "To you and your children and to ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF." And Paul said the Gentiles were those afar off in Eph. 2:11-17. Why didn't you mention that?

And in Acts 3:25 Peter said it was intended that the gospel should FIRST be preached to the Jews. But he said it is "for all the families of the earth." Why didn't you mention that? You know, he's got one of the grandest, one of the



most wonderful "forgetteries" I've ever seen. It's splendid! It's oiled and working nicely in this debate.

He said that we are saved by grace, and grace alone, and "I'll give up if I'm proven to be wrong." Well, I'll tell you what I'll do: Will you open my Book, I'll not even ask you to stand up, but will you open my Bible where it says we are saved "by grace and grace alone?" Will you? If you'll open it and mark it, I'll read it and quit the debate NOW. Do you see him opening it? It's just not there, ladies and gentlemen. No one knows it better than Bert Baker. Are you going to give it up? You said you would give up your error when you were proven to be wrong. The Bible doesn't say that, now does it? Now come on, Bert! Does it say it? (Laughter). Does it say it? I want to know! Is it in the Bible?

He said that Paul was not one of the twelve. No, but he was an apostle just like the rest of them. You'll remember that I read last night 1 Cor. 9:5 where Paul said, "Am I not an apostle ... Do I not have a right to lead about a wife like the rest of the apostles?" He said, "Don't I have that right just like the rest of the apostles." He put himself in the very same class. What has he (Baker) said about it?

But he said they were to sit on twelve thrones, and that Jesus didn't say thirteen thrones. No, because there were just twelve there when he was speaking. He couldn't say, "I give you thirteen thrones" speaking to twelve men—unless one of them was going to occupy two thrones. That's ridiculous.

Well what does it mean? He said they would sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. When? "In the regeneration"—in the time that people are regenerated. Are people regenerated today? Titus 3:5 says we are. Well then, they're judging today. To be seated upon twelve thrones means that they were given power to judge, to lay down the laws and rules by which a man might be saved (Matt. 16:19). Does Paul have that power? He said we are going to be judged according to his gospel (Rom. 2:16). So he occupies the same place that they do you see. He's not getting any place.

And he says that Paul received the "mystery" for the Gentiles "to fulfil the Word of God" (Col. 1:25). You know, Mr. Baker, that word fulfil (you said complete last night immediately after you read it) is found in Mt. 1:22: "Now all these things are come to pass that it might be fulfilled . . .

which is spoken by the prophets, A virgin shall be with child." Paul preached the gospel to the Gentiles, the mystery to the Gentiles, that the "Word of God might be fulfilled." What does it mean? Why, to fulfil the prophesies concerning that. He (Baker) says there are no such prophecies, and the very passage that he read proves that there were. Acts 13:46-48 also proves that and he's never breathed it to this good moment.

But he says that I misquoted him last night. He says that he said that men are justified "by faith through grace and Paul was NOT justified by faith alone and grace." No, and no other person under high heaven has ever been saved by grace alone and through faith alone and you can't prove it.

(Mr. Baker speaks from his seat: "You just said a moment ago that he was.") NO! I didn't say that Saul was saved by grace alone or by faith alone. I've denied it all the time. You said that he was saved under Pentecostal preaching. Paul said that he was "saved by grace through faith and not of works" (Rom. 5:1; 2 Tim. 1:9), but that's not grace alone nor faith alone! I know it's getting warm isn't it? (Mumbling on Mr. Bakers side). (Laughter).

(Mr. Baker: "A-men").

But now let us notice exactly what Paul does say. Paul had to be baptized to "wash away his sins" (Acts 22:16). And yet the Bible says that he was saved by grace through faith and not of works (2 Tim. 1:9; Rom. 5:1). Why that does not say that Saul was saved by faith alone nor by grace alone. Last night you said that Saul was not saved by grace, and later on you said by grace alone. Never was anybody saved by grace alone—in the sense of a sinner. Not at all.

Now, if Saul could be by grace through faith and not of works, and he had to be baptized to wash away his sins, if I am baptized to wash away my sins, why am I not saved by grace through faith and not of works? If PAUL was saved by grace through faith and not of works under Pentecostal preaching why can't I be saved that way? You deny that Pentecostal preaching was salvation by grace through faith and not of works. Don't you? Don't you deny that? I challenge him to say "Yes" or "No", or to bat his eye! Yes, Paul says he was saved by grace through faith and NOT OF WORKS. This man (Baker) and the Bible too points out that he was saved under Pentecostal preaching—that he was baptized to wash away his sins. That's what salvation by

grace through faith is, Mr. Baker. Don't you see that? Well there's something wrong if you're not catching on.

But he said that Paul received the gospel of grace after conversion. I realize that thoroughly, that Paul was converted and then received it. But I can show you something else. Paul said "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, but preached in Damascus and in Jerusalem and in all the country of the Jews that men should repent and turn to God." He preached that both to the Jews and to the Gentiles.

Then he said that Paul alone sets forth the truth of the "one Body." Now he is, of course, using the term "Body" there. When he answers the question about the Lord's Supper we'll have some more to do with that one. Paul mentions "the Body." And he's the only writer that speaks of the Church as the Body. He thinks, therefore, the Church started with Paul. Well Paul is the only writer that speaks of the Lord's Supper as being the communion of the blood and body of the Lord. But I want him to say that the Lord's Supper began there. He doesn't have the courage to either affirm it or deny it. You watch and see. He'll be as silent as the grave about it when he comes to the platform.

He said that Paul did preach the faith that he once destroyed. Yes, and he said I continue. Did you not get that last night? You say he quit. Paul said, "I continue" (Acts 26:22). Did you not get that? Paul said, "I continue." Bert Baker says, "Paul, you didn't do it you stopped." Paul said, "I continue—I'm still at it!" And he was still at it in Acts 28:28-30. Mr. Baker says, "Now, Paul, I beg your pardon, sir, but you quit. I know that one time you did it, but you quit."

But he said that Gal. 2 referred to something that happened fourteen years after. Yes, but it doesn't mean that Paul didn't preach it until that time. It was that time when he went up and told the Church at Jerusalem that God had permitted him to preach to the Gentiles.

But he said that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul, and the gospel of the circumcision to Peter. And he says that it was "of" and not "to". Well if he had just read verse 8 he would have found that "of" meant "unto." Paul said, "He that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also UNTO the Gentiles." Now can't you see that what he's talking about is that Peter was an apostle of the circumcision, he was an apostle UNTO

them. Verse 8 says it is. This man gets up and tries to make this mean that there were two different gospels.

He says that the covenant of Gen. 17 was in force until Paul received the gospel of uncircumcision. That's not so. The Bible doesn't teach that. Mr. Bert Baker said it. The Bible says in Jno. 7:22, "MOSES hath given you circumcision, not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers." The law of circumcision was incorporated into the law of Moses. Now what happened to the law of Moses? It was nailed to the cross. Well, what happened to circumcision? It went the same way; it went to the cross just exactly when the law did! (Jno. 7:22; Eph. 2:13-17). It won't do you any good to dodge it.

He said again that Paul had preached the faith that he once destroyed. Yes. But he said now he preaches the gospel of grace. In preaching the gospel of grace, he preached the gospel of the Kingdom. In preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, he preached the gospel of grace. In Acts 20:24-25 Paul said concerning the grace of God that he would fulfill his ministry to "preach the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all among whom I went about preaching the Kingdom, shall see my face no more." He uses them interchangeably. Mr. Baker wants to make something different out of them.

He said that Romans 4 and James 2 referred to different things. Yes. Romans 4 referred to the works of the law—that Abraham was not justified by keeping the works of the law. James 2 refers to the working of an obedient faith.

But he says James 2 was written to the twelve tribes. Mr. Baker, Why did you not answer James 2:1 where James says, "Brethren, hold not the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons," and Jas. 5:14, "Call the elders of the Church?" This man thinks that he was writing to all the Jews. He was doing no such thing. He was writing to those that were in the Church. Can't you read that? JAMES 5:14! It says the CHURCH! This man gets up and says, "All Israel whether or not they have obeyed the gospel."

Then he said that Abraham was justified in uncircumcision. Abraham was justified by an OBEDIENT FAITH. But James says that faith was not "fulfilled" until he offered Isaac his son upon the altar in James 2. (I'll deal with that more thoroughly in my next speech).

Mr. Baker said that he (Abraham) was not justified by "any works." We have it on the tape. He said not justified

by "any works." JAMES said he was "justified by WORKS." Baker says "Not any of them, neither the law of Moses nor any other works." Well it's either Bert Baker or the inspired James, whichever one you want to accept. Which one do you want? I'll take James. (Time called). I thank you very kindly).

#### BAKER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

We'd like to call your attention again to the fact that I'm affirming, not denying. That's my business. I'm affirming truth. I'll ask him the questions tomorrow night.

In my statement in the beginning I said that the Bible teaches that there are two gospels. Not I teach it, not Stam teaches it, but Paul teaches it, that there is the gospel of circumcision and the gospel of the uncircumcision.

Mr. Rogers said that baptism is necessary for entrance into the Body of Christ, and yet he has this dilemma: He has twelve apostles that never were baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. How did they get into the Body? He says you can't get into the Body of Christ without being baptized. And here are twelve men who were baptized when Jesus was on the earth ministering to Israel, the lost sheep, preaching the gospel of the kingdom.

I have never said that Paul preached the kingdom. He said that. He put those words in my mouth. You never heard me say that. I said Paul was preaching the gospel of the grace of God. And I said that the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." In Acts 14:14 we have two new apostles, Barnabas and Saul. Why do we need two more apostles? God had twelve. Matthias filled up the number of twelve. But Paul and Barnabas are not associated with the twelve. God has a new order of apostles in the apostles Paul and Barnabas and Silas and Timotheus (1 Thess.). We have that borne out.

Last night he asked me, "What about the mystery of iniquity?" Well, where did he get that? Out of Paul's gospel. He hasn't quoted one word from Peter or James or John to show that they were in the Body of Christ. Not one word! Why is it that these, Peter, James, and John do not mention the Church which is Christ's Body? Ask yourself the question then answer it. How did twelve apostles baptized under John's baptism get into the Body of Christ?—Twelve of them, and all of these were baptized in John's baptism. How, I say,

did they get into the Body of Christ, when the apostle Paul tells us in 1 Cor. 12:13 how we got into the Body of Christ? The Holy Spirit says, "In one Spirit were we all baptized." He did not say, "In water were we all baptized." He said, "In one Spirit." I have always admitted that Cornelius had two baptisms. He has admitted that the apostles were baptized by Christ in Spirit. He has admitted that there are more than two baptisms in the Book of Acts. But Paul says that in the administration of grace, "There is one Lord, one faith, ONE baptism." Now which one are you going to eliminate in this administration of the grace of God?

Then our opponent said that the apostle Paul did not end circumcision. He went up to Jerusalem for that very matter. Turn with me to Acts, chapter fifteen, if you will, and I'll show you that Paul even in Acts 16, because of the Jews circumcised Timothy. Why did Paul circumcise Timothy? Was circumcision for the Body of Christ? Or, is there an overlapping of administrations? I'll ask our opponent to answer WHY Paul baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and circumcised Timothy.

In Acts 15 notice this: "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." Note that, what these brethren said. Then verse 2: "When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension about this matter they determined that Paul and Barnabas . . ." Why Paul and Barnabas? Why is the latter part of the Book of Acts taken up with Paul and Barnabas and those associated with him?

Now, notice in the Book of James we have the word assembly. It's synagogue. Does our debater believe that the synagogue is the Church of Christ? In the Book of James they were in the synagogue—that's where you'll find Jews. And the twelve tribes are all Jewish. And in the synagogue you find circumcised Jews. Now in the Book of James we have the synagogue mentioned. Where the word assembly is it's the word synagogue. And I'm sure that you don't believe that we are in a synagogue tonight. We're not Jews; we're members of the Body of Christ. In Christ Jesus there's neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female, we're all one in the Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:28). That's Pauline truth. We were baptized in one Spirit into the one Body. Why doesn't he quote that from Peter? or James? or John? One quota-

tion from any of those writings will do. "IN ONE Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." When was Peter baptized, and James and John, into the Body of Christ? Answer that question! It's important.

He said last night that God set them in the Church. Without water baptism? Under the Great Commission? How did God set them in the Church if they were never baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit? How did God set them in? Paul says in 1 Cor. 12:13, "In one Spirit were we ALL baptized into one Body." Now Peter, James, and John never were re-baptized after the Great Commission was given. They were baptized in the time that John the Baptist was preaching to Israel. When God's salvation was only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. "Go not into any way of the Gentiles . . ." And these twelve apostles, and I ask you again tonight, How did they get into the Body without being baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit and for the remission of sins? They never were baptized after the Lord Jesus Christ ascended to heaven. They were baptized with the power of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. They were baptized, as Jesus said, and as John the Baptist said, "I indeed baptize you in water . . . but He (Christ) that cometh after me shall baptize you in Holy Spirit." They received that baptism in Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. And when they received that baptism in Spirit they were filled with power.

Let me ask you a question. Can a person get into the Body of Christ in any other way than 1 Cor. 12:13? Romans 6 says, "Buried with Christ . . . by baptism into death." And yet my opponent has admitted that Peter, James, and John were baptized before Christ died. In the Book of Galatians we are "baptized into Jesus Christ." We are baptized into His death; we are circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands; we are baptized into the faith of the operation of God. And our opponent tonight will have to convince you from the Scriptures that these twelve men were baptized into the Body of Christ in some other way than the Great Commission. I know Peter preached it, but the apostle Peter never did submit to it anywhere in the Bible. And "where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent we are silent."

In the Book of Acts, chapter 15 the question of circumcision was not settled. When Paul went up with the gospel of the uncircumcision it was settled. The gospel of the circum-

cision put an end to the covenant that God made with Abraham for the members of the Body of Christ for salvation. Because the Jews would not allow another uncircumcised Jew in the synagogue or in the temple Paul did circumcise Timothy for his mother was a Jewess and his father was a Greek.

A moment ago he challenged me to say that the apostle Paul continued on with his ministry—the faith that he once destroyed. I've pointed out every time that I've presented this truth that in Paul's writings we have the message of the grace of God. He does not go to Paul, he goes to Dr. Luke, the Book of Acts. Did Paul write the Book of Acts? Or, did Luke write the Book of Acts? Dr. Luke was with Paul, but the apostle Paul wrote the Book of Romans.

He said, "Are ye justified by faith?" You remember in the Book of Galatians Paul says, "Before the faith came, we were shut up under the law unto the faith that should afterwards be revealed." Paul said in Gal. 2:20, "I have been crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God." In the Book of Romans, in the third chapter, it is "the faith of the Son of God" that is emphasized.

Let me call your attention to Rom. 3:21-22: "But now the righteousness of God without the law . . ." How could James preach the law? You notice he never denied that James was preaching the law. Not once did he say that those twelve tribes that James was preaching to was not under law. He can't show you that in the Book of James. You can find it in the Book of Romans. You can find it in the Book of Galatians. You can find that circumcision is not for the Body of Christ in the Book of Galatians. You can find everything that the apostle Paul says about the end of signs in Paul's epistles. Why doesn't he go to Peter, and James and John and say that signs are ceased. He goes to Paul. Why does he have to go to the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 13: "Where there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away." Why go to Paul? Because he's the apostle to the Gentiles with the gospel of the grace of God and the revelation of the mystery.

Listen to Romans 3: "Now the righteousness of God is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no differ-



ence: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Abraham was not under the law, and Paul says that he was justified without works. In what way was Abraham justified without works? James writes of Abraham in circumcision; Paul writes of Abraham in uncircumcision.

Now, I'd like to make one point. He said that I said that the gospel was the mystery. I never said that! He put those words in my mouth. I said the gospel is one thing, and the mystery of the gospel is another thing. I never said the gospel was not prophesied. I never said anywhere in my debate that the Gentiles were not to have the gospel preached to them. Salvation for the Gentiles is not the mystery. What is the mystery? We've been talking about it, and our opponent says there is no mystery, nothing was hid, it was all prophesied.

Let me quote a text from Romans 16, and let me quote it in this way so that you can see that the gospel is one thing and that the mystery of the gospel is another thing. The gospel is, "Christ died for my sins according to the scriptures, and was buried, and on the third day arose from the dead." My opponent always goes to Paul for the gospel. Always does he go to Romans 1:16. That's Paul gospel. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to every one that believes to the Jew first and also to the Greek." The apostle Paul says that in that gospel "is the righteousness of God revealed out of faith and for faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith." The gospel is not the secret I never said it was. But Paul had a mystery that was hid in God. He said so. He said it was "hid from generations and ages past." Now if it was hid from generations and ages it was not the gospel. He just got through telling us that the gospel is found all over the Old Testament. It's not hid. It's not hid to men today, but the mystery, the secret that was committed to Paul,

that was given to Paul by Christ has to do with the Church Body, Jews and Gentiles one. Jews and Gentiles with the same inheritance in the heavenlies in Christ. And they're JOINT-partakers of his promise is the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and that the Gentiles and the Jews have one Glorified Head at the right hand of God. Not once has he said in Acts 2 that Christ was raised up to be the head of the Church the Body. It isn't there! Every time that he speaks of the head of the Church he goes to Paul. And I challenge him to produce one passage that says that the Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the Church the Body in the Book of Acts when Peter was preaching.

I said that Peter preached, and Peter did preach it in the gospel of the circumcision, "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but ... he that feareth God and worketh righteousness . . ." That's what Peter Preached in the tenth chapter of the Book of Acts. In the Book of Titus Paul said, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." Now, I'm made to say, Haven't you the mind to see that "to him that worketh NOT" cannot be "to him that works righteousness"? Paul said, "To him that worketh NOT." Peter said, "He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." I ask you again, Is it one thing to work righteousness and another thing "NOT by works of righteousness which we have done"? That's Paul again. Wherever you have grace in its purity, and grace in its finality you go to Paul.

He said that Paul filled up the sufferings of Christ, and that Paul filled up the Word of God. That's truth. I said that, that Paul fills up the Word of God, that he fills up the suffering of Christ for the Body's sake, the Church. That's in the Book of Colossians.

Let me give you Romans, chapter 16. It's in your Bible. The gospel and the mystery are not the same thing. I never said they were. He said that Paul was offering the kingdom. We're going to debate the kingdom this week. We've got some more nights coming. So I'm not going to debate tonight what I'm going to debate next time. We're going to debate the kingdom then we'll find out whether or not the apostle Paul was preaching the same thing the great apostle Peter was preaching when he preached to the circumcision and Cornelius. (And we're going to deal with Cornelius. He had two baptisms. He was baptized in Spirit before he was baptized in water.)

Then let me call your attention to Romans, chapter 16. These are facts, brethren. These are in your Bibles. These are not my words. God bless you, get away from Stam and O'Hair. Get away from Baker. Get back to Paul. He's our apostle. "Follow me as I follow Christ," he said. And if you follow Paul as he followed Christ, unto Paul was given the dispensation of the grace of God for the Gentiles—that's what Paul said. He denies it. He said Paul never said, "It was given to me." Tell me: Why did Paul write thirteen letters to the Gentiles, and not Apollos and not anyone else? Only Paul. We ask him to go outside of Paul and find these Sacred Secrets that we have in Paul's writings. He hasn't produced them in James. He can't find it there! It's not there! You search it, and you can't see it there. That's written to the twelve tribes. Paul wrote to the Gentiles. And what you find to the twelve tribes, Israel, you don't find to the Gentiles in the gospel of the grace of God.

This is Romans 16. Listen to what Paul says, verse 25: "Now to him that is of power to stablish you (Bless God, the grace of God that Paul preached established them)—now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel (You ever hear that before? Listen), according to my gospel AND the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery." Now, there are two things there: The preaching of the gospel (that's found everywhere in the Scriptures). Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. God raised him from the dead, that's according to the Scriptures, the third day, but not that the Gentiles were to be in a JOINT-BODY. You can't find that in the Scriptures.

He said that Paul preached none other thing than Moses and the prophets said should come. Then he goes on and says that Christ died and that he arose on the third day. That's the gospel. That's not the mystery. There's a difference between the gospel of our salvation prophesied, and the mystery that the Gentiles in spirit are in a JOINT-BODY, a JOINT-INHERITANCE, and are JOINT-PARTAKERS in Christ by the gospel whereof Paul was made a minister.

Listen again: "Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began." That's in your Bible. I didn't say that, not Baker, but Paul. It's not Baker or this debater here, it's Paul we're appealing to tonight. We're not present-

ing anything that any man said, but what you find in your Bible and mine. Now I ask you again, When Paul said, "According to the revelation of the secret which was kept secret since the world began, but NOW (at the time Paul was preaching it)—but NOW is made manifest by the prophetic writings . . ." (And these are Paul's writings).

You know last night he said, "What are you going to do with the mystery of iniquity?" Why, I'll give it to Paul. He was the dispenser of the secrets of God. It is Paul that said, "I show you a mystery: we all shall not sleep, but we shall all be changed." Who said that? Paul! Paul said, "Blindness in part hath happened to Israel." That is a mystery. That's Paul. Go on in Paul's writings and you'll find that he is the dispenser of God's precious secrets and God's precious promises. Of course, there is in Paul's ministry that which is prophesied and that which is unsearchable—that which you cannot track out, that which you cannot trace out. The gospel is trackable. You'll find it in Isa. 53 and Psa. 22 that our Savior was doing to die. But my message is I'm affirming these facts tonight from the Word of God. I'm affirming that the apostle Paul preached the gospel of our salvation, the gospel of uncircumcision, and the revelation of the secret that was committed to Paul that was kept secret since the world began. And through Paul's prophetic writing are NOW made manifest. Go to Corinthians and you'll find it.

Then again let me call your attention to what the apostle Paul said in the Book of Ephesians, chapter 3. He said last night not one passage of Scripture where the apostle Paul said that the dispensation of the grace of God for the Gentiles was committed to him. I challenge that statement! The apostle Paul said, "I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles." You're not the twelve tribes. You're Gentiles. And the Jews that heard Paul's gospel, like tonight if there's a Jew here or a Gentile, if they put their faith and trust in what God said in his Word they shall have together a joint-inheritance. There was no difference. There are not two gospels today. There's the gospel of our salvation. There are not two messages today. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father, who is above all, and over all, and through you all." In this administration of grace we are forgiven through the riches of his marvelous grace. We're surrounded by grace. God rains grace. And in this administra-

tion of grace we have abounding grace. "Where sin doth abound, grace doth superabound."

Now again. If my opponent makes Romans 6 the way into the Body of Christ, and that's water, he's got to exclude Peter and James and John and the rest of them. You can't take Romans 6 and put the crowd in. The twelve apostles were baptized, I tell you, after Jesus Christ was raised from the dead and ascended into heaven. So you've got to leave the twelve out if you make Romans 6 water.

If you go to 1 Cor. 12:13, "In one Spirit." That's what God said, not what I say, not what the preacher wants me to say, but that's what God says. "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body . . . and were all made to drink into one Spirit." Search the Scriptures. Don't believe any man, but trust God for light.

#### ROGERS' FOURTH NEGATIVE

Worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm happy to appear before you for the last speech on this proposition. First, I want to notice the questions that my opponent didn't answer. You know, Mr. Baker, if I were to do your questions like you've done mine I think my brethren would give me a spanking and send me home. I honestly believe they would, and they ought to. And I'm just letting you know that's what I think yours ought to do with you. I don't think my brethren would appreciate my coming down here and just ignoring and dodging and sidestepping and refusing to meet the issue. I'd be ashamed to be a man that claims to be an outstanding Dispensational preacher that does not have the courage to come up and answer the questions that are asked on what you teach.

When I talked to Brother Robert Witt about the debate here, he said, "Whenever you meet Mr. Baker, you'll have met the cream of the crop, the finest the dispensationalists have." Well, I believe that, and suppose that that's still true tonight. But I'll tell you right now, If I were these "grace people" I'd see that my preachers learned how to answer questions! I'd take them off and teach them a lesson on answering questions. I'd do that. I think they need to start a school on How To Answer Questions! They haven't learned that as yet, just how to do it.

## MY SECOND LIST OF QUESTIONS

1. But, you know that I suggested that he has left the impression in the country that he one time was a member of the Church of Christ. Now I don't know where he aims to leave that impression or not. But in his very first minute of his first speech last night he said that he was one time "Pastor of the First Church of Christ." Then he began to talk about the Campbells. Well, you tell us, Sir, just what Church you were a member of when you left and went to the Dispensationalists. I'd like to know if you were a member of the Church of Christ just who it was that baptized you, I'd like to know when and where and what Church (congregation) you were a member of. I'll tell you I don't believe that the man has ever been a member of the Church of Christ. He may have been. As I said, Judas was one time a disciple of the Lord. That's the reason that question was asked. They seem to make capital of the fact, or try to, that he says that one time he was a member of the Church of Christ. They even announced that on the radio, and some of the brethren in Arkansas heard it and came and asked me about it. And I said, "I don't know whether he ever has been or not, but, brethren, if there's anyway to I'll find out." But I don't believe you can find out. I don't think you can find out because he won't confess and he won't deny.

2. Let us notice also his trying to "steal our thunder," that he "speaks where the Bible speaks, and that he's silent where the Bible is silent." I asked him since he makes that affirmation, Where does the Bible say that man is justified by faith alone? What did you say about that? I just wonder where that verse is! We've been here two nights. He has completed his fourth speech and not one single time has he read the passage that says that man is justified by faith ALONE! And if he stayed on this subject for three more days or three more years he couldn't give it. Why? It's not in God's Book! He has affirmed it; signed his name to the proposition, but he cannot find it. I've read to him time and time again that man is NOT justified by faith alone (Jas. 2:24). He says, "I know that's not true—I know he is." He said that was written to the twelve tribes and I'll deal with that again in just a moment because he quibbled on that a moment ago.

3. Then he says that if a man is saved today under the Pentecostal preaching, then that's not salvation "by grace

through faith and not of works." Well, I pointed out that to be saved under the preaching of Peter and under the Pentecostal gospel is exactly that. Paul was saved under Pentecostal preaching. This man says he was. Yet Paul, "God saved US (that included Paul)—God saved us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but by his GRACE." In Romans 5:1 he said it's "by faith." Now Paul said he was saved by faith, through grace, and it's not of works. But he was saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching. If you want to be saved "by grace, through faith, and not of works," then you be baptized to "wash away your sins" after you believe sincerely and repent of your sins as the Bible directs. (Acts 22:16). And then, even this man here must admit that you'll be saved by grace, through faith because Paul was. Paul was saved under teaching of the Pentecostal gospel. But Paul was saved by grace, through faith, not of works! Then to be saved by the Pentecostal preaching is to be saved by grace, through faith, and not of works! And this man is quibbling when he says that it's a different gospel. Can't you see that? (Laughter). Have you not figured that out yet?

4. Then I asked him, Does any writer of the Bible call the Lord's Supper the "communion of the blood . . . and body of Christ" besides Paul?

You know, he says, "Find the Body in somebody's writings besides Paul's. You find something about Christ being the head of the Church in somebody's writings besides Paul's." He reaches the conclusion, therefore, that the Church as the Body of Christ did not exist until the days of Paul. That's his conclusion. And yet we find that no writer spoke of the Lord's Supper as being the "communion of the blood and body of the Lord" until Paul. Well, did the Lord's Supper begin, then, with Paul? I dare you to say yes. Did it? Did it? (Laughter). I'd just love to know! You know the Lord instituted the Supper back in Matt. 26 and Mark 14. And in 1 Cor. 11 Paul said when he delivered it unto the Corinthians, after they were converted, that he delivered what the Lord delivered on the night he was betrayed. That didn't start with Paul did it? Or, Was Paul converted the night the Lord was betrayed? He said the Lord's Supper started the night He was betrayed, and yet it's not called the "communion of the blood and body of the Lord" until Paul! This man would Like, therefore, to get up and say that since it's not called the "communion of the blood and body of the Lord" un-

til Paul, then the Lord's Supper started with Paul. But Paul said it started the night that Jesus was betrayed. So just because Paul uses a peculiar term in expressing a thing doesn't prove that it commenced with Paul. Aren't you ashamed now for taking that dodge? Can't you see that? It seems to me that a grown man ought to be able to see that just because Paul uses a particular term in describing the Lord's Supper (that no other writer used) that does not prove that it began with Paul. Well, if it doesn't prove it about the Lord's Supper why does it the Church of the Son of God? It doesn't! That's just a Dispensational teaching.

But I remember right there that he said a moment ago, "You all forget the writings of Stam and O'Hair and Baker and Just take the Bible." If you do you'll QUIT being Dispensationalists! You know the only way that I know anything about what Bert Baker teaches? I had to write Mr. J. C. O'Hair and some of his other brethren and get their books and tracts, because I couldn't find it in the Book of God! I found some of their perversions. I found where they had perverted some of the Scriptures and where they had twisted and wrested some in their books. Yes, indeed! But you can't find it in the Bible. I had to order some of their books. I had to read O'Hair's work, and Stam's, had to find out about their work from "Dr." Charles Baker. (I don't know whether he's related to you or not.) But I had to get their books in order to know what you teach, because it's not in the Bible. We can't get away from them and know what you say about it. My goodness, Man! what's wrong with you?

5. Then I asked him if the Lord's Supper was not instituted until after Saul was converted and he wouldn't say. Why? You figure it out for yourself. He knows. And I think that he knows that you know too.

6. Do you teach that people are baptized in the Holy Spirit today as the apostles were on Pentecost? You just as well to answer. (Mr. Baker: Shakes his head in the negative). They're not? Then that baptism in 1 Cor. 12:13 is not the same baptism that they had. Then the baptism by the Holy Spirit that's referred to there the Spirit is the administrator of it. Now, would you be so kind as to tell us what element he used?

(Mr. Baker speaks from his seat: "Tomorrow night.")

Tomorrow night. All right, he's a very promising man, isn't he? We started out discussing this the first night, and



now he's going to do it tomorrow night! We're going to see! Yes, we're going to find out, he's going to tell us tomorrow night. He's a very promising man. You ought to have done that the first night when you started debating. But now he says he'll answer tomorrow night. We'll see that he does; we'll give him another written question on it.

8. Was Matthias appointed an apostle before or after the ascension of Christ?

He tried to make a big play last night upon the argument that Paul was appointed an apostle after Christ ascended. I pointed out that there was another that was appointed after Christ ascended, Matthias. He tried to quibble on that by saying that Matthias saw Jesus after the resurrection and before the ascension. I agree with that. But certainly he was not appointed an apostle until after the ascension. Was he? He was appointed after the ascension, wasn't he? Then he was appointed an apostle the same time Paul was wasn't he—after the ascension? Now you tried to make a big distinction last night and now you admit that Matthias was just like Paul as far as the ascension of Christ is concerned. (Mr. Baker agreed from his seat). Well, he's coming along. We may get him after awhile! (Laughter).

9. Do you believe with Paul that people today must "walk in the steps of that faith" of our father Abraham?

Do you know how he Read Rom. 4:11? He said that Paul said in Rom. 4:11 that we are to "follow in the steps of Abraham before he was circumcised." He didn't say any such thing. You can't find "before he was circumcised" in Rom. 4:12. Paul didn't say, "Follow him before he was circumcised." He said, "Follow in the steps of Abraham." Mr. Baker is the man that speaks where the Bible is silent. He's put something in there.

But he said in that connection that Abraham was not justified by any work. Well James says "Ye see then how that by WORKS our father Abraham was justified when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar." (Jas. 2:21-23). This man says it was not by ANY works; James says that it was by the work of offering his son. You can't believe Bert Baker and James too. But he comes along and says, "I'll tell you about James, he was writing to the twelve tribes." Yes, he was writing to the twelve tribes, so he wrote something to them that wasn't so, I suppose! Since he as writing to the Jews it's not so! He told a fib when he wrote it. Did he? Or,

is it not just as true even though it was written unto the Jews?

But let us notice something else. He said that this referred to the law. And that they were under the law. Yes, but what law? You read it in verse 12, that men are to live "as men that are to be judged by the law of LIBERTY!" Why, don't you know what the "law of liberty" is? The Bible says in Rom. 8:1: "We are made free by the Law of the Spirit of life," the New Testament, the New Covenant, the gospel of the grace of the Son of God. James said, "a law of liberty." Why, the law of Moses is not a law of liberty, is it? James says here that the law he was referring to is the law of liberty. Peter said that that was a "bondage" and a "yoke" which "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear" (Acts 15:10). James was not talking about the law of Moses, he was talking about the "law of liberty." He even names it. And this man comes up and says, "James says they were under the law of Moses." Now, that's not true.

But he says that James told Paul to keep the law. Now I realize that Paul was doing certain things that were in the law, not because they were in the law, but because he desired to gain his brethren. He wanted to know why. Well, Paul told you in 1 Cor. 9:17-20. He said, "To the Jews, I became a Jew . . . that I might gain them ... to those that were under the law, as under the law that I might gain them . . ." What for? "That I might gain them." He did it that he might gain them to the gospel. He didn't do it because the law was still in force like this man says. The law was already nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14-16).

But there's a rather amusing thing about the dodge that he's taking here. He said, you know, that Paul went up to Jerusalem in Acts 15 and he cut out circumcision. Paul had it stopped—that's where circumcision stopped, in Acts 15. Paul had it stopped! Well the first thing wrong with that is it's not so.

You'll remember that there was a conference in Acts 15. You know who the first speaker was? It was that old man Peter that you don't like it seems. The Bible says that "After there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe." And then he said concerning the Jews "We believe that we shall be saved by the

grace of the Lord Jesus" just as the Gentiles were saved (Vv. 7-11).

And Paul and Barnabas then rehearsed some of the things that had happened in their ministry among the Gentiles (V. 12). And then James started. Here's the man that you thought was going to tell them to keep the law. James got up and suggested that the tabernacle of David would be rebuilt for the very purpose "that the Gentiles might seek after the Lord." (Vv. 13-17). Whenever the brethren heard that the argument was brought to a close and they decided that the Gentiles didn't have to keep the law. Now who decided it? Peter, James, and John had just as much to do with it as Paul did. But this man tries to make Paul the very one that went up and cut it out. Now you can see that that man is not teaching what the Bible does on it.

Then another thing. He said in Acts 15, right there's where the law stopped, right there's where circumcision stopped. Then after that a man fell from grace if he was circumcised. Did you not know that in Acts 16:3 the Bible says that Paul circumcised Timothy because of the Jews? Well that's in Acts 16 AFTER Chapter 15! Did Paul fall from grace? Why, Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews," not "because of the law." And he did not do it to observe the law, because he had already pointed out here he took Titus with him (Gal. 2:1-3) and he wasn't compelled to be circumcised. They had all come to the agreement, Peter, James, John and Paul and the other brethren, that they did not have to be circumcised. Yet when Paul got ready to take Timothy among the Jews he circumcised him. After they had already settled it according to Acts 15 and according to this man. Well, why did he do it? Because the law was in force? No, he said the law had already ended, that Paul wound it up in Acts 15. Well, why did he do it? Because of the Jews—he knew that they wouldn't listen to him unless he was circumcised. That's a rather interesting point.

Then he said that James brings in works and Paul excludes them. James says it's "by works," and Paul says it's "not by works;" and, therefore, they're different. I've asked you, and begged you and have done everything but get down on my knees, to notice that there are different kinds of works in the Bible, one, the works of the law of Moses, and one, the works of the gospel. Will you please open your Bible to Gal.

5:6. Paul says there, "In Christ Jesus neither doth circumcision avail anything nor uncircumcision, but faith that WORKS (Do you know what that is?) — that WORKS by love." Paul preached works just like James did. Rom. 2:4, I've given him this time and time again and he will not refer to it, Paul says that certain ones will be judged "according to their works." And in verse 16 he says it's "by MY GOSPEL." Then the gospel of Paul, the gospel that Paul said is mine, will judge a man according to his works. This man says it's not according to his works; it's by faith alone.

Then he referred to Tit. 3:5 and said that that meant grace alone. Why it doesn't. Paul was saved under Pentecostal preaching. But he said, "Not by works of righteousness which WE did." Paul included himself. "Not by works . . . which we did, but by his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Lord; that, being justified by his grace, we might be heirs of the hope of eternal life." Now Paul says, "I'm in that." Paul, how were you saved? "Not of works, not of my own devising, but by the mercy of God and by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." How did these things come about? Acts 22:16: "And, now, Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Paul says, "I was saved by grace and by the washing of regeneration—in that way." He thinks you can't be saved like Paul was and be saved by grace. He denied it last night.

But he said that Peter said in Acts 15, "We SHALL be saved." That puts it future tense. So the Jews were not saved at the time Peter wrote. Well Paul says in Rom. 5:9, "Much more then, being justified by his death . . . shall we be saved by his life." So they weren't saved in Paul's day. Man, do you not know that there are two salvations spoken of in the Bible, present and future? The Jews already had remission of sins (present salvation), and they should be saved (future) by the grace of the Son of God if they'd be faithful as the Lord directed. I know he doesn't believe that, but I can prove it. And Paul said in Rom. 5:9, "Being justified by his blood . . . we SHALL be saved"—that's future tense. Does that mean that nobody was saved in Paul's day?

But he came to Cornelius and said that Peter said, "It's by WORKS." (Acts 10:34). And Paul said it's "not by works" (Eph. 2.8-9). Well, What works were under consid-

eration there? Works of man's own devising? works law of Moses? or works of the gospel? What works are involved? Why, Paul says that a man that would be saved, that would have a faith that avails, must have a "faith that WORKS." He also said in Rom. 2:4-16 that a man must be justified by his works. That's Paul's gospel. Peter preached works and Paul preached works; therefore, they preached the same thing. When Paul said, "It's not of works," he was referring to the works of the law of Moses. If this man would get his Bible and try to rightly divide it, and try to find out that there are works of the law of Moses; works of man's own devising; works of the gospel, he'd not be so confused when he comes to these points.

Then he said that there were two gospels with opposite messages. Well, why didn't you tell us what Paul would have said to a mixed audience? You know, if I had a golden pumpkin bug, I'd give it to him to tell us. Just exactly what would Paul have preached to a mixed audience? He said he'd tell us on the Kingdom question what Paul preached on the Kingdom. Well, you were supposed to have preached it here.

He said that Baker will ask the questions tomorrow night. Well, What if I do yours like you did mine? It won't do him any good to ask them will it? If I do yours like you did mine that'd be unfair wouldn't it? (Laughter). I'll answer yours. I'm fair; I'll answer your questions. I'll not do yours like you did mine. I'd be ashamed and head for Memphis if you were to ask me questions and I refused to answer them if they were pertinent to the proposition. That's exactly what I'd do—I'd be ashamed of myself. I'll answer. It's going to look kindly bad because I'll have a chance to ask him some more questions, and when you ask me some and I answer them, what do you think they're going to think about your not answering mine? Just what will you (the audience) think? I'd be ashamed of myself, Mr. Baker.

He said the Bible teaches two gospels; one of circumcision, the other of uncircumcision. Mr. Baker, I've begged and pleaded with you to look at Eph. 2:11. "The circumcision" means the JEWS; the "uncircumcision" means the GENTILES. Well, now then, Paul says that there is one gospel for Jew and Gentile (Rom. 1:16). In Gal. 2 The Bible teaches that there was a special work given unto Paul to go unto the Gentile and preach the gospel; a special work given to Peter, James, and John to preach the gospel to the Jew. But I've told

you time and time again that there's a difference between a work being special and exclusive. Don't you know the difference between those two words? If you don't, I have a Webster's Collegiate Dictionary in the car and I'll loan it to you when the debate's over and let you look it up.

But he began to ask the question, "How did the twelve get into the Church?" Well they were baptized with John's baptism. And He asked me if they got in without water baptism. No. They were baptized with John's baptism, and they were baptized with John's baptism "for the remission of sins" (Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3). And the Bible says in Lk. 1:17 that John came to "prepare a people for the Lord." Now John prepared these people for the Lord. They were prepared. They don't need any other job worked on them. If they were prepared, What else did they need, Mr. Baker? Did they need to be worked over and overhauled? Did he just half prepare them? Or, did John do all the Lord intended for him to do. The Bible teaches that John prepared the material and upon Pentecost God united that together and it was the Church. He said, "How did they get there?" 1 Cor. 12:28 says, "God set some in the Church, first apostles." Certainly God put them in the Church. Possibly the word "first" there refers to rank rather than the time element, but it still says the apostles were set in the Church. God did it. They were already prepared. They didn't have to be prepared again and again and again. He might still be preparing them if your idea about it's true. God set them in. But he asked was that the Body. It certainly was. It says, "God set them in the Church." In verse 20 it says, "But now there are many members, but ONE BODY." The Body of verse 20 is the Church of verse 28, and the apostles were put in it. Don't you see that?

But he said that Baker never said Paul preached the Kingdom. No. But "Dr." Luke did! I guess "Dr." Luke is as good as "Dr." Baker! Dr. Luke did say that Paul preached the Kingdom, didn't he? Luke says in Acts 28:23 that Paul called certain of the Jews to him and "testified unto them concerning the Kingdom of God." And in verses 30-31 the Bible says that for two whole years (after this man says it stopped) that he continued doing that. No, he hasn't said it, but Dr. Luke did, and I think Dr. Luke is as good as Dr. Baker.

But he said that God had a new order of apostles starting in Acts 13. Why, that's not true. Paul said in Gal. 1:17, (and he's never mentioned these passages that I've referred

to), "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before I was"—or "before me." And in 1 Cor. 9:5 he said he had a right to lead about a wife just like "the rest of the apostles, and Cephas." Why, don't you see that he's comparing himself there with the "rest of the apostles and Cephas"? He's just like they are. He's just like the "rest" of the apostles, and had a right to get him a wife if he wanted one. Every man has that right.

But he said Peter, James, and John did not mention the Church. It's according to what you mean by the "Church." Now as far as the use of that special term (the Body) is concerned we might concede the point. But he said, "Why?" Well, in 1 Cor. 13:9-10, Paul said, "We know in part, and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." All the "good news" was not given to Paul; all was not given to Peter, James, or John. But it was given to ALL of these, and these, each in his turn, gave his part of the revelation. Whenever God got it completely given, He closed it with the Book of Revelation as we have it in our New Testament.

Then he said again that "in one Spirit were we baptized." But he said a moment ago that this doesn't mean the element. Well, I want to answer that thoroughly once for all upon that point. He says that this (baptism by the Spirit) is the administrator and not the element in 1 Cor. 12:13. Is that what you mean? (Mr. Baker says, "No" from his seat.) He won't say that. Well, I'll just have to wait and find out. He says that we're not "baptized in the Spirit" like the apostles were. Then the Spirit is not the element; and if the Spirit is not the administrator, I'd like to know what part the Spirit is playing! He's either the element or the administrator. Now I want to know which end you're going to take.

Well either way that he does, he referred to Rom. 6:3-4. He said, "If that's water baptism he's going to get the apostles out." No, I've already got them in! And Romans 6:3-4 is certainly water baptism. You said that Paul was converted under Pentecostal preaching. That was water baptism wasn't it? And yet Paul said, "Know ye not that so many of US (that includes Paul) as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore WE . . ." That includes Paul! Did Paul get Pentecostal baptism? And wasn't Pentecostal baptism water baptism? Then the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4, the baptism which puts us into Christ, is water baptism!

"Dr." Baker being in the affirmative upon that point! Yes, indeed. Yes, he'll have to concede the point that Paul was baptized with Pentecostal baptism, water baptism, and this is the very baptism that Paul had (in Rom. 6:3-4) that inducts us into Christ. You'll be wishing to high heaven that you had taken that back before it's all over.

But he said that when James wrote, he wrote to those that were in a "synagogue." I don't reckon that he has a Revised Version of the Bible. It gives synagogue in it. In the margin in it says the "assembly;" and it's the same thing as in Heb. 10:25 where it says, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is." It says it in the margin of the Revised Version, if you want to see it. "Not forsaking the assembling . . ." What's he talking about? Is Paul, in writing Hebrews, telling the Jews to keep going to the synagogue? Or, What assembly is under consideration? James says in James 5:14 that he's talking about the assembly of the CHURCH. What's he said about it? Have you heard him say Church in James 5:14 yet? Now, there's something wrong with a man that won't notice arguments.

Then, he said that he never said that Paul continued. No, but Paul did! And it's all right with me if Paul said it (Acts 26:22). But he said that we had to go to Paul's writings, that Paul didn't write the Book of Acts, that Dr. Luke wrote it. Well, Was Dr. Luke inspired? Is it so? Did Luke tell the truth? Are you trying to say that just because Paul didn't write it it's not so? What's wrong with you, Mr. Baker!

But he said that he (Paul) was crucified with Christ. Yes, under Pentecostal preaching! That's the thing I preach. Paul said he was crucified with Christ (Gal. 2:20).

But he said Paul was justified by grace (Rom. 3:24). Yes, and in 2 Tim. 1:9 he said that he was saved "by grace, not according to works;" and yet, he was saved under Pentecostal preaching. And there's no contradiction. I wonder what's wrong with the man if he can't see it. He must have a veil over his heart.

But then he said that he never said that the gospel is the mystery, nor that salvation for the Gentiles is the mystery. The thing that he says is the mystery is that the Gentiles were to be in the Body which is the Church. Is that your position? (Mr. Baker: "No.") Well, he doesn't know what his position is! He hasn't decided yet just exactly what he's going to teach on it.



Then he referred to Rom. 16:25-26: "Now to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel and the . . . revelation of the mystery which hath been kept secret from time eternal, but NOW is manifested and by the Scriptures of the prophets. . ." (You said, 'By Paul's prophetic writings.' It doesn't say it.) Paul says, "And by the Scriptures of the prophets is made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." The "mystery is." And in Rom. 1:1-6 that same gospel that Paul referred to as being prophesied of (v. 2), is the one that is referred to here (16:25-26) that was revealed for obedience among all nations and is the same thing exactly. And Paul said "it's preached according to the Scriptures of the prophets." This man says, "The prophets didn't say anything about it." Pshaw!

And he said that Peter's (gospel) was "of works," and Paul's was "not of works." I've pointed out time and time again that Peter preached that we must work righteousness, that we must have a living, active, obedient faith. What did Paul preach? He said it's "faith that works by love" (Gal. 5:6). That a man will be justified by his works (Rom. 2:4). And he also taught in Rom. 2:16 that we'll be judged according to his gospel. In 6:17-18 it's when we obey. In Heb. 5:9 it's when we obey the Son. Now, you ought to be able to see and understand that Paul says it's of works just as much as Peter does. Well, Why did you say there's a contradiction?

He said that he was "going to show what Paul preached on the Kingdom." Yes, he's a promising young man.

But he said that I said that Paul was not appointed to preach to the Gentiles. No, I didn't say that. I said that Paul didn't say, "God appointed me ONLY." Don't you remember my emphasizing that only? Don't you remember that? Paul said that a "dispensation of the grace of God was given unto ME." I said, "Now, you claim to speak where the Bible speaks, and that you are silent where it is silent; and yet you say that it was committed unto Paul ONLY. Paul didn't put the 'only' in there and you did. So you're not speaking where the Bible speaks." Don't you remember my telling you that?

But then he said (in Acts 26:21) that Paul referred to the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Yes, and something else: "That He should proclaim light BOTH to the people AND to the Gentiles." And not only that, but Paul said he "spake NOTHING (not anything else, not ANYTHING!) other than what the prophets said." Baker says, "I know you did,

you told something that never was foretold." Paul says, "I didn't speak anything else." Baker says, "You did!" Now, whom are you going to accept, Paul, or Mr. Baker?

He referred to Eph. 3:9, the "unsearchable riches of Christ," and said "untraceable." It means incomprehensible. We cannot thoroughly comprehend the grace of God.

But then he said that I said that the dispensation of the grace of God was not given to Paul for the Gentiles. No. I said not to Paul exclusively.

He said, "There are not two gospels today." No, and there never were. I've already proven it. Peter preached the gospel of works and Paul did too—the works of the gospel, the works of faith.

Then he referred to Rom. 6 again and said that we would exclude the apostles. No. I've already shown how the apostles were brought in. They were prepared material and went into the Church of God, the building, as prepared material. Then again I call your attention to Rom. 6, that Paul was included in that. He says, "Know ye not that so many of US as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore WE WERE buried with him . . ." So Paul was in that too. Paul had water baptism under Pentecostal preaching, and that's the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4. You might as well pack your bag and head for Grand Rapids! (Laughter). Since you've admitted that Paul was baptized according to the baptism of the Great Commission, and since Paul says that the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4 is the one that he got, then you just as well go home for your part of this debate is over!

Now then, ladies and gentlemen, he has been striving, shouting, sweating, and arguing for two nights, and not one single verse has he read which says that this dispensation began with Paul; not one verse has he read which says that man is justified by faith alone. I just wish that if he knows the verse that says we are justified by faith alone—that says it!—that he'd just stand up now and tell us where it is. (Time called).

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

September 2-3, 1953

Proposition II: The Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and that water baptism to the penitent believer is for (to obtain) the remission of sins.

Bill L. Rogers, Affirms

B. A. Baker, Denies

### ROGERS' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

My worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I'm grateful to the Providence of God for the privilege that we have of assembling here again tonight to continue our investigation of the subject of when this dispensation began, and just exactly what is involved in the Plan of Salvation.

You understand, of course, that we're still discussing the same subject that we were discussing the first two nights; the only difference is that we've changed positions and now I'm in the affirmative and Mr. Baker is in the negative.

I'll read the proposition and define it in just a moment, but first I have some questions for my opponent. I'll appreciate some answer to these whenever he comes to the platform.

### MY THIRD LIST OF QUESTIONS

1. Why did you sign an agreement to define the terms of your proposition and then REFUSE to do so after continual prompting?

He signed the agreement to be governed by Hedge's Rules of Debate. The very first rule in those is that a man must define the terms of his proposition so clearly that there cannot be any misunderstanding concerning them. I asked him to define them again and again, and he has flatly refused. Now, I want to know why. Just why is it that he'd sign his name to something and then refuse, after saying that he would do it? He was honor bound to do that, and yet he hasn't done it.

2. Why did you sign an agreement to examine the proofs lodged against your position and then REFUSE to deal with questions advanced against that proposition?

And not only that, I have here listed more than sixty verses of Scripture that I introduced in the four speeches. I asked him twenty-four questions, he answered two of them! And he signed an agreement and said, "I'll do what Hedge's

Rules say." And the first of those rules reads like this, that a man must take up and examine with fairness and candor any argument, or anything, that is lodged against his position! I never signed a "rubber check" in my life, Mr. Baker. I never signed a "rubber agreement" in my life either. When I sign an agreement that I'll deal with the things brought up, I'll deal with them. You haven't done it. I'd just as soon sign a check that's not any good as to sign an agreement that's not any good. I don't see how your brethren could appreciate your coming here, sign an agreement to deal with these things and to define the terms of your proposition, and then violate that rule and that agreement. Now, you answer and tell us why it is that you don't. I think this audience is beginning to see. I think you can see why I'm pressing the issue—because of the fact that he's violating these rules, and he will not do the thing that he has agreed to do.

3. Is the baptism of 1 Pet. 3:21 Spirit baptism or water baptism?
4. Do you teach Jews today to be baptized "for the remission of sins?"
5. (And you'll remember that he promised last night to tell us about this tonight). In the baptism of 1 Cor. 12:13 is the Spirit the administrator or the element?

You know, last night I said, "He's a very promising man." All I've found out about 1 Cor. 12:13 since this debate began is that "Mr. Baker has a secret!" He has a "mystery," it's "hidden," it's not revealed! And you can't pull it out of him, push it out of him, or knock it out of him it seems. It's a "secret," it's not revealed, and he won't tell. Mr. Baker has a secret as to what the baptism of 1 Cor. 12:13 is; and yet he promised to tell us tonight. Now we'll see what we'll see.

6. If the Spirit is the administrator (that is, if he does the baptizing), What is the element?
7. Did the "last days" begin on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection?
8. Since you admit that Saul was saved under the preaching which began on Pentecost, and since he says that he was saved by grace through faith and not of works (2 Tim. 1-9; Rom. 5:1), Was not the preaching which began on Pentecost the gospel of Grace? If not, I'd like for him to tell us, Why not?

I think that that will do for the questions now, and I'll deal with them in my next speech if he doesn't. As I suggest-

ed, I think, before, if he does answer them, he'll wish that he hadn't, and if he doesn't he'll wish that he had! He can take either horn he wants.

Now then, for the proposition tonight: The Scriptures teach that the present dispensation began on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and that water baptism to the penitent believer is for (in the sense of to obtain) the remission of alien sins.

The first agreement, the first rule, that I signed is that I must define the terms of that proposition. I'm going to do that: By "The Scriptures" I mean the Word of God, the Book that's called the Bible. By "teach" I mean the Scriptures impart this information. By "the present dispensation" I mean the dispensation of the gospel (or the gospel dispensation), or the time of grace. Now be sure to get the definition of the terms for they're very important in any debate. By the "present dispensation" I mean the gospel dispensation, or the time of grace. (Cf. Jno. 1:17). By the word "begin" I mean it had its commencement. By "the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ" I refer, of course, to that feast day of the Jews that they observed, and the first one that came after Jesus was raised from the dead, as recorded in the second chapter of Acts. By "water baptism" I mean a burial in water. By "to the penitent believer" I mean a person who has believed and repented of his sins—that water baptism to that person is for (I explained that there in the parenthesis), "to obtain," that's what I mean by the word "for." The "remission" means the forgiveness of sins. By "alien sins" I mean those sins that a person commits before he becomes a child of God.

Now you realize, of course, that this is a compound proposition. It has two thoughts in it. The first is, that this dispensation began on the day of Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. That's one proposition. And the second is, that water baptism is for the remission of sins.

I'd like to point out here that if I prove the first part of my proposition the second stands. Because my friend, Mr. Baker, agrees readily that upon the day of Pentecost when Peter said, "Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"—my opponent admits readily that Peter meant what he said and said what he meant. There is not any quibbling on what the word "for" means, or what "unto" means. He admits that these people had to be

baptized "in order to have their sins forgiven!" And (he agrees) that Peter actually taught that. But he says that we don't live under the dispensation that started when Peter preached that, that the dispensation that we're under didn't start then. Now, if I prove that the dispensation that I live under did start with Peter, then the words that Peter said are applicable to us today, and my proposition that water baptism is for remission of sins is sustained, it's proven!

Now, I'm going to prove that this dispensation began right there on the first Pentecost following the resurrection of Christ.

## ARGUMENTS ON THE BEGINNING OF THIS DISPENSATION

1. The Gospel Dispensation: You'll remember that after Jesus was raised from the dead that he appeared unto his disciples on a mountain in Galilee. And he said, "All authority has been given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world" (Matt. 28:18-20). Now Jesus says here that the preaching of the Great Commission (it's commonly called the Great Commission), as given in Matt. 28, would last to the "end of the world."

Mark's record says that Jesus came and said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mk. 16:15-16). (Now, we'll deal with the "miracle argument" when he brings it us. If he doesn't, I'll bring it up).

We also have this recording of the Great Commission: "And said, Thus is it written, and thus it behoved the Christ, to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:46-47).

Now here we find that this Great Commission, recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke,—this Commission was to BE-GIN in Jerusalem. Well what kind of Commission is it? It's one where the gospel of the Son of God is to be preached. "Go teach all nations," says Matthew's record. Mark's record says,

"Preach the gospel to every creature." Matthew's record says that it was to last to the "end of the world." (Matt. 28:20). Luke's record says, "It will begin in Jerusalem." That's the beginning place.

Then Luke said, in verse 48, "And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be clothed with power from on high." Now he said it would begin at Jerusalem—"It'll begin there. But you don't preach it until you're clothed with power from on high. When the power comes, then you'll begin to preach — you'll begin to preach this gospel that I've suggested."

Then we turn to Acts 1:8 and we find where Jesus suggested to his disciples: "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you, and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Now they were to begin when the power got there. But the Bible says "the power will be there when the Spirit comes." In the second chapter of Acts the Bible says: "And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place (v. 1). And in verse 4 it says, "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Now Luke's record says that this "gospel that you're going to preach will begin at Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:47). When? "When you're clothed with power." (v. 49). But Jesus says the "power will come with the Spirit" (Acts 1:8). When did the Spirit come? It came on Pentecost! Then when the Spirit came they began to preach; and thus we have the beginning of the gospel (dispensation).

Well then, the Bible says that Peter preached in Acts 2:38 the very thing that Jesus had said in Luke 24:47: "Repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus." He said, "Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." But now then, this is not something that was just temporary; it's not something that ceased.

The Bible says that Paul persecuted the Church during this time. But Paul says that he "preached the faith that he once destroyed." (Gal. 1:23). Now he did not stop preaching that faith, as Mr. Baker says, but in Acts 26:22 Paul said, "I continue unto this day, saying nothing but what Moses and

the prophets did say should come." Paul said, "I continue—I'm still preaching the same thing that I started." And I pointed out last night, in Acts 28:30, Paul was preaching it there for two whole years after this man says it stopped. So it wasn't a thing that was just temporary, that just lasted for a while. But it started on the day of Pentecost (and he'll admit that something began there), and the Bible says that Paul started preaching it and continued it, and that's the thing that we're under today.

But notice that it was "for the remission of sins" and "in the name of Jesus Christ." What did Paul preach? He said in Acts 13:38-39, "Be it known, therefore, unto you that through this man is declared unto the remission of sins." What's Paul preaching? The remission of sins. Where? In Christ or in the name of Christ. Now we can see that they're teaching the same thing. When did it commence? Why it started on the day of Pentecost when the Spirit came, when they got the power. Now that's when it began. And that thing will stand untouched when this debate ends.

2. The Last Days: I also want to emphasize that we're living in the "last days." I also want to suggest that the "last days" began upon the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ.

In Acts 2:16-17, you know certain ones had accused the apostles of being drunk, and Peter said, "These men are not drunken as ye suppose seeing it's but the third hour of the day, but this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: It shall come to pass in the last days . . ." Now, Peter says, "This is that." Well, What's that? That's this. This very thing is coming to pass here. The last days have commenced! And the Bible says in Acts 11:15, concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit as it fell upon the house of Cornelius, "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell upon them (the house of Cornelius) even as on us (the apostles) at the BEGINNING." Why he said that's when it began. And Peter said the "Holy Spirit fell upon US." When, Peter? "At the BEGINNING." But he said, "It's the last days;" and, therefore, the last days had their beginning upon that day of Pentecost.

Well, did we change and get into something else. Well let's see. In Heb. 1:1-2, written twenty years after this man says that the last days had stopped and the Church had been brought in by way of Parenthesis, Paul says, "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers by the prophets in divers por-



tions and in divers manners, hath in these last days spoken to us through his Son." The Church there was in the last days. I suggest that the last days commenced on Pentecost. (Peter suggests that much.) And not only that, but the Church is (still) in the last days. Well, if Paul was living in the last days twenty years after he (Baker) said it stopped, I'm still in it. And not only that, Peter in 2 Pet. 3:2, "In the last days men shall come with mockery." They shall come. That indicates that the last days were to go on a long time after the time that Peter wrote. We are, of course, still in the last days. When did the last days or this dispensation begin? This dispensation is the last days, and the Bible teaches distinctly that the last days began upon the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. Well, what was preached at that time? Water baptism for the remission of sins, and my opponent will not deny it.

3. The Dispensation (or Time) of Grace: I also said that by "this dispensation" I meant the "time of grace."

Peter says in 1 Pet. 1:9-12, "Concerning the salvation of your souls . . ." He's talking about "receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (v. 9). ". . . Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, when they prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time (there's the dispensational element), or manner of time the Spirit of Christ . . . did point unto when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed that NOT unto themselves did they minister these things, but unto you . . ." Now we can see that the "time" here involved is the "time of grace." The prophets foretold that time.

When did it begin? Now, if I can find out somebody that was saved under this dispensation of grace, then find out when that dispensation began that he was saved under, I'll know.

Well, Paul said in 2 Tim. 1:9 that God saved him, Paul, "God saved US not according to our works, but by his grace." Now Paul was saved under the dispensation of grace. But this man has already said that Paul was saved under Pentecostal preaching. Then the dispensation of grace began on Pentecost, and the Pentecostal preaching was the dispensation of grace. In Titus 3:5 Paul says, "Not by works of righteousness which WE did ourselves, but by his mercy he saved us, by the

washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." And in verse 7 he says, "That being justified by his Grace we might be heirs of the hope of eternal life." Now, we can see that Paul says that he was saved by grace. Was he saved by grace before the time or dispensation of grace began? That's the thing I've been trying to get him to tell me from the time this debate commenced, but he will not answer, he will not speak.

We understand that Paul was saved under the dispensation of grace. He was not saved by works, that is, the works of the law, and he was saved by a working, active obedient faith. And in order to be saved by grace through faith he had to be baptized to wash away his sins (Acts 22:16). That's what salvation by grace is, Mr. Baker, if you haven't figured it out yet.

When did the dispensation that Saul was saved under commence? He'll admit that it commenced on Pentecost—I believe that he will. If he doesn't I'll read some of his brethren on it that do say it. It doesn't make any difference to me whether he says it or not his brethren teach it. Dispensationalist in general teach it. And we can see then that since Saul was saved under the dispensation of grace, and since the one that Saul was saved under commenced on Pentecost, then the dispensation that began on Pentecost was the dispensation of grace. And the man that can't see through that can't see through a ladder! It seems to me that the man ought to be able to catch on.

Now, we have proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, by three clear cut arguments, (and we have some more, and if he'll come up and face the the music and toe the line, we'll debate some more of them. But I'm not going to offer any more until he deals with these.)—but I have proven that we are under the dispensation that began on Pentecost, and the very words of Peter, in Acts 2:38, are applicable unto people today. What are those words?

#### ARGUMENTS ON BAPTISM FOR REMISSION

1. Acts 2:38, "Be baptized for the remission of your sins." When men were cut to the heart and "cried out unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, What shall we do? Peter said, Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is

unto you and your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:38-39). So this gospel that Peter preached was not to the Jews only, but to the Jews and their children and to all those afar off, according to Eph. 2:11-17 the Gentiles. So the gospel was to be sent unto them.

Matthew's record said, "Unto all nations" (Matt. 28:19); Mark's said "every creature" (Mk. 16:15); Luke's record said "to every nation, beginning at Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:47-49). We find that it began here, that Peter says it would be for all nations (Acts 2:39). We see that it was "baptism FOR the remission of sins." He won't deny that that "for" there means "in order to obtain." Not only that, Peter did not change.

2. 1 Pet. 3:21, "Baptism doth NOW save us." Peter wrote his first epistle about A. D. 63. In that he said, "When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water: the like figure whereunto even baptism, doth also NOW save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." What did Peter preach in A. D. 33? He preached water baptism "for the remission of sins." What did he preach a few years later when he wrote to the Jews? He preached that water baptism doth "also NOW—N-O-W—save us." That involves that very proposition. And Peter said that it was in the "last days" (2 Pet. 3:3). Now, we can see that Peter did not change. Let him make his dodge now and well tend to him when he does.

3. 1 Cor. 1:12-13, Baptized to be "of Christ." Then we come to 1 Cor. 1:12-13, and we find there that Paul suggested that for the Corinthians to belong to Christ they had to be "baptized into His name." "This I say, that each one of you say, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, and I of Christ." Then he asked a question. He proved that they did not belong to Paul, they did not belong to Apollos, they did not belong to Cephas, and he proved it by a two-fold argument. He said, (First) "Was Paul crucified for you, or (Second) were you baptized into my name?" Unless Paul has (1) been crucified for you and (2) you have been baptized into his name you do not belong to Paul! Then Paul taught in 1 Cor. 1:12-13 that in order for us to belong to any person (Christ included) that being must be crucified for us (but that's not enough; there

must be something else) and we must be baptized into his name.

I know that Paul goes on to say that there was division. Certain one were claiming "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas." And Paul says, "I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius, lest some body should think that baptism is for remission!" Is that what he said? Why, no. He said, "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I baptized into my own name." (Vv. 14-15). Then he goes on to indicate that "Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (v.17).

Apparently they were having a dispute over who had the authority to baptize. One said, "An apostle baptized me, therefore, my baptism is better than yours." But Paul says, "My right to baptize does not inhere in my apostolic office. Every Christian has a right to baptize. That doesn't inhere in my being sent; anybody can do that. It's all right for Apollos to do it. It's all right for Peter to do it. It's all right for Paul to do it, or any other Christian. Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

Now, he didn't say that "I didn't have the authority to baptize." He does not suggest there that baptism is no part of the gospel. These men make a syllogism that goes like this: Christ sent Paul not to baptize; but (he sent him) to preach the gospel; therefore, baptism is no part of the gospel. Why, that's not logical. They're changing this from one thing (to baptize) to another (baptism). In the first statement, "Christ sent me not to baptize" that's a verb; and in the conclusion they made a noun (baptism) out of it. Now if you'll understand that "to baptize" (the act of baptizing) is no part of preaching the gospel it's a good syllogism. But whenever they try to make it "baptism is no part of the gospel" they pervert the Word of God and wrest it and twist it to their own destruction!

Now, we need to understand, that in this very chapter, Paul taught that for you to belong to any person, you must be baptized into that person's name. (1 Cor. 1:12-13).

Now, notice something else. He admitted that Paul baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 1:12-13; Acts 19:5). Do you know what **in the name** means, Mr. Baker? It means to do a thing by one's command and authority. Therefore Paul had the command and authority to baptize, didn't he? Yes, he's admitted that he did it in the name of Christ,

and if he did, he did it under the command and authority of Christ.

4. Acts 22:16, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Now then to something else. We've already found that Saul was saved under the dispensation of grace. He admits that we are under that dispensation (the dispensation of grace). You'll remember that the Lord said unto Saul to go into the City of Damascus, "and it shall be told thee what thou MUST do." (Acts 9:6). And the Bible suggests that he went into the city, Ananias came unto him and said, "And now, Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord." Now, how was he saved? This man says he was saved under Pentecostal preaching. But Paul says in 2 Tim. 1:9 and Rom. 5:1 that he was saved by "grace, through faith, and not of works." Now to be saved "by grace, through faith, and not of works" is to be saved under Pentecostal preaching; it's to be saved by obeying the Lord. After a man has sincerely believed and repented, he's to be "baptized for the remission of sins." Is there any virtue in the water? NO! There never has been, there isn't now, there never will be! Where is the virtue? In obeying the command of God. Somebody says, "I can't see any use of it." That doesn't make any difference! Whether you see any use in it or not, the God of heaven said it and that makes it so!

5. Rom. 6:3-4, "We (Paul included) were baptized into Christ." Then we come to Rom. 6:3-4. I call your attention to the fact that Eph. 1:3 says that "every spiritual blessing is IN Jesus Christ." Paul said in 2 Tim. 2:10, "Therefore, I endure all things for the elects sake that they may also obtain the salvation that is IN Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Any man that would be saved must be IN Christ. Well, how do you get into Christ?

I've already pointed out, Rom. 6:3-4, the Bible says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we also might walk in newness of life." Well, What kind of baptism is that? What kind did Paul have?

I want to give you just a few things here about English grammar. Mr. Baker doesn't seem to appreciate this, he won't notice it. Paul says, "Know ye not that so many of us . . ." That's a pronoun in the first person and the objective case.

Paul says, "Know ye not that so many of US as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore WE (Now, there's the nominative form of it—the first person) — Therefore WE were buried with him into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father we all might walk in newness of life." Paul says, "As many of Us . . . and WE . . ." Now what kind of baptism did Paul have? Mr. Baker said he had Pentecostal baptism! Well then, Pentecostal baptism is the one referred to in Rom. 6:3-4! And it seems to me that my worthy opponent should be able to comprehend that. Paul said, "So many of US as were baptized into Christ . . . Therefore WE were buried . . ." Now, What kind of baptism did you say Paul got? Was it Pentecostal baptism to wash away his sins? Then that's the kind that inducts a man into Christ! But he must admit that salvation's in Christ; all spiritual blessings are in Christ, and you can't enjoy these spiritual blessings without being baptized just like he was. You must be baptized just like Saul was. And, What kind of baptism did he have? What kind? He says, "Pentecostal baptism." Where did it put him? It put him into Christ. Paul says, "WE were baptized into Christ." How? With what kind of baptism, Paul? What kind did you get? "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And thus we can see that Pentecostal baptism is the one involved.

In Gal. 3:26-27 Paul says, "We're all the sons of God, by faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized INTO Jesus Christ did put on Christ." But we find from Rom. 6:3-4 that the baptism that inducts one into Christ is Pentecostal baptism. Then the baptism of Gal. 3:26-27 is Pentecostal baptism.

Also, he admits that to be in Christ is to be in the Body. To be "baptized into the Body" is to be "baptized into Christ." But we found out from Rom. 6:3-4 that the way a man is baptized into Christ is with Pentecostal baptism. So when the Bible says, "By one Spirit we're baptized into one Body," it means that the Spirit inducts us into Christ (the Body of Christ) when we're baptized with Pentecostal baptism! Now don't you wish you hadn't said that Saul got Pentecostal baptism, that he was saved under that dispensation? Certainly, we're under the same one that he was under.

The baptism of Col. 2:12 and 13 in which we're buried and raised with Christ is the same thing. In Rom. 6:3-4 the

Bible says that we're "buried with Him . . . that like as Christ was RAISED from the dead, we also might walk in newness of life." The baptism of Col. 2:12 is one in which we're "buried" and in which we're "raised." In Rom. 6:3-4 it's forever settled that this is the baptism that began on Pentecost and that Paul enjoyed himself. Now, I ask my opponent to deal with these things, and if he doesn't I'm going to ask his moderator to read this rule of debate and make him do it, if he can. If he can't he ought to send him back to Grand Rapids. If he's not going to deal with these, not going to do the thing that he signed to do, take up these arguments one by one as he's supposed to do, then this moderator is honor bound and obligated to stand here and read that rule of debate and make him answer these questions and arguments that are being presented.

6. Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Then I come to Mk. 16:16. Jesus said in Mk. 16:15-16, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature (Are you a creature?). He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Mr. Baker admits that that baptism there was necessary for salvation. I have their books here on my desk wherein they ridicule other people who say, "If you believe you're saved and then may be baptized if you want to." They say you're changing the Word of God. Yes, if you do that you are changing the Word of God, because the Word of God says, "He that believeth and IS baptized shall be saved," not "He that believeth and is NOT baptized shall be saved."

Now, how long was the Great Commission to last? To the end of the world! Well, has the world come to an end yet, Mr. Baker? I just wonder about that. Has the world come to an end? The baptism of the Great Commission was to last to the end of the world (Matt. 28:19-20), and was necessary for salvation.

Let me now reiterate the arguments that I have made: I proved that this DISPENSATION BEGAN on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection because (1) The gospel was first preached (in the name of Christ) upon the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. And the Bible says distinctly that it began at Jerusalem (Lk. 24:47); that it was something that Paul persecuted, later began to preach and continued to preach (Gal. 1:23; Acts 26:22). He didn't

change; he can't find where he changed. (2) Then I pointed out that we're in the last days, and that they began on Pentecost (Acts 2:16-17; 11:14). (3) That we're under the dispensation of Grace; that Saul was saved under that "time" or dispensation; and that dispensation began on Pentecost according to my opponent.

On baptism: (1) Acts 2:38, "Repent, and be baptized for remission of sins . . ." And that's to "all afar off," even the Gentiles. (2) That Peter taught in A. D. 63 "baptism doth NOW save us." (3) That we must be baptized to belong to Christ (1 Cor. 1:13). (4) That we're baptized to wash away our sins under the age of grace (Acts 22:16). (5) That water baptism inducts us into Christ (Rom. 6:3-4; Gal. 3:26-27; Col. 2:12-13; 1 Cor. 12:13). (6) And that the baptism of the Great Commission is in order that we might be saved (Mk. 16:16), and was to last to the end of the world (Matt. 28:20).

Now, my opponent is honor bound, he signed his name, to come to the platform and deal with the arguments thus presented. We'd like to see him do it. I feel like that he realizes that his brethren are not going to appreciate it unless he comes up and toes the line and faces the music. He hasn't been doing that, and I'll just be frank, fair, and forthright about it, I wouldn't have been satisfied if Mr. Baker had been representing what I teach. I wouldn't have been satisfied. He ought to WORK at it! He can't defend what he teaches, but at least he could try, couldn't he? (Time called). I thank you very kindly, ladies and gentlemen.

#### BAKER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Dear Friends:

We're happy to be here again tonight to present to you what the Bible teaches, and what the Word of God declares, to men about His will.

Our opponent is lying to you. All you have to do is get these recordings and you'll find out that I'm answering the questions. I don't have to say to him, "I'm answering this one, or this one." Just listen to the recordings—get the book—and you'll find out that I've answered.

He said I said the questions were not answered. I've told him every time that the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles began with Paul, and I gave him Scripture for it. He never gave you a passage of Scripture tonight that



had the word "dispensation" in it, that this present dispensation began with Peter. I gave you a passage last night, and I quoted, that says it began with Paul. Listen to it: I'm giving to you what I say is God's Word, with the word dispensation in it, that Paul is the dispenser of this administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles. Now, I'm calling your attention to this fact, that I told you from God's Word that the present administration of grace was committed to Paul, and not to any one else.

I told you last night that there were two gospels. He denies it. The Bible says Peter had the gospel of the circumcision. He denies it, he denies it again tonight. He does not say that Peter had the gospel of the circumcision. I told you that the word circumcision means Jew, Israel. He didn't tell you tonight that Israel was present on Pentecost.

Let me call your attention first to Eph. 3 to give you a positive statement in denying what he says. "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which was given ME." Now Paul says that long after Peter had preached the gospel of circumcision and the gospel of the kingdom. The word dispensation is in that. A dispensation is God's order for his House, the present economy. Now notice this, "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given ME to youward." I don't add anything to it nor take away from it. That's God's Word.

Then in the Gospel According to Matthew he quoted only a part of the Commission. In that Great Commission that the Lord gave to the eleven and later to Matthias who became numbered with the twelve the Lord said, Jesus Christ the Son of God, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations (you twelve apostles Go teach all nations), baptizing (these nations) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." (He never gave you one passage that says they ever baptized anyone "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Read your Bibles. You'll find he (Peter) was not baptized "in the name of the Lord," not in the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Now don't challenge that statement until you've examined it. Then notice this: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I HAVE commanded you." Now the apostle Paul received his message after the Lord went to heaven, after the Lord sat down at the right hand of God, after, after if you please, the

Lord Jesus Christ commissioned Paul to go to the nations.

You notice that our debater tonight said that I would not state the issue. You'll notice that he again tries to challenge the statement that I was not answering the questions. I want to deny the statement that the dispensation of the grace of God for the Gentiles began with a Jewish feast day. In the tenth chapter of the Book of Acts God visited the Gentiles for the first time.

We called your attention to Eph. 4:5, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." This is the unity of the Spirit to be kept in the bond of peace. This is the order for God's House today. Let me read it to you again: "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one Body, one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism . . ." Now our debater admitted tonight that there were two (baptisms). He did not tell you that Peter was not baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He did not tell you that the apostles were not baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. He did not tell you that there were two baptisms, and in the administration of God's grace there is one baptism.

I told you last night that Paul received his message on the installment plan. I told you that in Paul's writings we have God's order for his House today; that in Paul's written epistles we have the truth for the Body of Christ today. This man cannot believe God's Word. He must defend a doctrine. The apostle Paul is inspired.

You'll remember in the Book of 1 Corinthians he quoted, and why did he not emphasize, "Christ sent me not to baptize"? Why did he say, "Christ sent me NOT to baptize"? The Great Commission says to "Go and baptize." Mark 16 says, "Preach the gospel . . . and baptize." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." There were two baptisms on the day of Pentecost, and Peter, James, and John received the baptism in Spirit for power on the day of Pentecost. The apostle Paul tells us that Christ sent him not to baptize. Now, I don't care what he does with that, Paul says, "I thank God I only baptized some of you." "I thank God." How could a man thank God that he only baptized a few if that baptism was for remission of sins? How could he thank God that he baptized only a few if baptism was into the Lord Jesus Christ?

No, there is another baptism, a baptism that our debater

did not mention, a baptism that's found in Eph. 4, that we're going to deal with tonight.

In 1 Cor. 12:13 we have this statement: "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." There's no water there! It's not mentioned! He must read water into that text. He read Romans 6. Water is not mentioned in that text. He mentioned Gal. 3. Not one word for water in the text. He quoted 1 Pet. 3.

He said last night that Peter never received baptism except under the law of John the Baptist. He wasn't even a member of the Body of Christ or the Church of Christ. He received his baptism under the law, Peter did. And yet Peter says, "Baptism in a like figure (baptism the like antitype) doth now save us." Now, if it takes the baptism of the Great Commission to save Peter was lost. "In the like figure baptism doth now save us." Now, remember he has not given you one Scripture to prove that the twelve apostles were baptized. Ask him where it is found in the Scriptures, and then you'll find that they were not baptized when Jesus gave the Great Commission. Now, if that baptism puts you into Christ, and you must get into Christ only that way, and that eliminates the apostles from being in the Body of Christ unless there's another way of getting into the Body of Christ.

Our opponent said last night that God set the members in the Body without water baptism. Now that's what he said! He said last night that the twelve apostles were set in the Body without being baptized under the Great Commission. He said that God accepted the preaching of John the Baptist, the work of preparation, John's baptism of repentance for Israel for the remission of sins. He says they were saved under that baptism, and that baptism was sufficient, and God set them in the Body on the basis of that baptism. They were baptized, he says, under the law and not by what he calls the dispensation of grace that he says began at Pentecost. Peter preached the Great Commission. Peter had the gospel of circumcision. God's word says so.

Now, I'd like to call your attention to 1 Cor. 12:13, "For in one Spirit . . ." Now we find this word "one Spirit." I'd like to call your attention to what the Bible says about it. In 1 Cor. 6:13, "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." Now I call your attention to Eph. 4 and what the Holy Spirit says through the apostle Paul. This is the word of God. Listen to it: "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit." Now, this

is the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Everything in this unity has to do with the Spirit. It is the unity of the Spirit. That's what God says now. And that unity says in verse 4, "There is one Body . . ." That has to do with a unity of the Spirit. ". . . There is one Spirit." Now, notice that we are "baptized in one Spirit," and we are not baptized in that text in water! It says, "In one Spirit." The "one Spirit" is defined in the Word of God in chapter four, verse 3, "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit." And in verse 4, "There is one Spirit." Now Paul himself defines what this one Spirit is. And we were baptized in one Spirit into the one Body.

Now, you'll notice that this baptism in one Spirit was administered by God. My opponent told you that last night. God the the Father is the administrator. He told you that God set the members in the Body. He put the twelve apostles in the Body by God setting them there. And that's exactly what we do by grace. What he did to the twelve, we do to the whole Body of Christ. And we say that God "set the members in the Body as it pleased him." How did he set the members in the Body?

There are two texts that tell us. 1 Cor. 12:18, "Now God hath set the members everyone of them in the Body as it pleased him." Who set them in? God. God is the administrator. God is the baptizer in Spirit into the one Body. Then in 1 Cor. 12:27, "Ye are the Body of Christ and members in particular . . . And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles ..." He says these are the twelve. We called your attention that the dispensation of the grace of God for the Gentiles began with Paul's written ministry. We called your attention to the fact there were two sets of apostles. My opponent will not acknowledge that. That Paul was born out of due time. The apostle Paul, even though he was saved under the Pentecostal administration, received his message of revelation after he was separated in Acts 13. And in Paul's written ministry I find God's order for his House today.

In 1 Cor. 12 we have God's order for accepting the members into the Body. No wonder Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." John the Baptist said, "He that SENT me to baptize . . ." The Lord sent the twelve apostles to baptize. And then Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize." How could Paul say that if Paul was to baptize everyone? How did Paul exclude himself? Paul says,

"Christ sent me NOT to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Why did he say that? He has a baptism in one Spirit into the one Body. And God is the administrator of that baptism into that one Body.

Now, let me call your attention to the Book of Colossians. In this message that the debater brought tonight he began with a Jewish feast day. The administration of grace for the Gentiles began with Paul. We know that on the day of Pentecost God was speaking to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And in Col. 2:11, listen, we are told that we "are complete in Him Who is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Christ had two circumcisions; one in the flesh, and one at Calvary. And we are circumcised with that circumcision not made with hands. Notice in verse 11 our sins are put away by circumcision. Let me read it. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." That's not a fleshly circumcision.

Then notice if you will verse 12, "Buried with him . . ." Why do we emphasize the words "WITH Christ." Where was he buried? Where was the Son of God entombed? Where was the Lord buried, entombed? We were "buried WITH him." We were with him, with him. We are dead with him. We are seated with him. Everything is with him. Now let me ask you a question: "I am crucified with him," and if I'm crucified with him, Who crucified me? I was crucified WITH him. I was buried WITH him. And I emphasize the words "WITH HIM." Not like like him, but WITH him. He was buried; I was there! He was crucified; I was crucified. Not like him, but WITH HIM. Then notice in our text, "Buried with him." How? By baptism in water? No. By baptism into death. Whose death? His death. Where was I baptized? Into his death. No mention of water here, he has to read that there.

Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize." Paul says, "There's ONE baptism," not two, not three, not many, ONE! And it is a baptism in which there is a circumcision made without hands.

Then notice in our text again this verse, "Buried with him in baptism where in ye also are risen with him—WITH him, with him—through the faith of the operation of God." Who

baptized us? God. Where did God baptize us? In one Spirit, into the one Body. How did I get into the Body of Christ? God placed me there. How do I know I'm there? Eph. 1:13 says, "On believing ye were sealed unto the day of redemption." "On believing ye were sealed unto that day of redemption with that Holy Spirit of promise." Only Paul brings out the truth that we are identified with Jesus Christ in his baptism. That we have been buried with Christ.

Let me call your attention to Romans 6. Look at it and see with me whether you can find any water there. Paul was baptized in water under the Pentecostal administration. But this baptism takes you back to the cross, to the death of Christ. This baptism takes you back to the place where Jesus Christ died "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God." Notice in Rom. 6: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid—let it not come to that— How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?"—Dead in sin. When did these die to sins? Notice in verse 3, "Know ye not, that so many of us . . ." (and Paul includes himself in this death baptism.) This is not water. Paul got this when he was caught away to the third heaven. Paul received this by divine revelation, and he says there is only one baptism, and "Christ sent me not to baptize." He didn't say, "Christ sent me not ONLY to baptize." That's not what the Bible says. The Bible says, Paul the apostle to the Gentiles says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

Then again let me call your attention to Rom 6. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ . . ." Who baptized us into Jesus Christ? "By the faith of the operation of God." Who circumcised us when the body of sins was cut away from us without hands? Whose hands separated us from the body of the sins of the flesh? We are circumcised today with a circumcision not made with hands for we have the "faith of the operation of God" in our baptism into death. Now notice your Bible again. Notice it says in verse 3, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into WATER?" No. It doesn't say that. It says that we're "baptized into his DEATH." There's a lot of difference in being baptized into water and being baptized into death. Notice that Paul is bringing this out.

Last night my opponent said, "Were you baptized?" I

surety was. My opponent said, "Were you a member of the Church of Christ?" I was a member of the Church of Christ in Rossville, Illinois. And there I was set apart by the Brethren. I became Pastor, I said, of what is called the First Church of Christ in Danville. I ministered throughout the State of Illinois and throughout the State of Indiana. And for years I believed that water baptism was necessary and essential to salvation until I found out that I was not following Paul as I should, for he said, "Follow me, as I follow Christ."

Then notice in our text here. "Therefore, we were buried—buried where? Where were we buried? We were entombed, buried with him by baptism into DEATH." Did Peter have that? Our moderators know that our debater said last night that God set the twelve apostles in the Body without baptism. The Bible doesn't teach that. He didn't tell you the truth. He didn't tell you that those twelve apostles did not receive baptism after the Great Commission was given. I say again, the only way you can get into Christ is to be baptized into Christ. And in that baptism God is the administrator. And he that is joined to Christ is one Spirit. For "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." God, the Father, baptizes us into that Spirit into that Body, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. We are hid with Christ in God. I'm dead with Christ. I'm buried with Christ. I'm ascended with Christ. I'M seated with Christ. Not like him, but with him. And tonight I'd like to say, "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things that are above where Christ is seated at the right hand of God who is our light."

Then notice in our text again. "We were buried with him by that baptism into death." That's what Rom. 6 says. On the day of Pentecost did Peter preach that? "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins." Did our debater tonight tell you that they were baptized into death? Where did he go for that? You notice every time he goes to Paul.

Last night he said that I was wrong in Rom. 4 when I told you that we were to follow Abraham in uncircumcision. He ought to read his Bible. In chapter 4 if you'll go down there, I'll read it to you if you want me to, that we are to follow Abraham in the steps that Abraham had before he was circumcised. And the Bible says it right there in Rom. 4 and he denied it.

We are circumcised with a circumcision not made with

hands, and if our opponent is circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, Where did that take place? Who did it?

Again in our text, "We were buried with him with this baptism into death, that like as Christ—like as Christ—was raised from the dead . . ." Am I dead with Christ? Am I crucified with Christ? Just like him. I've been nailed to the cross. When did they nail me to the cross? God nailed me to the cross in the death of his Son. I was crucified with Christ. Where was I buried? In the same tomb that Jesus Christ was buried. Who buried me? God, the Father, buried me. Paul says, "One baptism." Paul says, "The administration of the grace of God began with me."

Again our opponent quoted, as he brought his message tonight, that the last days are upon us. Let me ask him a question: How could the apostle Paul receive an administration of grace for the Gentiles, in which Paul preached that this was not made known in ages past and generations past? And every night he has denied that Paul preached the unsearchable, the untraceable, riches of Christ—that Paul preached a mystery that was hid in God, and not made known in ages and generations past. He has denied that Paul preached that which was "hushed up" in ages past. He has denied that we were chosen in Christ before the foundation or overthrow of the world. We are in Christ by a divine baptism. And God, the Father, is the administrator.

Go with me to the Book of 1 Corinthians, chapter 10, Paul refers us back to the time that the whole nation of the house of Israel were baptized unto unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. You'll remember that a nation was baptized unto a person. Who baptized a nation unto Moses? They went through on dry land. Moses pushed the water aside and God let them go through on dry land. And God baptized a whole nation unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. God did the baptizing. They were baptized unto Moses. And we are baptized by God into Jesus Christ, into his death, and we are complete in him.

#### ROGERS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm happy to appear before you for my last speech of the night.

It seems that Mr. Baker is getting rather warm under



the collar. About the first thing that he did he got up and said, "Rogers is lying." That's a rather rude statement to make, Mr. Baker. That's not very ethical, not very polite. I don't believe that I'd do that. I'd like to keep the debate on a high plane. And if the book comes out as they suggest you wouldn't want that to come out in it, would you? So let's just keep the debate on a high plane and leave things of that nature out of it altogether. I understand that when a man doesn't have anything to fight with and you begin to rub him it's very easy for him to get warm under the collar. Mr. Baker ought to have known before he came down here what he was going to get into and just come prepared for it.

He said he had answered my questions. Well, I'll let the people decide whether or not you've answered my questions. I have twenty-two that I asked you the first two nights of the debate that you never even hinted at, that you didn't even act like you'd like to answer! much less answer them! And you never answered the ones that were asked tonight. So I'd advise you to just leave the things out that you started a moment ago. Your brethren won't appreciate it and mine won't either. It's not polite; it's not ethical; it's not gentlemanly; so let's leave that at Grand Rapids. What do you say?

Then he came to the argument on Eph. 3. We heard the same record, the same tune, the same song that we heard the first speech that he made in this debate. I knew he wasn't satisfied with the first two nights of this debate, so now he's trying to patch it up! I don't blame him. I would too if I had made such a failure as he did. I'd come back tonight reading Eph. 3 trying to patch up my failure!

But he said that he read a passage that had the word dispensation in it. Yes, but you know that I know, and you know that I know that you know that the word dispensation does not mean a period of time (in the text). I don't believe that you'll say it. If you do, I'll take your own "Dr." Cornelius Stam and show you that it doesn't mean it. It means a stewardship. Now the way I use the term dispensation I said it meant time. Did you not find "time" in 1 Pet. 1:9-11? Did you read that in your Book? The Bible there tells of the grace that the prophets spoke of and that they looked "concerning what time—that's dispensation—or what manner of time." The term dispensation may mean a stewardship or the right to dispense something, as he suggested. That's what Paul meant when he said that it had been given unto him.

He had a right to dispense something unto the Gentiles, and he did not mean a period of time. I don't believe you'll say it. His argument is no good, for he doesn't believe it and neither do his brethren.

In 1 Cor. 9:17 that word is translated "Stewardship." Paul said, "I have a stewardship committed unto me." What does he mean? "I've been given the power to dispense the blessings of the gospel unto the Gentiles." He didn't mean any special time, not at all. The word dispensation (in Eph. 3) doesn't mean that. I answered that the first speech I made in this debate.

But he said that there were TWO gospels; one of circumcision, and one of uncircumcision. I've never been able to get the man to see or understand that when the Bible says the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto Peter, James, and John, and the gospel of uncircumcision was committed unto Paul, it merely means that Paul had the right to preach the gospel to the Gentiles (and even that wasn't an exclusive right), and Peter, James, and John, had the right to preach the gospel to the Jews. Eph. 2:11-17 teaches that distinctly. Well, were they teaching one thing to the Jew and another to the Gentile? Let us see. In Rom. 1:16 Paul says, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for IT is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the JEW—there's the circumcision part of it—and also to the GREEK—that's the uncircumcision part of it." Now, How many gospels? Paul says there is one gospel, "the gospel of Jesus Christ, and IT (He didn't say, 'they are the power of God,' but 'IT') is the power." Don't you know the plural from the singular? Paul said "IT is the power of God unto salvation." I can't get the man to come to this issue. He hasn't come.

But he said that I quoted only a part of the Great Commission. I started out at verse 18 (Matt. 28) and quoted ALL that applies to the Great Commission. (Matt. 28:18-20).

He said that Matt. 28:19 says, "Baptizing them INTO the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And he insisted that it never was done, that they never baptized people into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Do you want to take that back? (Mr. Baker shakes his head in the negative.) You won't take it back?

In Acts 2:38 the Bible says that Peter commanded them to repent and be baptized "in the name" of the Lord (Jesus Christ). Now, Will you tell me what "in the name" means?

Dr. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon says that it means "by the command and authority." Well, What is that 'command and authority," Mr. Baker? What is it? He said, "This is my authority: All of it, in heaven and earth is given unto me." What's the command? "You go and baptize them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Peter did it in the name of the Lord. And if he did it in the "name of the Lord," He did it like the Lord commanded it and according to the authority of the Lord. You ought to join the Oneness Holiness, Mr. Baker. You've already got the Holy Spirit baptism, now you've got the Oneness proposition that they teach—that baptism should be in the name of Jesus only. Why, certainly they were baptized in the name of Jesus. And "in the name of Jesus" means by his command and authority. And that command and authority was, "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Now, he said they didn't do it. In other words, the apostles flatly refused to do what the Lord commanded them. Did they? Did the apostles flatly refuse to do what Jesus commanded? Did they? Did they just flatly refuse to do it? Did the Lord say, "You go do this—I'll give you power—and start in Jerusalem." And then at Jerusalem Peter got up and said, "Lord, I know you said it, but I don't aim to do it!" Is that the attitude he had? What's wrong with you, Mr. Baker!

But he says that I ought to notice that Jesus says, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I HAVE commanded you." And, of course, that's present (perfect) tense, so there wasn't anything else that they could tell the people except what he had already showed them. Do you want to take that one back? In Jno. 16:13 Jesus says, "When he the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth (He'll bring to your remembrance what I have said, but he will also guide you into all truth)." Now, do you wish you hadn't said it? Not only was the Spirit to bring to their remembrance what Jesus had said, but in verse 13 he said, "He will show you things TO COME." Now, Don't you see that? Yes. Jesus was talking to the twelve when he said that. He said, "The Holy Spirit will bring to your remembrance all that I have said, but not only that, he will show you things TO COME." That's out there in the future, Mr. Baker. And it's to the twelve too.

Then he said that in Acts 10 God visited the Gentiles for the first time. I asked you the first night of this debate, and

I've been asking you ever since, if Cornelius was saved under the dispensation of "grace," or under the dispensation of "works;" under the dispensation that "started with Peter," or under the dispensation that "started with Paul." Why won't you tell us? Please, please, Mr. Baker, tell us! Ladies and gentlemen, I'll tell you what's wrong. A false teacher will not answer questions, he doesn't want to get exposed. He'll get exposed whether he wants it or not. I'll deal with him again on Cornelius in just a moment.

Then to Eph. 4. He said, "There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism." Now then he says that that one baptism is Holy Spirit baptism, that we are baptized "in the Spirit." He says that God is the administrator and the Holy Spirit is the element. That's the argument that he made. Now, if a man is baptized in the Spirit, he's baptized just like the apostles were. Do you have the same power that they had? (Mr. Baker shakes his head in negative.) You don't have it? Then you weren't baptized like they were? (Mr. Baker shakes his head in negative). No! He admits that he wasn't! But they were baptized in the Spirit. Now, were you baptized in the Spirit? The apostles WERE baptized in the Spirit, but now you say that you weren't baptized like they were! You weren't baptized like the apostles, but the apostles were baptized in the Spirit; therefore, you weren't baptized in the Spirit. Is that right? He says now he wasn't baptized in the Spirit. He got up a moment ago and argued, and debated, and disputed for half an hour that he was baptized IN the Spirit and that God was the administrator. Why my goodness, man, what's wrong with you! Where are you going from here? Just hard to catch up with a man when he won't stay seated for a time.

But he said that I said that Peter got into the Church without being baptized. No. I said that Peter wasn't baptized under the Great Commission. But did you not remember, you haven't referred to it, that I pointed out according to Lk. 1:17 that John the Baptist prepared this material for the Lord. And I asked you last night, "Did he half prepare it? three-fourths prepare it? or just what did he do?" Did he prepare it like the Bible says? Was it ready to be put in? Or, did it need something else?

But he said if a man had to be baptized with the baptism of the Great Commission, then the twelve apostles were lost.

Well, you admit they had to be baptized with the baptism of Acts 2:38. Now, were they (apostles) lost? Were they lost? (Mr. Baker says: "You said it.") No I didn't. You're the one that said it.

Then he came to this (Eph. 4) and said that there were two baptisms during the days of "works," and after that, in the days of grace, there was just one. You want to take that back? You won't take it back? Well, you'll wish you had. For the Bible says in Acts 10:47 that Peter commanded Cornelius to be baptized. He said, "Who can forbid WATER that these should be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we." Now there was Spirit baptism. He said they got the Spirit. Not only that, but Peter said, "Who can forbid WATER." Now, how were they saved? Acts 15:10. (He quoted it last night), Peter said, "We believe that we shall be saved (how, Peter?) by the GRACE OF the Lord Jesus in LIKE MANNER AS THEY." But Baker said when GRACE WAS there, when people are saved by grace, there's just one. Yes, but Peter said that Cornelius was saved by GRACE. He was baptized in Spirit, and baptized in water. So there were TWO there when grace was there. Wasn't there? Now, don't you see that? Cornelius had TWO; one in water, and one in Spirit. And yet he was saved by GRACE. He gave it last night. So they were saved by GRACE, AND YET there were two baptisms at the very time. I know that there is only one baptism now, and that is the one that was to last to the end of the world, which is the baptism of the Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20). And he admits that that is water baptism.

Then he came to 1 Cor. 1:17. And he said why did I not say, "Christ sent me not TO baptize," (I think that's the way he said it), instead of saying, "Christ sent me NOT to baptize"? Well, I expressed unto him and pointed out that the reason Paul said, "I thank God that I baptized none of you" wasn't because he was afraid that someone would get the idea that it was necessary. (Do you read that in your Bible? It's not in yours, is it? No, it's not in mine either.) Paul said, "The reason that I'm glad I didn't baptize some of you is because of that carnal attitude that you have, and because you are saying that you were baptized into the name of the one that did the baptizing. I'm glad that I didn't baptize but a few of you on that account!" Why, certainly, any man that is spiritual will have that attitude. But I pointed out that when Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize" that he does

not mean that He sent him without authority to baptize, for you've admitted that Paul said that he baptized in the name of the Lord. That means by his command and authority. But that means that Paul's right to baptize did not inhere in his apostolic office. Any Christian may baptize. He didn't send Paul for that special purpose. He sent him to preach the gospel. Anybody in the world can baptize that's a Christian.

Then he came to 1 Cor. 12:13 and said that we are baptized into one Body. And he says that God is the administrator. He says we are baptized IN the Spirit, but the Spirit is not the element. Well, pray tell me, what part does the Spirit play? Will you tell me? You promised last night you would. You know I said, "He's a promising fellow." He promised last night to tell me, but tonight he comes and says God is the administrator—God is the baptizer, one time he used that expression. But now he won't tell me just exactly what part the Spirit plays. He says it's "IN the Spirit," but the Spirit is not the element. Well I can't figure it out. I don't think he can. It's a mystery; it's hidden; it hasn't been revealed! And he's going to keep it a secret because he doesn't want me to get hold of the right end of it!

Here's what "Dr." Charles Baker says about it: "In the former group of Scriptures it is plainly stated that Christ is the baptizer and his people baptized with the Holy Ghost. Paul, on the other hand, represents the Holy Spirit as the baptizer or the administrator." Did you ever read that? Now that's another Dispensationalist. They get up and say, "Folk disagree on baptism; therefore, let's just leave it out." Do you think that they agree on anything? Dr. Charles Baker (and they say that he's a great man in their books) says that the Holy Spirit is the baptizer. This man gets up and says, "Now, Charles Baker, you're wrong. It's not the Holy Spirit that's the baptizer; it's God that does the baptizing, he's the baptizer. And he does it IN the Spirit, but the Spirit is not the element. He does it in it, but that's not it. It is it, but it's not it." I don't know exactly where he's going, but we'll find out before it's over!

But he said I never found a drop of water in Rom. 6:3-4. He says it doesn't say "water"; therefore, it doesn't mean "water." Well, does it say "Spirit," Mr. Baker? If because it doesn't say "water" it doesn't mean "water"; then if it doesn't say "Spirit" it doesn't mean "Spirit." Why do you say that it means "Spirit," since it's not in there? But the

fact is I've pointed out (and have you seen him notice the grammar of it) Paul said, "Know ye not that so many of US as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? . . . and WE were buried with him by baptism." And he says that Paul got water baptism under Pentecostal preaching. Now, that's when Paul got that. That's when Paul got remission of sins. And Bert Baker knows it. Well then, that's the same kind the Romans had. Why don't you just come up, Mr. Baker, and face the issue and toe the line and admit that the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4 is the baptism of the Great Commission—the baptism of Pentecostal preaching since Paul said, "It's the one that I had"? Why don't you deal with it? Why won't you look at it?

Mr. Shaver, I'm going to request that you have your man to answer the arguments that are made, and deal with these pronouns here on the blackboard and these things that are brought forward.

(Mr. Shaver says: "In my judgment he's already answered them.)

Well, in my judgment he hasn't! (Laughter).

And then to Col. 2:12. He says that we are buried, and he thinks that's Spirit baptism. Well, we're buried in the one of Rom. 8:3-4 and that is the very one that Paul says is Pentecostal baptism. You haven't touched it top, edge, side, or bottom! And he's not going to touch it.

Then he came to 1 Pet. 3:21, and he said that if it took that baptism to save then Peter and the rest of them were lost. Well, Peter taught that it took it in Acts 2:38. Were they lost then? Were they? And you admit that he taught it then—Peter taught that it was necessary for others. You're not taking up these arguments point by point and attempting to answer them at all.

And again he said that I said that God put the apostles in the Church without baptism. No, I said without the baptism of the Great Commission. I pointed out that they were prepared (Lk. 1:17), and that God set them in the Church as prepared material. They didn't need anything else. Just as in 1 Kings 6:7 the Temple was made out of stones made ready at the quarry, and in the building of the Temple there was heard neither hammer or any other implement of building upon it, in that very way the material was prepared and God put it together on the day of Pentecost and we had the

Church. There wasn't the "sound of a hammer" heard at that time.

But he said that it's IN Spirit. And in 1 Cor. 6:17 it says that if we are "joined to the Lord, we are one Spirit." And Eph. 4:1 speaks of the "unity of the Spirit." And Eph. 4:4, "There is one baptism." Yes, I realize that there is one baptism. And I know that we are to enjoy the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." And I realize that "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body." But what is the ELEMENT. Have you heard him breath it? Have you heard him mention it. That's his secret! He has a secret! This man has a mystery that never has been revealed! It's hidden since this debate began. Mr. Baker, What's the element? He comes along and says, "It's IN the Spirit."

Now, I pointed out to you that that word in (en) according to Davis' Greek Grammar may be instrumental as well as locative. You're using it in a locative sense, meaning that that's the element in which a person is baptized. That's the way you're using it whether you know it or not. But it may also be used in the instrumental. And the Holy Spirit is the instrument that baptized us into Christ. How? Why the Bible says in Jno. 4:1-2 that "John's disciples heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John." Jesus was baptizing. And yet the Bible says, "Jesus baptized NOT, but his disciples." Now Jesus did the baptizing. How? When his disciples baptized. Now the Spirit does the baptizing. How? When the disciples baptize. We that are "joined to the Lord are one Spirit" (1 Cor. 6:17). When those that are "one spirit" baptize, the Holy Spirit is doing it through the instrumentality of the disciples of Christ. That's all in the world that's involved in it.

Then he came along and said that it's administered by God. Well, it is in a sense. In the sense that the people of God do it, as we've suggested from Jno. 4:1-2.

And then he said that in 1 Cor. 12:18 God set them in the Body. And he said that this was a brand new set of apostles, altogether different from the ones that came before. Mr. Baker, have you ever heard 1 Cor. 9:1-5? Paul said, "Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not a right to lead about a wife that is a believer like the rest of the apostles." Have you not heard that? There Paul connects himself with the "rest" of the apostles. He's just like the rest of them. Paul draws an argument and says, "Brethren, I have a right to marry if I



want to." Well, Paul, how are you going to prove it? Well, Peter and the rest of the apostles marry; therefore, Paul has a right to marry." But (per this man) Paul was altogether different from "Peter and the rest of the apostles;" and therefore, his argument is is not valid, don't you see, according to friend Baker. I'd be ashamed if I had to defend a doctrine that called upon me to ignore passages like this man has.

Then he came again to 1 Cor. 1:17, "Christ sent me not to baptize." It still doesn't prove that baptism is no part of the gospel, or that Paul didn't have the authority to baptize. Because Paul did (baptize) and in Acts 19:5 he did it "in the name of Christ." "In the name of Christ" means by "His command and authority."

But he said, "Of all things, Rogers started off this dispensation with a Jewish feast day." Rogers didn't do any such thing. The Bible does it. God did it. In Lk. 24:46-47 the Bible says that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations (Where's it going to begin?), beginning at Jerusalem." That's Jewish. And then when the day of Pentecost was fully come it started there. Peter says, "The Spirit fell on them as on us at the BEGINNING." Now, if you've got any argument you argue with Dr. Luke. (I believe he called him that last night.)

Then he came to Col. 2:12 and said that the circumcision is "without hands." Yes, I readily agree that the circumcision was without hands, but it doesn't say that the baptism was without hands. He won't find the verse that says the baptism is without hands. We're baptized, and then God forgives us. The forgiveness is spoken of as our sins being cut loose. Who does it? God. With hands? No. When does God do it? When we're baptized into Christ with Pentecostal baptism. Acts 22:16, "And now, Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord."

He says that we are "buried with Christ." Yes, and he also says that we are "crucified with Christ." (Gal. 2:20). That doesn't mean that Mr. Baker was actually there. It doesn't mean that he was IN Christ and then was baptized into Him, if he's actually done that.

But he said that in Rom. 6 there isn't any water in it. Was there any water in Pentecostal baptism? Was there? Was there any water in the Pentecostal baptism? Paul says, "Know ye not that so many of US as were baptized into Christ

were baptized into his death? And therefore WE were buried with Him . . ." There was some water in that one wasn't there? Paul says that this (baptism) of Rom. 6:3-4 is the one I had. That's Pentecostal baptism. Was there any water in that one?

He referred to Eph. 1:13, "We are sealed by the Spirit." Yes, these Ephesians were sealed by the Spirit when they believed. It says, "After that they believed." It doesn't say just how soon after they believed. Acts 2:38 says to repent and be baptized for remission of sins, and then you'll get the Spirit. Acts 5:32 says obey Him and then you'll receive the Holy Spirit. That passage doesn't say you'll get it by faith only.

But he said that Paul got this revelation when he was caught up into the third heaven. That's something else I imagine you'll want to take back. Yes, he said that Paul got this revelation when he went to heaven. You know Paul said in 2 Cor. 12: 4-5, "I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth), such an one was caught up even to the third heaven." (He said it was even Paradise). Well, Paul, what did you see and learn? He said, "I saw things that is not lawful for man to utter." Paul said, "I couldn't speak it. It was not lawful for a man to utter." He comes along and says, "Paul broke the law. He did something that wasn't lawful. He came along and told it anyhow." I heard about Mary Baker Eddy. She went to heaven (she said) and came back and told it. I wonder what was the difference between Paul and Mary Baker Eddy, unless she was a woman and he was a man and she would tell it anyhow! Paul said here that it was not lawful for a man to speak the thing he saw. This man comes along and says that that is the very revelation that he did speak. Well, that's Dispensationalism, not what the Bible says.

Then we come to another point. He said that he was a member of the Church of Christ in Danville, Illinois. Do you mean that you were a member of the same Church that I'm a member of? (Mr. Baker says: "If you're in the Body of Christ, Yes.") Well I'm in the Body of Christ. (Mr. Baker: "Then we're in the same Church.") Now, you're not answering the question. You know the point that I refer to. When you were with this group, before you got into Dispensationalism, were you recognized with the same group that I'm recognized

with? (Mr. Baker: "The Church of Christ.") The Church of Christ.

You know that the Bible says that Judas was a disciple of the Lord. I didn't know when I came down here that I was going to deal with an apostate. I'm dealing with a man that has apostatized from primitive Christianity! I don't know how to lighten the punch. I wouldn't if I could. But the Bible teaches distinctly that in "the latter time some will fall away from the faith." (2 Tim. 4:1-4). And Bert Baker has done that. He's my Brother, if he ever obeyed the gospel of the Son of God, was a member of the Church of the Lord. But Paul says in 2 Tim. 2:15-17: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane babblings: for they will proceed further in ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a gangrene: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; men who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." This is Hymenaeus or Philetus one. He has erred concerning the truth. He has left primitive Christianity that we read about in the Bible, and gone off with Dispensationalism, a thing that he couldn't prove to save his life tonight. I think that it's time for a confession—high time.

But he said, "In Acts 2:38, Where did Peter say that (baptism) is into death?" Well, you admit that Paul got the one that Peter preached in Acts 2:38, don't you? Didn't Paul get the one that Peter preached in Acts 2:38? The one that Paul got was into death (Rom. 6:3-4). Then the one that Peter preached was into death. (Mr. Baker mumbles something from his seat.) Paul didn't get the one that Peter Preached? Then Peter didn't preach Pentecostal baptism then! I thought he started it. He's saying now that Peter didn't preach Pentecostal baptism. He's shaking his head in the negative (that Paul didn't get Pentecostal baptism). Why that's the very baptism of Acts 2:38. Well what kind was it? One into the death of Christ (Rom. 6:3-4).

But he says that in Rom. 6 the element is death. No. The Bible says that "by baptism" or "through baptism" we get into death. First the baptism, then the death. You get us into the death and then the baptism. Can't you see the difference in that? Paul says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus were baptized into his death? And therefore, we were buried with him by baptism (the Re-

vised Version says, 'through baptism') into death." First the baptism, and that's the thing that puts us into the death. He says you get into the death, and there you get the baptism. Weil now, somebody is wrong, either Paul or Baker. You either get into the death through baptism, or you get the baptism through the death. Now, which is it? Wi!l you tell us that you get the baptism through the death? That's your position. That's what you've been arguing here tonight—that a man doesn't get the baptism until he's passed through the death. Paul says you don't get the death until you've passed through the baptism. That's the difference between Bert Baker, a Dispensational preacher, and the Word of God, a man that says that he was one time a member of the Church for which Jesus died.

Then he came to Rom. 4. He said that I said Paul didn't say, "Follow Abraham while he was in uncircumcision." I didn't say that the statement in Rom. 4, where Paul was speaking of Abraham, that Abraham was in uncircumcision, or that he wasn't. But I said that when you read verse 11 you read it that way, and it doesn't say it. I realize that Abraham was in uncircumcision at the time Paul referred to him in Rom. 4. But Paul did not say, "Follow him just up to that point." That's the point that I made. He doesn't say, "Follow him up to that point and quit." It doesn't say it and you can't find it. It doesn't say, "Follow him just as long as he was in uncircumcision." It does not say it, and Bert Baker cannot find it if he stays here a month. Rogers knew what Rom. 4 says a long time before he ever saw Bert Baker.

But he said that I had been denying that it was unsearchable. No. I've been denying your definition of unsearchable. I pointed out that the "unsearchable riches of Christ" means the "incomprehensible riches of Christ," and that's what the Greek-English Lexicons give as a definition of the word. I'm just denying your definition of terms. That's what I'm doing.

And he said that I said it wasn't hid. No. I said your definition of the word hid is not Scriptural. I pointed out from Lk. 18:31-34 that Jesus pointed out from the Prophets that he was going to die. He said, "It's in the prophets." And he told them about it, that he would be delivered to the Gentiles, that they would spit upon him and mistreat him, and that he would die and be raised the third day. But the Bible says they didn't understand it and the "saying was hid." What does it mean? Does it mean that it never had been told be-

fore? Does it? He said, "It's written in the prophets, now I tell you;" and yet, it was hid to them. Mr. Baker says that when anything is hid that means it never has been told before. I just used the Bible and showed that his definition of the word hid, as it is found in the Bible, is an unscriptural definition.

He says I don't believe in the mystery. I believe in the mystery all right, but I don't believe in the kind that he believes in. I believe in the kind the Bible reveals. His definition of the word mystery is a man-made definition that will not stand the test of the Bible. Paul said that a mystery may be something that has already been revealed. Well, why is it a mystery? Because it's not understood. In 2 Thess. 2:7 Paul speaks of the "mystery of lawlessness." He said, "It already works." And in verse 5 he says, "While I was with you I told you these things." It's a mystery, but Paul says, "While I was with you, I told you about it." So a thing may be told and still be a mystery, because it's not thoroughly comprehended. If you don't quit quibbling on that the people are going to see exactly the definition of the term and you'll be worse off than if you had just left it alone.

Then in 1 Cor. 10:1-2. He said that these were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Well, I realize that. And they were baptized by God in that sense. Now, I want to know if we're baptized in the same sense that they were? Is this a literal baptism, or is it a figurative baptism? Your own writers say that it is a figurative baptism. I don't know which end you're going to take. You can take either end you want to and we'll see how it works out. But you don't claim to have the same type of baptism that they had and I don't either.

Now then, let me go back and review the arguments that I have made for the consideration of my opponent. Many of them have been overlooked. Let us remember that the baptism of the Great Commission was to last to the end of the world. (Matt. 28:20), that it was to begin at Pentecost. (It did as I pointed out from Lk. 24:47; Acts 1:8; 2:1-4). I pointed out also that it was the very same thing that Paul preached, that Paul continued to preach, and this man cannot find where he started to preach something else.

I also pointed out that we are in the last days. The "days" there have to do with time—this dispensation. That's exactly what the term means and his own writers will admit it. O'Hair

admits it. Stam admits it, all these other Dispensionalists will. He's just in a tight. That's the only reason he doesn't admit it. "The last days" refers to the dispensation. But I found out that it started on Pentecost, that it continued even when the Book of Hebrews was written and when Peter wrote his second epistle. So the Church had not "interrupted," it had not come in as a "parenthetical dispensation."

I pointed out that this dispensation was the "time of grace." It began on Pentecost, because Paul was saved by grace, through faith, not of works under the terms of Pentecostal preaching. And since this dispensation began then my proposition is proven.

Then water baptism is for remission of sins because he admits that it is for remission of sins in Acts 2:38. A moment ago he said that if it was necessary for salvation, then Peter and the others were lost. There's no "if" about it because he admits that it was necessary for salvation. He knows that it was necessary for salvation. The baptism of Acts 2:38 was for remission unto "all afar off." Have you ever heard him mention that? Peter said, "Baptism doth NOW save us."

And 1 Cor. 1:12-13, In order to belong to Christ we must be baptized into his name.

Acts 22:16, We're saved by grace, through faith when we're baptized to wash away our sins (2 Tim. 1:9).

Rom. 6:3-4, the baptism that Paul says inducts us into Christ is Pentecostal baptism. For he said, "As many of US as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore WE were buried . . ."

Then we find Gal. 3:26-27 is the baptism that inducts us into Christ, identical with the baptism of Rom. 6:3-4.

Col. 2:12, that in this baptism we are buried in it and raised in it, and is, therefore, the same as Rom. 6:3-4 which is Pentecostal baptism.

1 Cor. 12:13, that that is the baptism that puts us into Christ or into the Body of Christ and is Pentecostal baptism (Rom. 6:3-4).

Then Mk. 16:16 says, "Every creature." Are you a creature?

(Time called).

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

## BAKER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Shall we go again to the Book of Acts and the first chapter. And I'd like to show you that this baptism "in Spirit" was the baptism that Jesus Christ said the disciples were to receive; and that Christ is the baptizer! and that Christ baptized them in Holy Spirit. I said in 1 Cor. 12 that God, the Father, is the baptizer, and baptizes us into the Son. The baptism by Jesus in the Book of Acts, the baptism "in Spirit" is always "upon" and "on"—all the way through the Book of Acts. And wherever there is a baptism "in Spirit" by Christ for power it's always "upon" and "on." But in 1 Cor. 12:13 it's a baptism "into" the Body of Christ. Now anyone can see the difference between a baptism in Spirit "upon," and a baptism "into" the Church which is the Body of Christ.

In the Book of Acts, in the second chapter, again I call your attention to this fact that the day of Pentecost was a Jewish feast day. And in Eph. 3, where I gave the definition of the mystery—"that the Gentiles should be joint-heirs in the joint-Body, and joint partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel, whereof I (Paul) was made a minister"—that is not found in the second chapter of the Book of Acts.

Now I did not say that the Lord Jesus Christ did not tell them that they should go out and baptize into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I simply have to believe what God tells me in his Word. And in Acts 2, in Acts 8, in Acts 10, in Acts 19, and in every instance where we have baptism in the Book of Acts, in water, (and I do not deny the fact that Paul was baptized for the remission of his sins, but I deny the fact that that was the baptism of Rom. 6. In Rom. 6 we do not have water baptism! And I insisted that Paul received by revelation a baptism into Christ, and a circumcision made without hands.)—in every instance where we have baptism in water mentioned in the Book of Acts it's in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the Book of Acts and the second chapter, I'd like to call your attention to the message that was preached here. We know that the restoration of Israel cannot be the Body of Christ. We know that to restore the kingdom—to restore something is to restore something that existed. "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel." In the Book of Acts, chapter 15, he said, "I will build again the Tabernacle of David." "Again." It was broken down, and it was going to be

built again. Now I say that the Body of Christ was a new creation. I've insisted that it was hid in God because the Scripture says so. And it was "hushed" up in ages past, but was now revealed by Paul, because the Scripture says so.

Now, he said I won't deal with Cornelius. I'd like to turn with you to the tenth chapter of the Book of Acts and deal with Cornelius. I tell you that Cornelius was a proselyte, and that Cornelius was saved under Peter's gospel of circumcision. The same message that God sent to the Children of Israel was sent to Cornelius. Turn with me to the tenth chapter of the Book of Acts and let me call your attention to the forty-fourth verse. "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." What was Cornelius doing? In Acts 10:2 he was a "devout man," one that "feared God with all his house," he gave "alms to the people" (that's Israel), and he "prayed to God always." He had a vision. He saw the vision about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming to him and saying to him, "Cornelius." And then Peter was commanded to go and preach to Cornelius. But before Peter would go God had to give him a vision. He had to let down a sheet from heaven. Why did he have to have a vision in order to go to Cornelius with the gospel of the kingdom and the gospel of the circumcision? He had the Great Commission. Why didn't he go without a vision? I would certainly concede that in Acts 10 Cornelius had two baptisms—that he was baptized in Spirit with this baptism of power, and then he was baptized in water; that he had two baptisms. And we said there's only one in the administration of the grace of God.

Now if the administration of grace began with Peter, and there's one baptism, how then are there TWO? I'm sure that Brother Rogers believes that there are two as he stated. And in the administration of grace there's only one. So we're living in the administration of grace with only one. And he has admitted that there are two. Now, two are not one.

The apostle Paul makes it plain that he opened the door of faith to the Gentiles. So in Cornelius' message we have the same message that was sent to the children of Israel. And we have Peter preaching after visions and revelations were given. And then Peter went, and while he was preaching the Holy Spirit fell on him. I don't have that baptism. Christ is not baptizing "in Holy Spirit with power." We do not have an



"upon" baptism today; we have a baptism "into" Christ and "into" the death of Christ.

In the Book of Acts when Jesus baptized, baptized with Holy Spirit, there were tongues, manifestations. God baptizes us with the death of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then, again, I'd like to call your attention to what Paul said in 2 Cor. 12. I'd like to have you note what he said in verse 1. "It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago . . ." Now how far back does that go? Fourteen years ago? I said that the administration of grace for the Gentiles began with Paul. About fourteen years ago takes you back to the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Acts, where the apostle Paul is called with Barnabas an apostle. And Barnabas and Paul are called apostles. I know the verse that he read, but that verse clarifies what I say. Paul was an apostle. And the signs of an apostle we wrought among the nations by Paul. And Peter acknowledges that Paul was an apostle. Did not Peter, James, and John give to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship? And they said to Paul, and they said to Barnabas, "You go to the Gentiles. We're going to stay with the Jews." Now were they not commanded to go and baptize all nations? How did they happen to say, "You, Paul, go to the Gentile and we'll stay with the Jew"? Were they disobedient to their command? I do not believe that Peter was disobedient. Peter had a gospel inspired, the gospel of the circumcision. But Peter had to be rebuked by Paul in the Book of Galatians because he came down and tried to impose Judaism upon the Gentiles. And Paul rebuked him to his face "because he was to be blamed." Peter knew that the Gentiles were saved by grace and through faith and that by divine baptism we are in the Body of Christ, and that our sins are taken away by a circumcision not made with hands.

And I'd like to call your attention again to another question that was asked in the Book of Hebrews. Where does it say in the Book of Hebrews that Paul wrote it? Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent. Paul said, "Every epistle that I write bears my name." He tells us that in the Book of Thessalonians. Where does it say in the Bible that the Book of Hebrews was written by Paul? It does not bear his name.

Then I'd like to call your attention to the Book of Peter,

the statement of Peter. And notice that that passage was used concerning grace. And I want you to notice that he did not finish that statement concerning grace. Notice in 2 Peter, chapter 1, "Moreover I will endeavour (verse 15) that ye may be able after by decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were carried along and moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Pet. 1:15-21).

Now, I want you to notice in 1 Peter concerning the prophecy. Notice in the first chapter of 1 Peter in verse 9. Listen to this now, Peter is speaking, "Receiving the end (the consummation) of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied (listen now)—who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you. Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand (listen) the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for THE GRACE that is TO BE BROUGHT unto you AT THE REVELATION of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 1:9-13). That's future.

Paul says in Titus, "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men." Here is a future grace (1 Pet.). And Paul's grace was present.

I'd like to take you back to the second chapter of the Book of Acts where we began our message tonight. In the second

chapter of the Book of Acts we said that Peter was ministering to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; that he was not ministering to the Gentiles. And you can't have a joint-Body without Jews and Gentiles in it. And it was stated clearly that the gospel was preached to Cornelius by Peter, and that Cornelius was the first Gentile saved under the gospel of the kingdom and the gospel of the circumcision. Now note that! I said that Cornelius was preached to by Peter, and that Peter preached the gospel of the circumcision. And Peter preached to him the same gospel that he preached on the day of Pentecost. And Peter preached, "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." I said that's not what Paul preached. Cornelius was a devout man. Paul says God justifies the ungodly. And there's a lot of difference in justifying the ungodly, and the works of a righteous man that needs yet to be saved. Cornelius had to be preached to, and then after he had received the baptism in Spirit he spake with tongues, and had to be baptized in water in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Now remember I do not teach, nor do I preach, that we have today the baptism in Spirit for power, or that the gift of tongues is in God's Church, the Body of Christ, today. There is no baptism in Spirit for power. Our baptism is into not a baptism upon. Check your Bibles tonight. Read the Book of Acts when you go to bed tonight, and underline the words on and upon. Go to Corinthians and underline the word into. And you'll find that an "upon" baptism is not an "into" baptism. And I'm sure that Brother Rogers does not believe that he has the baptism in Spirit, and that that baptism in Spirit is for the Body of Christ today. You see the one baptism not only eliminates the baptism of repentance for remission of sins, but it also eliminates a baptism of power from the Body of Christ today, where there is speaking with tongues and manifestations. Paul said, "Whether there be tongues they shall cease."

Now remember again in Acts, chapter 2, we have a Jewish feast day, and Peter is preaching to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Let me call your attention to this fact. He says in verse 22, "Ye men of Israel . . ." We are not Israelites. Peter was preaching to a nation. He was not preaching to Gentiles; he was preaching to the Jews. "Ye MEN OF ISRAEL, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God

among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and the foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." He was preaching to the house of Israel. In verse 36 notice again, "Let ALL the house of Israel know . . ." Peter had the gospel of the circumcision.

In Acts 15 he gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. He said, "You go to the Gentiles with the gospel of the uncircumcision, and we'll go to the circumcision." Now, notice it! In this text we are told, "Let ALL THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL know assuredly that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Notice that these JEWS had been guilty of the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus Christ. There were three thousand Jews present.

Now, I'd like to call your attention, if you will, to the Book of Acts again, where there is a re-baptizing. I'd like to call your attention again to a passage of Scripture that deals with that Pentecostal administration. I said, and I again say it, that the administration of grace—God's order for his house, a stewardship, an economy—was committed to Paul in his written ministry for the Gentiles. I've said time and time again that it's in Paul's written ministry. And we appeal there for God's order for his house today. In the elimination of tongues Paul gives us the divine order. When Paul speaks, he has a reason for speaking. When Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize," he did not mean what our debater said tonight—that he didn't have the right to baptize as an apostle—or he would not have baptized because there was a division. Brethren, if you think that there are no divisions in Christendom today, you're mistaken. But in God's Word there is one Body; and, thank God, there are no divisions there. We are all one in the Lord Jesus Christ.

I'd like to have you turn with me to the nineteenth chapter of the Book of Acts, if you will. Here the apostle Paul is definitely dealing with an experience. Notice in the twenty-fourth verse (of Acts 18), "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the

baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded him unto him the way of God more perfectly. And when he was disposed to go into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who, when he was come, helped much which had believed through grace: For he mightly convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. And it came to pass, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, (Jewish disciples), he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Spirit believing? Have ye received Holy Spirit believing? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit (or whether the Holy Spirit had been given.) And then Paul said, Unto what then were you baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were baptized IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS. And when Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve." (Acts 18:24-19:7).

Now I said that the gospel of the grace of God, and God's order for his house today is found in Paul's written ministry. When I come to Corinthians Paul says these words plainly, "Whether there be tongues they shall cease." If I want to know God's order today I'm not going to follow the order of the nineteenth of Acts. I'm going to follow the order of Paul in his written ministry. And follow him in the Book of Ephesians where there is "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," and where I'm not baptized in Spirit by Christ for power that I might speak with tongues.

Then let me call your attention to this fact: Why did Paul re-baptize these believers? Why did the apostle Paul baptize these men that had been baptized with John's baptism? Now again, Brother Rogers said that John's baptism prepared the people for the coming of the Messiah, and that John's baptism was good enough for the apostles, and they did not have to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, or in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Now these men had John's baptism and it was not good

enough. The apostle Paul had to RE-baptize them in the name of the Lord Jesus. And then he had to lay his hands upon them that they might receive Holy Spirit, that they might have a manifestation and speak with tongues. Now, brethren, the order for God's house today is found in Paul's letters. And I say it again, reverently, I have answered the question that the apostle Paul is the apostle that we are to follow, and that the administration of the grace of God, and that stewardship, is that which eliminates these things from the program that we find in the Book of Acts. Brother Rogers will have to go with me to the Book of 1 Corinthians. He'll have to go with me to the Book of Ephesians to eliminate this baptism in Spirit by Christ with power. He'll have to confess that he does not have the baptism in Spirit for power, that he does not speak with tongues, nor do his brethren speak with tongues. We both have eliminated these things from God's program. I have eliminated them by following Paul as he followed Christ. I have eliminated them by progressive revelation.

Now, I say again tonight that when the apostle Paul speaks of himself as an apostle, having the right to lead about a wife, he does make it plain that he is an apostle, and that the others were associated with him were apostles. Notice again that we are making it clear that Paul was separated by the Holy Spirit with Barnabas in the thirteenth of Acts. What were they separated from? What were they separated to? Again we say that God's order for the Body of Christ today is found in Paul's written ministry.

I am amazed that men cannot see that in the administration of the grace of God that the apostle Paul has the answer to all of these problems and difficulties that we have in the world today.

Let me answer another question for you that was given to me. Notice again this question has to do with baptism. I said, and again I say it with reverence, that Peter said, "In the like figure baptism doth also now save us." I say, and I said, it reverently that if baptism saves—water baptism saves—and Peter did not have that baptism, then, how could God save Peter without that baptism. How could anyone get into Christ without being baptized into Christ? And John did not baptize anyone into Christ. Remember that John the Baptist never became a member of the Body of Christ. John the Baptist was an Old Testament prophet, lived and died before Christ died, never saw the cross of calvary. He was saved; he was a

just man; one of the greatest prophets that ever lived, and this great prophet, this voice in the wilderness, this one that prepared a way for the coming of the Messiah, he was the one that God declared that that baptism was "for the remission of sins." And they had to be baptized before the Great Commission was given, but not into Jesus Christ, not into the Body of Christ, not into the death of Christ. John's baptism was not into the death of Christ, the death of Christ; and John's baptism did not put any one into the New Testament Church, as it is called, because John lived and died before the Son of God was made sin. Again, I say I have answered the question, and I'm sure when you read about it you'll agree.

May God bless you.

### ROGERS' THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

My worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm certainly grateful that we can assemble again in this capacity to continue our investigation of the Book of God, and to see just exactly what it teaches on the subject under consideration.

I'd like to suggest that as far as I'm concerned I'm thoroughly enjoying the discussion. I want you to know that whenever I press the issue I'm not doing it because I have any ill feeling toward my opponent. I've found him to be a very likable fellow, and I've learned to like him a great deal since the debate began. I certainly have nothing personally against him. When I press the issue as I am, it's not because I have anything at all against Mr. Baker. I like him fine, and I'm just sorry that we're on different sides of this proposition. But it just so happens that we are, and, of course, I love the truth. I came here to defend the truth and uproot error and unless I do that work I'll not be faithful to the Cause I have espoused. So I'm not trying to be rude or hard with him or anything like that. I love him. I'm not mad with him, but I endeavour to press the proposition in order that the truth might stand forth in all of its purity and in all of its simplicity. The truth is like gold, the more you rub it the brighter it shines. And so these issues need to be pressed, and I intend to do that as far as my part of the debate is concerned without any ill feeling whatsoever toward Mr. Baker.

Now, the first thing that I wish to do is to make another affirmative argument or continue one that I've already started,

that the present dispensation began on the first Pentecost after the Lord's resurrection and that water baptism is for the remission of sins. I affirmed last night, and it has not been denied successfully, that the Book of God says that the present dispensation (the gospel dispensation) began in Jerusalem upon the first Pentecost following the resurrection of Christ. Now I've indicated that the gospel began right there as Mark gave it in 16:15-16 and Luke said (24:47) that it would begin there. And Peter said it did begin there (Acts 11:15). I've also suggested that inasmuch as the last days began upon the day of Pentecost, and since we are still in the last days, and the Church is in the last days; then the dispensation that is known as the "last days" is the one that we're in and that began on the day of Pentecost.

I want now to re-affirm and point out that when the Bible commences in Acts 2 that there were TWO baptisms. I call your attention to the chart that I have on the blackboard. We have here that there is ONE BAPTISM (Eph. 4:5). Yet I realize that the Bible speaks of TWO baptisms in the days of John the Baptist. He spoke of water baptism (Matt. 3:11), and also of Holy Spirit baptism. Now, certainly you can add Spirit baptism and water baptism and get TWO baptisms. So there were going to be two baptisms. There was one in water and one in Spirit. Then you'll remember that the Lord mentions TWO baptisms, one in water and one in Spirit (Acts 1:5-6) when he said, "John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Now, he speaks of TWO, one in water and one in Spirit. Upon the day of Pentecost in A. D. 33 we realize that there were TWO baptisms. The apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit, and then Peter commanded those who heard to "repent and be baptized for remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). My friend, Mr. Baker, admits that this baptism is "for remission of sins" and that it's water baptism. So there were TWO baptisms there. We now turn to the household of Cornelius in A. D. 41. In Acts 10:44-48 we find that the Holy Spirit fell upon them in that miraculous measure called the "baptism of the Spirit." (Acts 11:14-17). And we also find that Peter said. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" (Acts 10:47). So we can see that John mentioned TWO baptisms, one in water and one in Spirit. We see that there were TWO baptisms, one in water and one in Spirit, in A. D. 33 and 41. But we find in



A. D. 64 when Paul wrote the Book of Ephesians that he says, "There is ONE Lord, one faith and ONE baptism" (Eph. 4:5).

(Chart)

## THERE IS ONE . . . BAPTISM

(Eph. 4:5)

- I. THERE WERE TWO BAPTISMS IN A. D. 33 & 41.
  - A. John mentioned two baptisms—one water, one in Spirit (Matt. 3:11).
  - B. The Lord mentioned two baptisms—one in water, one in Spirit (Acts 1:5-6).
  - C. There were two baptisms on Pentecost, A. D., 33—one in Spirit, one in water (Acts 2:1-4, 38).
  - D. There were two baptisms at the household of Cornelius, A. D. 41—one in Spirit, one in water (Acts 10:44-48).
- II. BUT IN A. D. 64 THERE WAS BUT ONE BAPTISM (Eph. 4:5).
  - A. There were two baptisms—one in water and one in Spirit in A. D. 33 and 41.
  - B. But in A. D. 64 there was only one baptism (Eph. 4:5).
  - C. Therefore, either water baptism or Spirit baptism had ceased by A. D. 64.
- III. WHICH BAPTISM CEASED?
  - A. The baptism of the Great Commission was to last to the end of the world (Matt. 28:18-20).
  - B. But the baptism of the Great Commission was water baptism (Acts 10:47).
  - C. Therefore, water baptism was to last to the end of the world.
  - D. Then the "ONE" baptism of A. D. 64 must have been water baptism.
  - E. Therefore, Spirit baptism is the baptism which ceased!

Now, Mr. Baker will readily admit that these TWO baptisms are not ONE baptism. There is only ONE baptism today and, therefore, either Spirit baptism or water baptism has ceased! Now, we can see from the syllogism that we have here (on the chart) that there were TWO baptisms, one in

water and one in Spirit, in A. D. 33 and 41. And yet in A. D. 64 there was only ONE baptism; therefore either water baptism or Spirit baptism had ceased by A. D. 64. Now we come to the grand question: Which baptism was it that had ceased? Which one was it that ceased?

We know when Paul wrote to the Ephesians that ONE baptism had ceased and there was ONE in force. Now, which one was it that ceased and which one was still in force? I call your attention to the Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20). Jesus commanded his disciples, "Go ye into all the world and teach all nations baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you and lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world." Here we find that the baptism of the Great Commission is to last "to the end of the world." But the baptism of the Great Commission is water baptism. It's a baptism administered by man. And, therefore, water baptism is to last "to the end of the world." Now, if you can understand that the world has not come to an end tonight, then you ought to understand that the baptism of the Great Commission (which is water baptism) is the ONE baptism that is still in force. Well, which one ceased? Spirit baptism is the one that ceased, and water baptism is still in force.

Let me emphasize this fact right here: My opponent will agree with me that this baptism of the Great Commission is water baptism. He will also admit that it is to last to the end of the world. But he teaches that this was taught just for a time — just for a few years — and that then the Lord rescinded that command, He took it back, and then the Church was brought in by way of parenthesis; and that that command doesn't apply to us today, but after a while that parenthesis will end, and they will go into all the world and this baptism here will be practiced again until the world comes to an end. So by the "end of the world" he will mean exactly what I mean. The only difference between us is this: Did this start in the last days? and is the Church in the last days? If I prove that this started in the last days (and I've already done that from Acts 2:38 and 11:15), and if I also prove that people continued in the last days after the dispensation of grace was brought in according to his theory, then I'll have proved that water baptism is the one baptism that continued and it will last to the end of the world, it is the one in force today.

In Heb. 1:1-2 the writer says, "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers by the prophets in divers portions and in divers manners hath in the end of these days (or as the King James Version says, in these!ast days) spoken unto us in his Son." The Book of Hebrews was written according to their own scholars about twenty years after this baptism was supposed to have ceased—after the last days had stopped! After the parenthesis had been brought in! But the writer of the Book of Hebrews says they were still in the last days. He says in "THESE last days." So I affirm tonight that my opponent's proposition is altogether wrong and my proposition is proven. The Great Commission was to last to the end of the world, and the baptism that's in it. We are still in the last days and, therefore, Spirit baptism is the baptism that ceased. We'd like to see him come to the platform and deal with the chart.

Now, to the speech that he made last night in his last thirty minutes. He said that in 1 Cor. 12:13 the Bible says, "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body whether Jews or Greeks, bond or free and were all made to drink of one Spirit." I've never been able to get that man to tell me whether or not he means that the Holy Spirit there is the element. He just will not say. That's a secret that Bert Baker has and apparently he's going to take it back to Grand Rapids with him. I just wonder why the man won't tell us what he means.

When the Bible says that "in one Spirit" or "by one Spirit" we're "baptized into the Body" I pointed out that it's instrumental, and that it means that the Holy Spirit is the instrument that baptizes us into Christ. How does he do it? The same way that Jesus baptizes. How did he do it? When his disciples baptized (Jno. 4:1-2). So we understand that the Holy Spirit baptizes people when the disciples baptize people.

Now, he says that we are baptized "in the Spirit" in the sense that the Spirit is the element. He uses it that way even though he denies it.

Then he made an argument like this: He said the baptism in 1 Cor. 12:13 is a baptism "INTO" and the baptism in Acts 1:5-6 is a baptism "UPON." Why Bert Baker, you couldn't find that if your life depended upon it! You can't find where the Bible says being baptized "UPON." No, he finds where the Spirits comes "upon" somebody and that they're baptized

after the Spirit does come upon them. But nowhere does the Bible say that any baptism is upon any person. It just doesn't say it. The idea is that when the Holy Spirit is given in such a measure that a person is "overwhelmed"—is immersed in it—then he's baptized in it. But we need to understand that it doesn't say "baptized upon," "but baptized in." And it's the same Greek word, by the way, that's here in 1 Cor. 12:13.

Now, let us notice something else. I want to emphasize the fact that this baptism here in 1 Cor. 12:13 is not Holy Spirit baptism, in the sense that the Holy Spirit is the element. Why? Because the Bible says, "By one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." The Bible teaches in Acts 10:47-48 that a person that is baptized in the Spirit receives the Spirit. If you've been baptized in the Spirit you already have the Spirit, you've already received it. But in this baptism of 1 Cor. 12:13 the Bible says that we're first "baptized in one Spirit" into the body and then you "drink the Spirit." You're first by one Spirit baptized into the Body and then you get the Spirit AFTER you're in the Body. But the Bible teaches that to "drink of the Spirit" means to "receive the Spirit" (Jno. 7:37-39). So to be baptized by the Spirit into the Body does not mean to be baptized in the Holy Spirit in the sense that we receive it. For the Bible says that "by one Spirit we're baptized into the Body" and then AFTER that we receive the Spirit. And Mr. Baker is perverting the text when he makes it mean that we're baptized in the Spirit in the sense that the Holy Spirit is the element. He's perverting it altogether.

But he says that God is the administrator (of the baptism) in 1 Cor. 12:13. That doesn't say that God baptizes us in the Spirit. It says that we're baptized "by the Spirit." If you use the Greek word *en* I still insist that it's instrumental, and it still means that the Holy Spirit does the baptizing. And I pointed out that the only way the Holy Spirit does the baptizing is through his disciples as Jesus did. And he hasn't dealt with it.

Then he said, "We get into Christ by a divine baptism." Mr. Baker, I want to ask you a question. Is the baptism of the Great Commission of heaven or of men? Is it divine or is it human? They make a distinction between the baptism of the Great Commission and divine baptism. Then the baptism of the Great Commission is not divine, it's of human origin according to this man. A thing being divine means that it comes from God. And yet he makes a distinction between the

baptism of the Great Commission and divine baptism. Don't you understand that Jesus said even of John's baptism when it was in force, "Is it of heaven or of men?" We must realize that John's baptism came from God, it was divine when it was in force. Therefore, we ask Mr. Baker if the baptism of the Great Commission is of heaven or of men. Is it human or is it divine?

But then he said last night (and last night is the first time that he's ever made his argument clear enough for us to catch on) that he doesn't accept anything except what is written by Paul. He gave this expression, I think, that we must get our orders from Paul's written ministry. Meaning by that that any sermons that Paul preached that might be recorded in the Book of Acts written by Dr. Luke (as he called him) that that word is not for us today, that we're to get away from it, that we're not to accept that. Want to take it back? (Mr. Baker shakes head in negative). Going to stick with it?

In 2 Thess. 2:15 (take this down. He hasn't taken a note since this debate began, and he's not going to answer these things. He's not trying to.) Paul said, "Brethren, HOLD the traditions which you received from us whether by WORD (that's his oral message) or by epistle." Paul says, "Now, brethren, you've got to accept BOTH of them. You've got to accept it whether written (epistle) or by WORD." And, where do we get the oral message? Eh? Who told us about the sermons that he preached? Why, Dr. Luke in the Book of Acts. That's where it is. But he (Baker) says, "don't you believe them, don't accept what Paul preached in oral message. For we're not to be governed today except by what he WROTE." Paul says, "Brethren, you be governed by the things that you received from me whether by WORD (the oral message) or by epistle (the thing that I have written.)" Now, Do you wish you hadn't said it? (Mr. Baker shakes head in negative). You don't? Then you don't care to deny the Word of God do you? You'll contradict it and be glad of it! Is that it?

Paul said you'll have to accept both of them. Mr. Bert A. Baker says you can't accept but one. Are you going to accept Paul or Bert Baker? Which do you want? Paul says, "Brethren, you must hold fast (don't get away from it)—ye hold fast the things that ye received of us whether by word or by epistle." Bert Baker comes along and says, "Brethren, don't go by the word that you heard, just by that which was

written." That's just the difference between Bert Baker and the Apostle of God. Now, then, you ought to be ashamed of yourself. Yes, Luke records the preaching of Paul, but he doesn't want that. You'll have to accept both of them (oral and written messages). Mr. Baker says, "I won't do it." Well, you reject the commandment of God. Paul said, "If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things that I write unto you that they are the commandment of God" (1 Cor. 14:37). Now, I suppose he wishes that he hadn't said it even though he's too stubborn to admit it!

Then he asked me the question, "Why were the Gentiles not preached to upon the day of Pentecost, and why was it not suggested that they were to be joint-heirs upon the day of Pentecost?" Here's the question I'd like to find out about if I possibly can, Mr. Baker: Why do you flatly refuse to notice Acts 2:39? There the record says that Peter said concerning the promise, "The promise is unto you (that's the Jews, the men of Israel as you suggested), and to all your children, AND to ALL AFAR OFF." Now, What's wrong with Mr. Baker? Why doesn't he notice that? That's the question. Rogers has quoted that in almost every speech in this debate and he's never referred to it yet. I'll tell you what I'll do. I know a quibble that your brethren have to that (I know the answer to it too!), but I'll tell you the quibble after the debate's over tonight if you want to bring it up tomorrow night. I'll just take you off to the side and tell you the dodge that they make so that I can answer it for you!! Yes, I know the dodge that they make, but if he does I reckon he's not going to make it. Acts 2:39 Peter said, "It's to the Jews (to you and your children) and to all them AFAR OFF." Paul said that those that were "afar off" were the Gentiles (Eph. 2:11-17). And Peter said the "Promise is unto them." Now, can't you see that they were to be joint-heirs according to the promise according to Acts 2:39?

But he said there were no Gentiles present on Pentecost. Then he turned around and said that Cornelius was a Gentile. He also said that he was a proselyte. So a proselyte is a Gentile, don't you see. Cornelius was a Gentile. Peter said so (Acts 15:7). But he said he was a proselyte. Then a proselyte may be a Gentile; he is a Gentile. Well, in Acts 2:9-10 the Bible says that there were "sojourners there from Rome both Jews AND proselytes." But a proselyte is a Gentile! So

there were Gentiles on Pentecost, weren't there, Mr. Baker? Or, do you want to take it back and say that a Gentile is not a proselyte or a proselyte is not a Gentile? We'll see where he goes from there.

Then to Matt. 28:18-20 where Jesus commanded the apostles to baptize into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit! He said that he did not deny that Jesus told them to do that. No. But you denied that they did it! And you ought to be ashamed. Your own brethren (I have their works there in my brief) say that that's a dodge that just won't hold up. His own brethren say it. It's just a dodge that won't hold up. Why? Because he admits there that to baptize in the name of Christ means to baptize by his command and authority. And his authority is "into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

About the only thing that he said about Matt. 28:18-20 was that Jesus announced unto them that "you shall teach them to observe all things that I HAVE COMMANDED you," and that meant they weren't going to get anything "brand new." So I suggested to him from Jno. 14:26 that the Spirit would bring to their remembrance the things that Jesus had said. And in Jno. 16:13 He said, "Howbeit, when He the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into ALL TRUTH." He (Baker) says, "No, didn't anybody get it but Paul." But the Bible says that the Holy Spirit would guide the apostles into ALL TRUTH AND "He shall not speak from himself, but what things soever he shall hear these shall he speak and he shall show you things that are TO COME." What has he said about it? He's as silent as the grave.

Then he came to the "restoration" of Acts 1:6, and said that you couldn't "restore" a thing without that thing first existed and then had fallen away. I understand that the apostles did not thoroughly understand the spiritual aspect of the Kingdom at that time. And we'll debate that proposition when we come to the Kingdom question as you suggested. Also on the Tabernacle of David being built again: It's according to what you mean by the Tabernacle of David, and it's according to the definition of that term as to what is meant there (Acts 15:16).

But he said that Cornelius was saved under Peter's preaching. I started the first night trying to get him to tell us and after begging and pleading for two or three nights he finally came up last night and admitted in his last speech that

Cornelius was saved under Peter's preaching (gospel). Well, did you not know that the Bible says in Acts 15:10 that Cornelius and his household were saved by grace? And yet you say that the dispensation of grace did not begin with Peter, then you say that this was the very thing that Peter started on Pentecost. Then he started the dispensation of grace on Pentecost, didn't he? That is according to your admission and logic. That's the reason I wanted you to answer the question.

But he also uses an illogical argument. He thinks because we find one baptism in Eph. 4 then the dispensation of grace could not begin before that time. He says there's just one baptism in the dispensation of grace. Well, that's true now, but one time there were two as I have already pointed out. Cornelius had TWO and yet he was saved by grace, wasn't he? Or, do you want to deny what Peter said about it? Cornelius could have TWO baptisms and still be saved in the dispensation of grace. Mr. Baker can't deny it successfully.

Then he again came to 2 Cor. 12 where Paul spoke of "visions and revelations of the Lord." And he said, "There's where Paul got the mystery," that Paul got it there and went out and preached it. What did he ever tell us about verse 4 where Paul said that when he was caught up into heaven that what he saw "WAS NOT LAWFUL FOR MAN TO UTTER?" What'd he say about that? What did he say? Some folks allow that he has answered what I said! Yes, and some other folk allow he hasn't answered what I said. What's he said about that?

Then he said that this (2 Cor. 12) goes back to Acts 14, that Saul was caught up in Acts 14 and that's where he got the revelation. Well, last night and the night before he said that he started in Acts 13 when the Holy Spirit separated Barnabas and Saul. And I find where they preached grace in Acts 13:43. Now he's admitted that it started before Acts 14. You've got your wires crossed! He says one time it's Acts 14, then he says that it's Acts 13. And if you'll press him a little bit he'll say that it's after Acts 28:28. Yes, that's exactly where he'll go.

Then he came to the Book of Hebrews. He said, "Where does the Bible say that Paul wrote the Book of Hebrews?" Well, it doesn't make any difference who wrote the Book of Hebrews. Is it inspired? Is it the Word of God? (Mr. Baker



nods in affirmative.) All right then, if it's the Word of God the man that wrote it was in the last days twenty years after you say they ceased, wasn't he? (Mr. Baker nods in affirmative). All right, let's shake hands on that—that he was in the last days twenty years after you say they ceased. (Mr. Baker refuses to shake). Why, we're going to convert the man! He's now admitted that the Book of Hebrews is inspired that that man (writer) was in the last days TWENTY YEARS after he (Baker) says they stopped! Was he (inspired writer) right, or are you (Baker) right? Somebody's wrong, either Bert Baker or the writer of Hebrews. Which is it? Mr. Baker, "I say they stopped twenty years before. And an inspired writer says they continued TWENTY years after I say it stopped." Yes, he admitted it! He nodded his head in the affirmative. He won't shake hands, but he admits that that's true. Now, Mr. Baker, are you right, or is the writer of Hebrews right? You say that he was in the last days after you say they stopped. Now, he was wrong about it, or you're wrong about it. Which one is it? We'll have some more about that in just a moment.

Then he came to the re-baptism of Acts 19:1-6. We find where Apollos came down and taught some men the baptism of John, and baptized them. When was that Mr. Baker? Was that before the baptism of the Great Commission was given or after? This was even during the days that Paul was preaching. That was AFTER the baptism of John had already CEASED. And if he doesn't believe that I can find that it ceased even before the Commission was given on Galilee I'll make him sick. For in Acts 10:37 the Bible says that the thing that began at Galilee was "AFTER the baptism of John." John's baptism had already stopped when Jesus gave the Great Commission. Now then, was Peter baptized before the Great Commission was given or after? He was baptized while John's baptism was in force. John's baptism WASN'T in force when Apollos baptized these men in that baptism. And for that reason Paul did it over. How did he do it? "In the name of Christ." What does it mean to do a thing "in the name of Christ?" By Christ's "command and authority." What is it? "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." That's the way that Paul did it just as surely as the Bible is true. Now, that's the reason these people were re-baptized. They were baptized with John's

baptism AFTER that baptism had ceased to be effective, for it had stopped by the time the Great Commission was given (Acts 10:37; Matt. 28:16-19). You need not expect him to try to answer that, for he's not in the answering mood. He didn't come down here to answer arguments. He hasn't taken a note and is not going to apparently.

Then he said that the grace of 1 Pet. 1:10 is future. And he referred to verse 13, "Wherefore girding up the loins of your mind be sober, and set your hope perfectly on the grace that is TO BE brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." There's not any man living, and there's not one dead, that has or has had any more faith in the idea that Jesus will bring grace with him when he comes again than I have. I believe that just like you do. But I also know that Peter taught that they were right then "receiving the end (or the aim) of their faith, the salvation of their souls." Now watch it. 1 Pet. 1:9-10 he said they were receiving it. When? Right then. "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Concerning WHICH SALVATION (the very salvation they were receiving then) the prophets sought and searched diligently when they prophesied of the GRACE that should come unto YOU: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them. To whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto you, did they minister these things, which NOW (not over yonder at the Second Coming of Christ, but NOW) have been announced unto you by them that preach the gospel unto you by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven; which things angels desire to look into." (1 Pet. 1:9-12). Why certainly, he says it's NOW. It's contained in the gospel. It's the salvation that they were receiving right then. And "end" there means the "aim" of their faith. Now, come to the platform and deal with the argument. Don't dodge.

I realize that there are two graces, that we are saved by grace from past or alien sins as Peter says here, and also be saved by grace after awhile. I realize that. But Peter says that they are "RECEIVING" the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls. Were they saved then? Were they? Were they saved, or were they not saved? And whenever he pointed out that it was this TIME of grace, and that it had

NOW been preached unto you by them that preach the gospel unto you, you ought to be able to see that it's a NOW salvation and not a FUTURE salvation.

I'll write that on the blackboard for him. (I think I have the statement.) Remember Peter said it is "NOW," "NOW"—not in the FUTURE, but "NOW" (I wonder if he's caught on). It's NOW that we have it. And so then this dispensation of grace was prophesied of.

The argument that I made upon that point last night was this: Saul was saved under the terms of Pentecostal preaching. Yet in 2 Tim. 1:9; and Rom. 5:1 Paul teaches that he was saved by grace, through faith, and not of works. Now when did that dispensation begin that Saul was saved under? Why, on Pentecost. That's the one that Peter spoke of, and the one that was in effect when Peter wrote, which was about twenty years after the time that Mr. Baker says that the time that Paul was saved under had ceased. Well, whose right, Peter or Baker? You can't believe both of them. It's just an impossibility to accept both of them.

Here is one thing that I wish to mention here in the closing moments of my speech and that is the argument that these men some times advance concerning Mark 16:15-16. Jesus there said, "Go ye, into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." (Now, I suppose that you're a creature, and if you are that applies to you.) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." The only dodge that Mr. Baker can make to that is this: (He admits that this makes baptism necessary for salvation, and that it was necessary for a time.) In verse 17 Jesus said, "These signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." And he says (now here's the argument) that miracles were connected with baptism; the miracles ceased, and, therefore the baptism ceased. That's the argument that these men make. And yet I can read from Mr. O'Hair and other men of his standing that there were miracles during the age that Paul preached—that Paul confirmed his word with miracles. Well, according to their argument, since miracles were practiced in connection with Paul's gospel, the miracles ceased! therefore, Paul's gos-

pel ceased! And what is Mr. Baker doing preaching it? Now, that's the logic that they're using.

But you'll remember that I suggested a night or two ago that that's a foolish argument. You might have thought that I was speaking harshly there. Mr. J. C. O'Hair in his book, *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ*, pages 232 and 233 says that that is an unsound argument, and that it's foolish when his brethren use it to eliminate the Lord's Supper in this dispensation. It's unsound and it's foolish when his brethren use it against him, but he thinks it's sound as a dollar and solid as a rock whenever he uses it against water baptism! Why? Because he likes the Lord's Supper and he's as afraid of water baptism as a mule is a sinkhole! That's all in the world that's involved. He's just getting around the command of the Son of God. That's all there is to that.

I'd like to also point out tonight that the miracles followed the faith in exactly the same way they follow the baptism. The Bible says, "These signs shall follow them that BELIEVE . . ." Has FAITH ceased, Mr. Baker? Has the faith ceased? You know I suggested that sometimes they'll bring a little poison, and they'll say, "Drink it. If you teach baptism, drink it." Well, if you teach FAITH then you'd have to drink it. I heard a man say not too long ago, "The worst indigestion a man can get is from having to eat his own words." I guess he hadn't heard about one having to drink his own poison! But that's exactly what we'll have if Mr. Baker wants to bring that out in this debate.

Now, I want him to notice the arguments. I want him to come to the platform and deal with them. I realize and have already suggested and pointed out to him that here are over sixty passages of Scripture (hands list of passages to Baker)—here they are, take them home and study them—that were introduced in the first two nights of this debate that he never even mentioned much less attempted to answer. There they are, over SIXTY of them. The reason I brought them he wouldn't write them down. But if he'll go home and study them, he'll see the absolute and complete answer to every dispensational argument that he has made or can make. (Time called). I thank you very kindly, ladies and gentlemen.

## BAKER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

I'd like to thank you for your Southern hospitality and your good singing. I appreciate it, and I've enjoyed it every night. I just like to hear the old songs as you sing them. I'm happy to be here in this debate. All right.

Shah we turn again tonight to the Book of Acts and the passage of Scripture that was given to prove that this present dispensation (began with Peter). You notice again that my opponent did not say anywhere that the Scriptures teach a present dispensation begins with Peter. Again I tell you a dispensation (and we found it) began with Paul.

No Scripture has been produced yet that the twelve apostles were baptized. He hasn't quoted one Scripture to prove yet that the twelve apostles were baptized even under John. Now, you find the Scripture and bring it to us next time. I want the Scripture.

Then I'd like to call your attention to the Book of Acts and the "last days" that I mentioned. In the first place, in the Great Commission the Lord Jesus Christ did not say, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." He said to the "consummation of the aionos, or age." The "age" is not going to end when the earth is burned up by fire. When we talk about the end of the age we're not talking about the end of the world. And I'm sure that my opponent will agree that the end of the age is not the end of the world. It's the "end of the age." It makes a lot of difference in what we find in the Great Commission.

Again I ask him to find in the Book of Acts where anyone was ever baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Again my opponent has not produced one verse of Scripture, but has said constantly that it was "in the name of the Lord Jesus." Now we know that the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is the name of the triune God. We believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. And when we say, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" we have Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (in view). When we say, "in the name of the Lord" we have ONE of the Trinity in view. "In the name of the Lord"—Israel rejected the Son. Now they have to be baptized in HIS name, and repent in HIS name because they were guilty of crucifying the Son of man.

In the Book of Acts it has been suggested (and I'm so

happy that my opponent agrees with me now) that there are more than two baptisms in the Book of Acts. I'm so happy that he has admitted that the baptism in Spirit and the baptism in water are two different baptisms. He did not tell you however that I still insist that "in one Spirit" is what God says. "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body . . . and are now made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13). That does not refer to either one of those two baptisms. I've insisted on that, and that Paul received a baptism into death. Now, he has not proved that on the day of Pentecost anyone was baptized into Christ's death. He has to go to Paul to find out that we were baptized into the death of the Lord Jesus Christ. Did Peter say, "Repent and be baptized into the Lord Jesus Christ?" Where does he find the expression "into the Lord Jesus Christ"? In the apostle Paul's written ministry.

Then you'll notice tonight that he agrees with me also that the baptism "in Spirit" has ceased. Now, where did he go to get rid of that baptism "in Spirit" for this administration of the grace of God? And again he has agreed with me that he has to go to Paul, to eliminate that baptism from this administration of grace. I'm so glad that he's coming our way, and that the grace of God is beginning to dawn upon his gracious heart. We are agreed now that there were three baptisms. He'll come to that first one and surely say the evil (baptism of suffering) is over.

The apostle Paul has said, "Christ sent me not to baptize." And Paul did not say that during the Acts period, neither did Dr. Luke write that. But the apostle Paul said that. And after he said that then he revealed that "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." Now, let me make it plain. The Bible says, "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Now, that's God's Word. Can you understand that? I would have you understand with me that in Eph. 4, "Striving to keep the unity of the Spirit." And in that unity of the Spirit there is "one Spirit." Now, if God tells you that in the unity of the Spirit there is one Spirit I'm sure you can understand that the one Spirit is not water. And if we are baptized in one Spirit into the one Body, then it is a baptism in one Spirit.

I called your attention last night to the fact that God the Father is the administrator. I called your attention to the fact that Paul had said that. The twelve apostles were set in the Church by God. And I proved last night that we are cir-

cumcised with a circumcision not made with hands; and that we are buried WITH Christ; and that we are crucified WITH Christ; and that we have been raised WITH Christ; and that we are seated together WITH Christ in the heavenlies.

Now, I'd like to call your attention to the Book of Acts, in the second chapter in studying the last days. If they are last days, what last days are they? What last days can they refer to? The last days are not the beginning of new days, they are the end of something that has been prophesied of in the Scriptures. And when you come to the "last days" then some things that have been prophesied of are about to be fulfilled. So the last days are not the first days. And the last days had to do with prophecy.

Now, let me call your attention to the prophecy that was fulfilled. In the Book of Acts, chapter 2, verse 15, "These are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing that it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that (not like it, but this is that.)" What came to pass on Pentecost was the fulfillment of prophecy. I have tried time and time again to make our opponent see that we are living in the administration of the secret, that we're living in a secret administration, that it's not prophesied. "Unsearchable" does not mean that you cannot find it out. Wouldn't I be foolish to say, "To make all men see what is incomprehensible?" How could I make you see that which is incomprehensible? God wants you to see what is the administration of the secret, and the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles that was committed to the apostle Paul. In Acts, chapter 2, we have the fulfillment of a great prophecy.

And this is the prophecy: "It shall come to pass in the last days (Now, what's going to happen in the last days? are we living in these last days? Now, look at them) saith God I will pour out my Spirit UPON . . ." (Now, you'll remember that our Brother has said that there is no difference in a baptism UPON and a baptism INTO.) Now, remember that when Jesus Christ baptizes anyone in the Book of Acts the Spirit comes UPON them. I'm going to prove it to you, and then show you in 1 Cor. 12:13 "IN one Spirit were we all baptized INTO one Body." Paul says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized INTO Christ were baptized INTO his death." And I've pointed out that God is the administrator in this administration of grace.

You'll notice in Acts 2, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." What's going to happen when God pours out his Spirit upon all flesh? How long is this going to happen.? You're not Pentecostalists. You belong to the Church of Christ. You don't believe that through all the last days God is going to keep up pouring out his Spirit upon all flesh, upon your sons and daughters, that they shall prophesy. Paul said, "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail, pass away." (1 Cor. 13:8). Now, how could Paul say in 1 Cor. 13, "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail" if they were not going to pass away? Throughout the last days there was to be the Spirit that was to come upon them and they were to prophesy. There were prophets in the Corinthian Church. I have said that in Paul's epistles we have progressive revelation. Our debater has admitted that—that there is progressive revelation. He has admitted that up to Acts 19 Paul did many things that you can't find in his written ministry.

We have pointed out that in the Book of Acts we have the falling out of the Holy Spirit. I believe in the Lord's Supper. You're not debating Pastor O'Hair or Mr. Stam, you're debating B. A. Baker from Grand Rapids. And I'm saying that in the last days God said, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: your sons shall see visions . . ." Do you brethren do that? You're living in the last days aren't you? And these are the things for the last days. Well, if these things aren't happening now, what happened to those last days?

God brought in a secret, and through the apostle Paul those last days were set aside for a while. We're not living now in "those last days." Well, notice what we have here: "Your young men shall see visions; your old men shall dream dreams: Yea, and on my servants and on my hand-maidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." Note that! "I will pour out my Spirit UPON." My opponent said that there was no such thing as an "upon" experience. When they were baptized by Christ they were baptized upon. And we are baptized by the Father "in one Spirit into the one Body." We're not baptized in fire; we're baptized into Jesus Christ. There's only one baptism in this administration of grace.

Then notice again in this chapter for he says, "I will show wonders in the heavens above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood and fire and vapor of smoke: the sun shall be turned



into darkness, and the moon into blood BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord comes." Now, Paul says that we're not going to be overtaken as a thief, that the day of the Lord is not going to come upon the members of the Body of Christ. We're living in the administration of grace. We're not appointed unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Notice: "In these last days the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before that great and notable day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Now, notice again if you will there on the day of Pentecost there were devout Jews out of every nation from under heaven. These devout Jews had to be baptized in Spirit and in water for the remission of their sins. Do not say they were not baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins. They were! I have admitted that Paul was baptized to wash away his sins. And Paul, after he was separated in Acts 13 (let me make it plain so my Brother will understand me) made known his truth on the installment plan, progressively. He has admitted that the Bible is a progressive Book, and that progressively we receive truth. Paul was separated in Acts 13, and in Acts 14 was caught away to the third heaven, Acts 15 went to Jerusalem, and in Acts 16 established a Church in Philippi, Acts 17 in Thessalonica, in Acts 18 Corinth, Acts 19 in Ephesus. If the apostle Paul had a progressive revelation we can understand how our Brother can do away with the Spirit baptism that God said would be for all of the last days. God does not say here that he's going to do away with the Spirit baptism.

We call your attention again to this second chapter of the Book of Acts: "It shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Now, let me show you what happens in this Book of Acts. First of all, let me refer to what he said about "to you and your children, and to all those afar off." He knows what's in Dan. 9:7. He knows that the Gentiles were without God and without Christ and without hope in the world before Christ died on Calvary, the just for the unjust. He knows that those that were "afar off" were the Jews that were in the land and were "afar off" from Jerusalem. And the Gentiles were outside the land and "afar off" from God. He knows that Dan. 9:7 refers to the Jews

that are outside of Jerusalem. And in the Book of Ephesians the Gentiles are afar of, and God made them nigh through the great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then again let me call your attention to Acts 8. I feel sure that my opponent would not go to Acts 8 and say, "This is the dispensation of the grace of God." I don't think that you would say to your Elders, "You have to lay your hands on someone to receive Holy Spirit." You must admit in the eighth chapter of Acts that this is not the administration of the grace of God. You don't do it today. Why not? Where do you find the cessation of the laying on of hands? Where do you find the cessation of this Spirit baptism with fire? You'll find in Paul's Corinthian letter, "Christ sent me not to baptize." And you'll find in 1 Cor. 10 the Lord's Supper is for the Gentiles and for the members of the Body of Christ. And you'll find in 1 Cor. 12:13, "In one Spirit (and Paul makes it clear! Why can't he understand that?) were we baptized." You know why he can't understand it? He doesn't dare! If he were to understand that, he would have to take my position that that third baptism was a baptism given to Paul by divine revelation.

You'll notice that he said up to a certain point there were two baptisms. But, lo, and behold, when we come to Corinthians there's still only one. And Paul says, "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius," and he names a few others, for he says, "I don't want to be accused of baptizing in my own name." "I thank God that I did not baptize any more of you."

My friend said that that was because there were divisions in the Church in Corinth. I say again tonight that Paul said, "Christ—C-H-R-I-S-T—sent me not to baptize." And when he said that he said, "IN one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." Now, go back to the eighth chapter of the Book of Acts and notice that where we have Spirit baptism Christ is the administrator and you have miracles and signs and wonders. But where God is the administrator into the Body you have Paul telling you, "Whether there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away. For we know in part . . . but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Where do I go to do away with the law of Moses? I go to Paul. "Christ is the end of the law." Where do I go to eliminate circum-

cision? "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Where do I go to do away with this baptism in Spirit for power? To Paul! Where? To the "one baptism" in the Book of Ephesians. He has gone there himself in his argument tonight.

I said in the beginning that the "end of the age" is not the "end of the world." In the "end of the age" everything that Jesus Christ said, will come to pass before he comes the second time, those things recorded in Matthew 24 and 25. We'll deal with those when we deal with the Kingdom.

But in the eighth of Acts notice verse 15. Notice these statements please. They're in your Bible. Again I say that the administration of grace is not found in the eighth chapter of the Book of Acts. Listen to it, verse 15, "And they, when they had come down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit." They prayed for them that they might receive Holy Spirit. They had been baptized by Phillip. And after they had been baptized in the name of the Lord by Phillip then the apostles came down from Jerusalem, those apostles with power and authority, the apostles that had apostolic authority, they came down. Notice in this eighth chapter, Why could not Phillip lay his hands upon them. They could not do it because Phillip and any of them did not have the authority that the apostles had.

But notice with me verse 16. "For as yet he was fallen UPON none of them, only they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them and they received Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit." That's the power of the Holy Spirit. "And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles hands the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money saying . . ." Is this the administration of grace? . . . Is that the way the Church of Christ practices here in this wonderful, wonderful place that we're in tonight? I'm sure that this is not the way that you'll find your place for God's House, or your order for God's House. I'm sure that you would stand up, everyone of you Elders, and say, "No, sir! We don't lay hands on anyone." This is not the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles. These are Samaritans. Jesus Christ said, "Ye shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in Judea, and in Samaria." And here we have them carrying out the Commission in Samaria. When they reach Cornelius, What happens? I pointed out last night that in

Acts 15 Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem, Peter, James, and John gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. And listen, in Acts 15 and Gal. 2, they said, "You go to the Jews (Peter, James, and John) and Paul and Barnabas will go to the Gentiles."

Now, why did the apostle Paul and Barnabas go to the Gentiles and the twelve apostles have to remain? (I should not say the twelve, for James was beheaded in Acts 12). But Peter, James, and John said, "You go, Paul and Barnabas, to the Gentiles, and we will go to the circumcision." Did not God tell the twelve apostles to go and baptize all nations? And yet in the tenth chapter Peter said, "It is not lawful for a man that is a Jew to go to a Gentile." And God had to give a vision to Peter before Peter would go and preach to Cornelius. You don't believe in visions tonight. God poured his Holy Spirit out upon all flesh. That's when the last days were there. Are you living in those last days, the (days) of the laying on of hands?

He said the Book of Hebrews (was in the last days). Let me call your attention that we have the same thing in the Book of Hebrews. And I want you to notice the second chapter where we have the passage that was quoted. Now notice this. Listen to this now, for this is the inspired Word of God: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast (that's the law of Moses) and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; How shall we escape if we neglect the GREAT SALVATION (now, where did that salvation come from? Who preached it first?) which at the FIRST began to be spoken by the Lord, (he said to his disciples, 'Go not into anyway of the Gentiles'—at first. Then he gave the disciples the Great Commission,) and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will?"

Now, I never said that Paul never had miracles. I noted in 1 Cor. 12 there was the gift of tongues, the gift of the interpretation of tongues. God tells us in 1 Cor. 14 that tongues are for a sign, "not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." And he pointed out that God had prophesied

that Israel would not believe even if they were talked to in a miraculous way and in a miraculous sign and in a wonderful way by God's Spirit. God poured his Spirit out.

Let me call your attention to Acts 8 again. I said that the dispensation or administration of the secret, the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles, did not begin with Acts 2. Our opponent has not given one proof that tells us that the administration of grace (the way we live today, the order for God's House today, the way we praise God today) —he has not produced it in the Book of Acts at all thus far.

And in closing I ask my opponent again to give us one verse of Scripture where the twelve apostles were baptized. Secondly, I ask him, When did this baptism in Spirit cease? and under whose authority did it cease?

#### ROGERS' FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

I now appear before you for my last speech in this part of the debate on these propositions that have to do with this dispensation and the plan of salvation.

I'd like to say now that I never felt better nor had less to do in all my life.

My opponent seems to be amused and amazed that I use Paul to prove my proposition. I'll tell you why I use Paul, because Paul is on my side! Why, certainly, I use Paul. I use Paul just exactly as I use the other inspired writers of the New Testament, Mr. Baker. I haven't ever repudiated anything that Paul has written. Whenever I accept what Paul has written, I accept it just like I accept any other inspired statement by a man of God. You need not be amazed. I haven't rejected Paul. Just because I deny your theory and your hobby on Paul is no reason (to think) that I deny what Paul teaches. I believe everything that Paul taught. And Paul teaches exactly what I'm teaching and that's the reason that I rely upon him. He said, "Why does Rogers use Paul here, or use him there?" Because he teaches what I teach! That's the reason I use him. Paul is on my side in this debate, and that's exactly the reason that I'm using Paul. I never have said that I don't believe what Paul preaches. I do with all my heart. But I don't believe the theory that Mr. Bert Baker presents on that.

But I might just advance a little something else. I'll tell you why I accept the epistles of Paul, and I'll also tell you why

I accept the preaching of Paul, because Paul said (and you'll remember that you didn't mention this, Mr. Baker) 2 Thess. 2:15, "Brethren, you stand fast and hold fast the traditions that ye received of us . . ." How did you get it? "By word (that's oral preaching) or by epistle." Mr. Baker won't accept anything except the epistles. The only difference between Baker and Rogers is this: Rogers will do what Paul said in accepting both his preaching and his letters. Baker rejects everything he says and most of what he wrote! That's the only difference between Baker and Rogers.

And I'll tell you something else. If you want to know why it is that I don't get away from the Great Commission and why it is that I hold to Paul the same writer says (of course, he denies that Paul wrote the Book of Hebrews, but I'll just give him this to chew on: All of his scholars say he wrote it. And besides that Peter said that Paul wrote to the Jews, 2 Pet. 3:15; 1:1-2. Now this one—Hebrews—is the one written to the Jews. Now, who wrote it if Paul didn't? And, which one did Paul write to the Jews if this is not it? He'll not deal with that either).—in Hebrews 2:1-2 the writer says, "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that we have heard lest at any time we should let them slip, or drift away from them." Why, Paul is here warning us that we're not to let this very thing slip. What? The things that "were first spoken by the Lord and was confirmed to us by them that heard." But he (Baker) says that's the Great Commission. Paul says, "Don't let it slip" (in one version). In the other version he says, "Don't get away from it." So we're to understand that he says, "Don't get away from the Great Commission, and don't let it get away from you!" Baker says, "Get away from the Great Commission as quick as you can!" Why? Well, that's just Baker's theory about it.

Well, now then, I accept both Paul's preaching and Paul's writing because he says to (2 Thess. 2:15). I also accept the Great Commission that you admit is the one referred to in Heb. 2:1-4 that was "first spoken by the Lord and was confirmed unto us by them that heard," because Paul said, "Don't drift away from it—don't let it slip." I hold to both of them. Why? Because they are identical (in content), there's no difference. Mr. Baker's the man that invents the difference.

Then he said that Rogers never found where the dispensation of grace began, that I never found where the dispensation

began. Well, I called his attention to the fact that the Bible says (and I also pointed out in my definition of terms that by the term dispensation I meant the gospel dispensation or the time of grace, the gospel of grace the very same thing that Paul was referring to, that I mean that in referring to this dispensation) in 2 Tim. 1:9 that Paul was saved "by grace apart from works." He was saved, therefore, under the dispensation of grace. Wasn't he, Mr. Baker? (Silence). Wasn't he? Paul said in 2 Tim. 1:9 that he was saved "by grace and not of works." But he was saved under the dispensation of grace then. But he (Baker) says that he was saved under that which began on Pentecost. Well then, YOU admit that the dispensation of grace began on Pentecost! A man that can see through a glass door ought to be able to see that. Paul says, "I was saved by grace and not according to works." Why, that's being saved under the dispensation of grace. But what did this man say Paul was saved under? "Under Pentecostal preaching!" He was saved under that which began on Pentecost, but he was saved according to grace according to Paul. Now, if Paul was right in saying that he was saved by grace and not by works, and if this man is right in saying that he was saved under Pentecostal preaching, then the dispensation of grace began on Pentecost. And there's not a way under high heaven that he can get around it. He'd just as well come up and shake hands on it and go home.

Then I find in Acts 11:15 where that very time (Pentecost) is called "the beginning." Peter said, "The Holy Spirit fell upon them even as on us at the BEGINNING." I pointed out also the "last days." He said the last days couldn't be the beginning of anything. Well, Peter didn't know it. For he said, "It fell on us at the BEGINNING" (Acts 11:15);-and yet, he said the Spirit fell in the "last days" according to the prophet Joel (Acts 2:16-17). So Peter didn't know what Baker knows. Yes, Peter taught that it was the BEGINNING. But he hadn't sat under the feet of Elder Baker. Mr. Baker said, "Now, the beginning couldn't be in the last days." But Peter says, "The Holy Spirit fell on us at the last days as Joel prophesied." Well, what is that, Peter "The BEGINNING!" Oh, Peter! You know Baker says, "The beginning can't be in the last days?" Don't you know you're contradicting "Dr." Baker? You're getting all mixed up, Peter, and contradicting Dispensationalism. Why, Mr. Baker, I think that I'd pack up and go

home if I couldn't come out and admit that the last days began there. Your brethren do it.

You know he said, "Rogers is not debating Stam and O'Hair." No. And I'm not debating Baker either, at least he's not debating me! He's making a speech and I'm making a speech, but I can't persuade him to debate. He hasn't debated since he's been here. He hasn't tried to, and he's not going to try to evidently. He sees the handwriting on the wall. And, like Belshazzar, his knees smote together and he just gave up the ghost and quit. Yes, he just won't, he will not debate at all. I'm not debating anybody, not even Mr. Baker. He's not trying to debate.

But he said he wanted the text. "Please give me the text, please give me the text, please give me text," he said it three times, "where it says that the apostles were baptized under John's baptism." Well, get your pencil out. Now, you asked for it! Get your pencil out and I'll give it. I'll just mark it right here. (Indicating section A under the first division of the Chart). John said (Matt. 3:11), "I baptize you in water . . ." Now, who is it that's going to come after you? "There is one to come after me whose shoes I'm not worthy to bear . . ." What will He do? "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire." Now, who was baptized in the Holy Spirit, Mr. Baker. Who was baptized in the Holy Spirit. The apostles were! But John said, "I baptize you in water." The ones that John said he baptized in water were the ones that he said, "Jesus will baptize in the Spirit." Now, there it is. Did you not know that is there? Eh? Did you not know that is in the Book of God before? (Laughter). Pshaw. Man, you're going to have to go to studying. You didn't come down here prepared to debate. You didn't leave Grand Rapids prepared to debate. And you haven't tried it since you've been here.

Look at Matt. 3:11! The ones that John baptized there in water were the ones that Jesus would baptize in the Holy Spirit. But Jesus said in Acts 1:5, "John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall receive the promise not many days hence." And in Acts 1:26 the Bible says that Matthias was numbered with the eleven apostles. In chapter two and verses 1-4 it says, "When THEY were all together in one place . . ." they were "filled with the Holy Spirit." Now, that's the baptism of the Spirit. Who got it? The apostles. Did they get any baptism besides that. John said, "I've done it (baptized them)



in water." Did you not know that is there, Mr. Baker. Put it down and tell us something about it. He's going to learn a great deal before this thing is over.

But he said that Matt. 28:18-20 doesn't refer to the "end of the world." I guess that Mr. Baker is a great deal smarter than the forty-seven translators that gave us the King James Version of the Bible. He's a great deal smarter than the one hundred and one that gave us the Revised Version of the Bible. He comes up and puts aside these one hundred and forty-eight Greek scholars that gave us the Bible as we have it today, and says, "I'll tell you, boys, you're wrong. It means the 'consummation of the ages'. It doesn't mean the 'end of the world' like you thought it did." Now, Mr. Baker, you're somebody "come." Suppose it does mean the "consummation of the ages." I find the very same statement in Matt. 13:39-40 where Jesus says, "In the end of the world (and it's the same in the Greek) the angels will gather out of the Kingdom all those that sin and do iniquity and cast them into a furnace of fire." So it does mean the end of the world. Doesn't it, Mr. Baker? It does mean mean it though he says it doesn't. It still doesn't mean it (according to Baker) even though Jesus says that it's at the time people are cast into hell, the world still hasn't come to an end! What's wrong with you, Mr. Baker? Why, certainly, the Bible says that it (Commission) was to last to the end of the world.

Now, here is the whole point there: He admits (and he must admit) that the baptism that is referred to here (Matt. 28:19) does last to the end of the world, or to the consummation of the age. Why? Because he admits that this baptism was effective for a time. Then the Church came in as his Sacred Secret that he speaks of (or their "mystery parenthesis") and that then this thing was withheld, it stopped. But after this parenthesis is over, then they'll start back teaching that same thing (the Great Commission) and that it will go on to the end of the world. So he thinks that it's to the "end of the world" just like I do you see. He's just quibbling. He sees the handwriting on the wall so he'll just dodge and quibble and try to get around it. Well, it won't work.

Matthew's Record says that this "end of the world" is the time that people are cast into hell (Matt. 13:39-40). Now, that's how long it's going to last—this baptism of the Great Commission. Water baptism is going to last that long. And

now, since he's admitted the Hebrew writer was in the last days TWENTY YEARS after he says the last days had stopped, I've already proven by Mr. Baker himself, and he's already made the good confession, that he's in error. The Hebrew writer said that he was in the last days twenty years after he (Baker) said this stopped, so this had not been withheld twenty years after Elder Baker said that it had been withheld. Either Elder Baker or the Book of God is wrong and I know who it is. I'll give you two guesses to figure out which one it is.

But he said that they were not baptized into the name of the Three. Mr. Baker, I wish you would debate. Why won't you notice that I pointed out that in the name (and the original word there means this) means "by the command and authority of the Son of God." Why don't you deal with it? What is the command and authority of Jesus? "Here's my authority: All authority in heaven and earth." What's your command? "Go into all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Now, to do a thing in the name of Jesus means to do that thing by his command and authority. Now, if I baptize in his name—by his command and authority—How do I do it? I'm not saying that you have to use some set formula. I'm not saying that. But I am saying that it must be done as Jesus said.

Now, did you notice that he let just a little slip just a moment ago? About the work of those that went to Samaria he said, "They went down there carrying out the Great Commission!" They went down there "carrying out . . ." Well, If they carried it out, they baptized like Jesus said, didn't they? If they didn't do what Jesus said, how were they carrying it out? Could they carry it out and not do what he said? He admitted that when they were in Samaria they were CARRYING OUT what Jesus commanded. Yet he says they weren't doing it!! They were, but they weren't! What's wrong with you, Mr. Baker? You just forgetting? Just forgetting you said something back yonder and contradicting it?

Then he said that he was glad that I admitted that there were two baptisms. Why, I've always taught that—that there were two baptisms, one in water and one in Spirit, up to the house of Cornelius. It stopped right there Mr. Baker. Right there is where it stopped. You don't have to wait till Acts 13

for Holy Spirit baptism to stop. I challenge you, every inch of you from "crown-lock to bunion," to find Holy Spirit baptism like Cornelius got and like the apostles got after Cornelius. That's where it stopped. It happened to stop while Peter was preaching too.

He said the Bible says, "In one Spirit," and that that is neither of these two. I never can get the man to tell us what he means by that. Does he mean that the Holy Spirit is the element? If he means that it's the element, then it's just like Cornelius got and just like the apostles got. Do you just not have the courage to say, Mr. Baker? Are you just afraid to say? What is it? I've been begging this man here for four nights to tell me whether the Spirit there is the element or just what part the Spirit plays. And he hasn't told us until now. And he told us two or three nights ago, "I'll tell you tomorrow night." I told you then that he's a promising man, didn't I? He's not going to do it. He may do it in his last speech when I won't have a chance to reply. But you may know that if he had replied it would have been answered. That's the reason it hasn't been brought up.

Then he said that on Pentecost none of them were baptized "into the death." Mr. Baker, I've pointed out that you admit that Acts 2:38 says, "Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins," and that that's the very baptism that Paul got, the one that started on Pentecost. Paul said that the baptism that he got inducted him into the death of Christ (Rom. 6:3-4). What baptism did he get? The baptism of Pentecost. So the baptism of Pentecost did put one into the death of Christ, didn't it?

Paul says in Acts 22:16 that Ananias came unto him and said, "And now, Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." What kind of baptism is that? Pentecostal baptism! What did it do for you, Paul? "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (Rom. 6:3-4). Paul says that Pentecostal baptism, "the one that I got put me into death." He (Baker) admits that it was Pentecostal baptism. So the baptism of Pentecost did put them into the death. And I've pointed out time and time again that just because Paul uses a peculiar term in speaking of any one thing that does not prove that that thing began with Paul. I illustrated with the Lord's Supper. Paul's the only one that

calls it the "communion of the blood and body of Christ;" and yet, Paul says the communion was instituted the night the Lord was betrayed (1 Cor. 11:24f). So according to his theory, since Paul is the only one that speaks of it like that it had to start after Paul was converted. Now, his logic is not logic at all; his reasoning is not reasoning. He's just making a statement. He reminds me of the fellow who said, "There's the ground, there's a set of post hole diggers; therefore, there's a hole in the ground!" Now, somebody's going to have to use the post hole diggers before there is a hole in the ground, Mr. Baker. You've found the ground, and you've found the post hole diggers, but you haven't found anybody using them. You're just not reasoning, you're not using logic.

Then he said that I had to go to Paul. Well, now, I never have denied anything that Paul wrote. I accept what Paul wrote, what Peter wrote, what the rest wrote if it's inspired of God. I accept any inspired writing that applies to me today. I'm not repudiating the teaching of Paul. He wanted to make it appear to you that I was rejecting Paul and that after I had rejected Paul I have to go to him to get what I teach. No. Paul and I have been in agreement all the way along. I shook hands with Paul at Acts 22:16 and we've been going along together ever since. I teach exactly what Paul taught.

But he spoke of the "unity of the Spirit" and being joined to the Lord and being one spirit. Well, that doesn't prove that we're baptized miraculously by one Spirit into the Body. By the way, did you ever tell me if the baptism of the Great Commission is of heaven or of men? was it human or divine? Some folk allow that he has answered, and some allow that he hasn't you know.

He said that God is the administrator and that Rogers said that God is the administrator. No. I didn't say that God is the administrator of the baptism of 1 Cor. 12:13 where we're baptized into the Body. I said in 1 Cor. 12:28 where the Bible says that God set the apostles in the Church that God did that. But that certainly doesn't say that God baptized them into the Body. And I pointed out that these people were prepared, and that they went into the Building prepared upon the day of Pentecost. I've already proven that time and time again. And I can't even get him to look at Lk. 1:17 that says they were prepared.

Then he came and said that we're circumcised with a

circumcision not made with hands. Yes, but it's not with a baptism not made with hands. He will never find where the baptism is not made with hands. Sometimes they make a dodge like this, if one is figurative (circumcision) then the other (baptism) is figurative. In other words, you could not have both figurative and literal language in the same passage. Well, I'll answer that ahead of time. In Psa. 80:2 the Bible says, "God brought a VINE out of EGYPT." Now the vine is figurative referring to Israel, but Egypt is literal. So you can have the literal and the figurative in the same passage. We understand that God "cuts off our sins" and that's not done with hands. I also understand that the Bible says that's when we're baptized, we're baptized into Christ, that we're buried with him. That's the one that Paul had which is Pentecostal baptism (Rom. 6:3-4; Acts 22:16).

But he said that he was "crucified WITH Christ; buried WITH Christ; raised WITH Christ." Well, what is your argument? I've been done the same way. I was crucified with Christ, buried with him, and raised with him. But that doesn't prove that it's unconditional, that it's by faith only, or by grace alone. Whenever Paul said that he was crucified with Christ, buried with Christ, raised with Christ, under what terms was he saved? In order for Paul to be crucified with Christ, buried with Christ, and raised with Christ, how was he saved? under what administration? He says, "Under the Pentecostal administration." Then if you wish to be crucified with Christ, buried with Christ, raised with Christ, you'll have to be saved under Pentecostal preaching, according even to Mr. Baker. Why? Because that's the way Paul got it. How am I going to get it? Just like Paul got it. He said, "Let's follow Paul." Let's follow him, Mr. Baker. How did he get it? Under Pentecostal preaching! Let's follow him, Mr. Baker. Will you? Let's follow him! Please, Mr. Baker, please, let's follow him. Where did he get it? Under Pentecostal preaching. That's where Paul was crucified with Him, buried with Him, and raised with Him. Now, let's follow him, Mr. Baker. Will you, please? Will you not quit giving up Paul? Won't you go with him?

Then he said that the "last days" were not the beginning of new days. I've already answered that in pointing out that the Bible says that it was the beginning, even though Mr. Baker said that it couldn't have been. But Peter says that it

was the last days. Now, if you'd understand, Mr. Baker, if you'd just buy you a good dictionary or a good Greek-English lexicon and look up the meaning of some words and find out what they mean, you'd find that the "last days" means the last dispensation of time. I pointed out that the "days" referred to the time element. And Peter pointed out that that began on Pentecost (Acts 11:15). His brethren also admit that, and the only reason that he doesn't he's in a tight, he's in a debate. (At least we're swapping speeches.)

But he said that this was a time that was prophesied of. Yes, and I pointed out that the time the Gentiles were to be saved was prophesied of. I introduced Acts 13; Rom. 1; 16:25-26; I introduced passage after passage after passage, which this man has never referred, to that indicated that the Gentile would be in the Church. Heb. 2:12 teaches that Jesus would praise God in the Church. Rom. 15:9 says that it would be among the Gentiles. Then the Gentiles were to be in the Church. Now, what has he said about it? He hasn't said anything!

Then he said that God said these miracles would go all along throughout these last days. You must be using Scofield Reference Bible. My Bible doesn't say that. My Bible doesn't say that these miracles would go all the way throughout the last days, or all during those days. Does yours? Or, didn't you add that? You know he started out the first night that he "speaks where the Bible speaks, and that he's silent where the Bible is silent." Why, Peter didn't say, "It's going to happen throughout the last days." He said, "This is that." It doesn't have to be fulfilled again. It was completely fulfilled when both Jew and Gentile enjoyed the blessing there spoken of. And the Bible teaches that Cornelius did that in fulfillment of that promise. Now then, we have both Jew and Gentile (Lk. 3:6) that received this very thing. It doesn't have to continue. And I wouldn't even have to go to Paul to get it, but I can prove from Paul as well as from this (that it was to cease). He can't find the verse that says it was to continue all the way through the last days. He can't find it to save his life. If his life depended upon it, he couldn't find it. It's not in the Book.

He said that Rogers said that there is not any such thing as an "upon experience." Now, you never heard Rogers say any such thing. I said that the Bible doesn't say that there's

a "baptism UPON." You said last night in your answer (in attempting to answer) to the chart, that there is baptism into and a baptism upon. "There's a big difference," you said, "in a baptism into and a baptism upon." And I just pointed out that there is no passage in the Bible that speaks of being baptized upon anything. The Bible does speak, and I pointed this out in my very first reference to this, that the Holy Spirit came UPON these and whenever the Holy Spirit was poured UPON them and they were overwhelmed in it, then they were baptized IN it. But that's not a baptism upon. That's the pouring upon. And when there's enough Spirit that they're overwhelmed, they're buried, then there's the baptism IN. There's not a baptism UPON and you can't find it in God's Book. That's chimney corner scripture invented by Dispensationalists to get around what the Bible says.

Then he said that the death is the element, that we're baptized "into the death of Christ" and that, therefore, means the element. Mr. Baker, I pointed out last night from both the King James and the Revised Version that Paul said, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (First the baptism, then we get into the death.) "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we also might walk in newness of life." The Bible teaches that it's through baptism (through baptism) that we get into the death. You teach that we get into the death and then get the baptism. You turn the thing right around. The Bible teaches that it's THROUGH BAPTISM that we get into the death. He says, "No, Paul. I'll tell you that's wrong. You must get into the death, and the baptism takes place in the death." Paul had it wrong according to Baker. Paul said you're baptized INTO the death. Baker says, "NO. You get into the death and that's where the baptism takes place." Well the Bible says THROUGH baptism, and BY baptism, we get into that death. Now we can understand that first we have the baptism and THROUGH that we get into the death of Jesus Christ. Which merely means that we enjoy the benefits of that death.

But he said that 1 Cor. 13 teaches that miracles would cease. Yes, I realize that. But I can prove that without going to 1 Cor. 13. If you'll get me up a debate with the Pentecostals I'll prove it. I can prove it without going there. I

can prove it from a great many other passages. Mr. Baker, if you don't know how, I'll tell you sometimes. You're right about the miracles, they ceased. If you want to meet one of them, I'd like to help you expose their error. But you are just as wrong as they are when it comes to these other things.

He said that I agreed that there was progressive revelation. Yes. But Rogers doesn't say that that revelation that's progressive is contradictory. That's what this man teaches. He says we have progressive revelation that contradicts itself, that one time Paul taught one thing and then progressed and taught something else. And you know he's never yet referred to the fact that Paul said, "I continue . . ." (Acts 26:22). Have you ever heard him. He's the man that's answering. He hasn't answered anything.

He then said that the last days were set aside for awhile. Well, Mr. Baker ought to have been writing the Book of Hebrews. For the writer of Hebrews never did find that out even though he wrote a long time after this man says that it was set aside. He said, "God having of old times spoken unto the fathers by the prophets, in divers portions and in divers manners, hath in THESE last days spoken unto us by his Son." He was in the last days. Mr. Baker says, "No you weren't." (Mr. Baker denies that he would say they weren't in the last days from his seat). You wouldn't? Then they hadn't been withheld at that time had they? You're getting away from Dispensationalism! O'Hair will kick you out if you don't watch out. Yes, O'Hair and Stam will get rid of this man if he doesn't watch out. He admits that the dispensation that we're speaking of here wasn't even withheld, wasn't even taken back as late as the Book of Hebrews was written. And according to his on scholars that's one of the last Books that was written. You better watch out now, you're going to get into it.

Then he said that the wonders of Acts 2:16-18 did not occur. Well, if they didn't then Paul's gospel is not in effect. Paul said, quoting from the very same passage of Joel, Rom. 10:11-12, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." He said, "It is written." Where is it written? Joel 2:28-30. When? After the last days began, whenever these signs had come to pass. Is Paul's gospel in effect now? If it is then these miracles that Joel prophesied of did some to pass.



But he said that the day of the Lord is not to catch us as a thief. It should not. But Paul said in 1 Thess. 5:2 that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night. He said, "You know that it will" (verse 1).

Then he referred to the Jews and Pentecost. What have you said about the proselytes that were there. And, what have you said about agreeing that a proselyte is a Gentile?

He finally made his dodge on Acts 2:39 after I told him that I'd tell him about it. He said that I knew about Dan. 9:7. I knew that you fellows pervert Dan. 9:7 and try to make Acts 2:39 refer to the Jews that were out of the land of Palestine. I knew you do that. That's what I was talking about. And he knew that I knew it. But the only difference in Acts 2:39 and Dan. 9:7 is the Bible speaks in Dan. 9:7 of "Israel that are near and are afar off." Israel is the subject in both instances in Dan. 9:7. Israel is near; Israel is afar off. But that's not true of Acts 2:39. Acts 2:39 says, "To you (Jews) and your children, AND to ALL that are afar off." That covers the Gentiles (Eph. 2:11-17). I knew he had a dodge on that and I didn't want him to save it until his last speech you see. When the Bible names Israel as being both near and afar off, you know that they're the only one involved. But Acts 2:39 names both Israel AND those afar off, and not just Israel only. So you see there's a great difference. These men pervert the Bible as I've already pointed out.

Then he said that I wouldn't think about calling the Elders and asking them to lay hands upon anybody like they did here in Acts 8. No. And there weren't any Elders that did it there! These were apostles! I don't have apostles in the Church that I'm a member of. Now, if I had some apostles I'd call for them. But nobody but the apostles had that power, and he admitted that before he got through. And the apostles ceased. It also happened under the time that Peter preached, the time that Paul was saved, and that was the time of grace (2 Tim. 1:9).

He said Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize." Yes. But I'd emphasize the fact again that he said, "I'm glad I baptized none of you, because you say I baptized you in my name." That's the reason that he was proud he hadn't. And I've pointed out time and time again that Paul's right to baptize did not inhere in his apostolic office. We all have that right.

Then 1 Cor. 12:13 says we're baptized into the Body. Paul says we belong to Christ because we've been baptized into His name (1 Cor. 1:13). That (baptism of 1 Cor. 12:13) was the water baptism of chapter one.

He referred to the Lord's Supper and where signs were administered by Christ, and when Paul administered. So if one (the baptism) ceased they both ceased (Supper also).

Then he said that some were sent to Jews and some to the Gentiles. He tried to make the idea appear to us that the twelve did not go anywhere except Palestine. The Bible says in Mk. 16:16, "Go into all the world." Verse 19 says, "They went EVERYWHERE preaching the word confirming the word with signs following." He thinks they just stayed in Palestine. He'll not deal with that. The Bible says, "They went everywhere."

Then he said that Peter said, "It's not lawful to go to the Gentile." Well, Peter didn't thoroughly understand (Acts 2:39). I know that they didn't understand all that they said. Even the prophets didn't understand all they said (1 Pet. 1:10-11), but nevertheless they said it.

They were in the "last days" in Heb. 1:1-2. We're still in the last days today. Therefore I have proved beyond a shadow of a doubt and without controversy that the last days or Christian dispensation began on first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and that water baptism to the penitent believer is for (in the sense of to obtain) the remission of alien sins. I thank you very kindly for the attention that you have given. I hope that you'll take your Bible and study carefully and prayerfully the arguments that have been made both by me and my opponent to see just exactly where the truth lies. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

#### BAKERS FOURTH NEGATIVE

I invite you to turn tonight to the passage of Scripture in the third chapter of the Gospel of John where he said you have the baptism of the twelve apostles. I want you to turn there and see if you can find it.

Mr. Rogers: "That's Matthew."  
Matthew?

Mr. Rogers: "Matthew 3."

Matthew 3:12. I beg your pardon. Matthew 3:12. Will you turn with me there tonight. I want you to notice if you

can find in this text the apostles. Notice again if you will. John the Baptist is preaching and he's preaching to the Pharisees and the Sadducees that came to his baptism. And he said unto them, "O, generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come. Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the ax is laid at the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance . . ." (Is he speaking to the twelve? Is there any record here that he's preaching to the twelve?).

Now, back again to the seventh verse where he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to (his baptism). Now, notice that he said in verse 11, "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance (not into Jesus Christ, not into his death, but into repentance): but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you (not only) with Holy Spirit but also with fire." I'm sure you don't believe that the apostles are going to be baptized with fire. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Now, Isn't it peculiar that I asked for a verse where the twelve apostles were baptized and they're not even mentioned here?

Then he quoted from the Book of Acts and said, "Who received the baptism?" Let me take you the Acts 11, to Cornelius. Now, let me call your attention to verse 14. Acts 11:14, "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved. And as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell ON them." Now, you go home and take your Bible, and take your pencil, and underline the words "on" and "upon" all through the Book of Acts, and then come back and tell me what you find. We have "on" and "upon" in reference to this baptism in power, this baptism in Spirit.

Then he says, "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell upon them, as on us at the beginning." I'm sure that the Spirit of God is not going to fall upon us tonight. I'm sure that not one of us will speak with tongues tonight, or that we

shah have the experience that Cornelius or the apostles had. Cornelius was not an apostle.

Notice again in verse 16, "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized in water, but YE (referring also here to Cornelius)—YE shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit. As much then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God?"

Notice no Scripture here where the twelve apostles were baptized. He hasn't one to give you.

Then he referred to 2 Thessalonians. Who wrote Thessaonians? I said that the apostle Paul wrote it and that his message was progressive. I didn't say that everything that the apostle Paul taught was not for the Body of Christ. I said progressively Paul eliminated those things that are temporary. You'll notice that in the text that was read we are told that we are to follow Paul and his traditions that he's giving them in this epistle. What are those traditions? Read the epistle, and you'll find in Paul's written ministry in the Book of Thessalonians the very words, the very traditions, that Paul is giving them so they'll know what to believe. He didn't say that they should believe something contrary to what he'd been teaching. Now he's bringing it over and putting it into writing so that we can understand it.

Then I'd like to call your attention to the Book of Ephesians. Again I call your attention to the sixth chapter. There are different administrators in the Bible. John the Baptist was an administrator of water baptism. Jesus Christ was the administrator of Holy Spirit, the power of the Holy Spirit. We know that Peter and the apostles became administrators in the name of the Lord Jesus. We know that Ananias became an administrator of baptism when he told the apostle Paul to be baptized, that devout Jew told Paul to be baptized "for remission of sins," or to be "baptized to wash away his sins." I've told you constantly that Paul stated that the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles was given to him. (Eph. 3). And again and again and again I have stated that an administration is not a period of time, that it is an order for God's House. And we have to go to apostle Paul's written ministry for God's order for his House today.

Now, notice again in Eph. 2. How did we get up there with Jesus Christ at the right hand of God? Are you seated

there tonight? Who seated you at the right hand of God? In the Book of Ephesians, chapter two, these are the words and preaching and teaching: (He says we're not debating. Well, I think we're doing a pretty good job of it, in taking the Word of God and expounding it and studying those things that are found therein. Paul "reasoned out of the Scriptures" and is that not what you're here for tonight? to find out what God's word teaches and preaches?)—Eph. 2: "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, (age) according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy (Who is rich? God), for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were DEAD in sins, (note that—even where we were dead in sins) hath quickened us together with Christ." Notice this if you please. "When we were dead in sins, he hath quickened us together with Christ." That's a wonderful truth, that we are dead with Christ, that we are buried with Christ in the same tomb that he was buried in, crucified on the same cross that he was crucified on, raised from the dead by the power of God, seated at the right hand of God in the heavenlies above all principalities and powers. God does that by a baptism into the death of Christ, a baptism into Christ.

He said do I believe that the Great Commission is divine. Of course I do. When the Lord gave this commission to the apostles he made Peter the apostle to the nations and the apostle to Israel and gave to him the gospel of circumcision. I've insisted on that.

You say the gospel of uncircumcision and the gospel of circumcision should be the gospel to. What is the gospel of the grace of God? Is it the gospel to the grace of God? What is the gospel of the Kingdom? Is it the gospel to the Kingdom? What is the gospel of our salvation? Is it the gospel to our salvation? What is the gospel of grace? Is it the gospel to grace? or the gospel that concerns grace and is about grace and deals with God's grace?

In Eph. 2 "We were dead in sins he hath quickened (or made alive) together with Christ, (by grace were ye saved)."

Now, notice that in this administration of grace when we were dead in our sins GOD quickened us together with Christ. GOD made us alive together with Christ. I want to emphasize that word together. It's jointly! I have insisted that in Eph. 3 Paul defines what is the administration of grace for the Gentile—that the Gentile are in a joint-Body, joint-partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel, and that the Gentiles have a joint-inheritance and that Paul gave to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ to make ALL MEN see what is the administration of the secret which was hid in God and not made known in ages or generations past. I'm simply quoting what the apostle Paul said about this present administration of grace. And we're saved by grace. It's God that quickens us together with Christ.

Now, notice verse 6, "He hath raised us up together (God hath raised us up together) in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace were ye saved (were YE saved) through faith; and that not of yourselves: It is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God before ordained that we should walk in them."

Let me call your attention to 2 Tim. 1:9. What a wonderful verse we have here! 2 Tim. 1:1: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." Then dropping down to verse 7: "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus (when?) before the world began." That's when God gave us this grace and this purpose. Think of tonight! Seated together with Christ in the heavenlies through a manifestation of God's grace.

Then notice verse 10. God purposed it before the ages, before the world. God purposed it. We are told: "But is NOW made manifest." It was purposed before the world. God's grace was founded before the world, "but is NOW made

manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel: whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. For the which cause I also suffer these things."

Let me call your attention to Romans again, chapter 15, again the statement of the apostle Paul. (You say I exalt Paul? No. Everything that he received, he received from Christ. "I am what I am by the grace of God," he said. He said, "Follow me as I follow Christ." You are yourselves imitators. Paul received everything from Jesus Christ and said, "I am the least of all saints"—great unto man.) Then notice in Rom. 15 we have this contrast: we have Jesus Christ "the minister of (or to) the circumcision." Rom. 15:8: "Now this I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to CONFIRM the promises made unto the fathers." The last days have to do with the fulfillment of prophecy! The fulfillment of God's plan. And God has a plan for Israel, and God has a plan for the Body of Christ. God has a purpose for Israel, and a purpose for the Body of Christ in the heavenlies where we're already blessed. Jesus Christ when he was on earth was a "minister of the circumcision" to confirm the great and precious promises of the Old Testament.

Notice Rom. 15:15: "Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I (listen!) should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles . . ." Note that, brethren. I only ask you to accept the claims of Paul that unto him were committed the great secrets of God, the administration of the secret, the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles. I urge you by all means to accept the economy of God that came by revelation.

Notice again, verse 16: "That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit."

Then in Rom. 11 we again establish this fact that the administration of grace did not begin with Peter on the day of Pentecost. He hasn't given you one bit of proof that the grace of God for the Gentiles, the joint-Body, the joint-inheritance was beginning on the day of Pentecost.

He said, "Are proselytes Gentiles?" Cornelius was a

proselyte but he had to be saved. He had to be saved by the preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom, the same message that God sent to Israel. And every proselyte went into the synagogue (listen) as the Word was preached. Although Cornelius was not circumcised and, therefore, Peter said, "It is not lawful for me to eat with a man that is uncircumcised."

My opponent said Peter didn't understand after he'd been taught by the Lord for forty days after His resurrection, after he was filled with Holy Spirit, after he received the Great Commission. He did not understand! Yes, Peter had great power, filled with the Holy Spirit. He was not ignorant to the extent that he did not know what God was doing.

Then let me call your attention to this eleventh of Romans, verse 13: "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify MINE office." I again submit to you that the apostle claims to be the apostle to the Gentiles, and that the administration of grace began on the great day that Paul said, "The administration of the grace of God was committed to me for you."

Let me call your attention to what our Brother said concerning these gifts and the baptism in Spirit ceasing with Peter. I again call your attention to Acts 19. Had they (the gifts) ceased in Acts 19? Does he accept what Paul teaches in Acts 19? He has to admit that as late as Acts 19 there had to be re-adjustments made yet, and that all the truth for the Body of Christ is not found in Acts 19.

Listen again. In Acts 19 Paul re-baptized these converts. They were baptized by Paul in the name of the Lord Jesus. "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them the Holy Spirit came ON them and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (Acts 19:6). Is this the administration of grace for the Gentiles? We are in agreement that we are living in an administration in which God is silent. We are in agreement that in the administration of grace there are no manifestations of miraculous power such as we have in the Acts period. We know that the administration of the grace of God is God's answer.

Then let me call your attention if you will to the great statement of the apostle Paul in Rom. 6 again. I have made the statement that Paul said, "In one Spirit." Why do I have to qualify what Paul says? Do I have to change what Paul says? or what the Holy Spirit says through Paul? "In one



Spirit were we all baptized into one Body." Is that not what Paul says? Do I have to explain it in a way that our Brother says that he can understand it? I know why he can't understand it. Because if he would understand it he would be where I am tonight. And if he would accept this statement that "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body"—if he would accept that statement, and also where Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize" he'd be with me. I'm going to hang on to that statement. That's an inspired statement and no matter what he says, it says, "CHRIST sent me not to baptize." If he had said "man," or "the apostles" or anyone else, then I certainly wouldn't accept that statement. But when Paul says, "CHRIST sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," (I must accept it).

What is the gospel? "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and was buried, and on the third day arose from the dead." What is the gospel? Where do we go for the gospel? the gospel of our salvation? Rom. 1:16, Paul said, "I'm not ashamed of the gospel of Christ . . ." Where did that gospel of Christ come from? "It is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Didn't I say we have a joint-Body? In the Body of Christ there are Jews and Gentiles. And in Eph. 2 of the Jew and Gentiles we learn that God made them both one in the Lord Jesus Christ. Didn't I say the joint-Body under Paul's ministry is the gospel of Christ which is the power of God unto salvation? "Everyone that believes"—for in that gospel is revealed "the righteousness of God out of faith and for faith." Oh, how we can see that "the just shall live by faith!" These are revelations that were committed unto the apostle Paul.

I have asked my dear friend to give you a statement where Peter ever said that he baptized into Jesus Christ. He has had to go to Paul's baptism into death. He has had to go to Paul's "in one Spirit" baptism to get you into the one Body. He has said that God is not the administrator and yet he's told you over and over again that God SET IN the Church the apostles and the prophets and teachers. And if he set the apostles and prophets and the pastors and the teachers, if he set them all in the Church without baptism then there simply must be something wrong with our reasoning. If he set the

apostles in, what about the prophets? "He set in the Church first apostles."

Then our Brother has not given you one verse of Scripture where the twelve apostles were baptized. I can take you to Paul. I can take you to the administrator. I can take you to Acts 9. I can take you to Acts 22:16. I can show you where Paul was baptized to wash away his sins. I can show you who baptized Paul. I can show you the time that he was baptized in.

Then you'll remember that our Brother said that these (signs) were not to be throughout the age. Let me read again in closing this second chapter of the Book of Acts. I ask you, Where does it say in Acts 2 that these things were NOT for ALL OF the ages? Listen to me will you! This is that great prophet: "It shall come to pass in the last days . . ." He admits that the last days are still here. I say that those last days went on until the apostle Paul received all of his revelations and mysteries or secrets for the Body of Christ. And that when Paul wrote his thirteen letters (and I've emphasized it that Paul wrote thirteen). Why? Why did Paul write thirteen letters to the Gentiles? Why did Paul write more than Peter and James and John? John wrote 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, the Gospel of John, and the Book of Revelation. Peter wrote 1 Peter and 2 Peter. But the apostle Paul wrote all of these thirteen letters to the Gentiles. They were without God, without Christ, without hope in the world. They were alienated from the life of God, they had no revelation. And God sent a special apostle to the nations who are afar off to bring them night. He sent a special apostle with a message of grace to bring those Gentiles from being "no people" into the heavenlies where they're blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ.

The apostle Paul in the Book of Ephesians constantly calls our attention to the heavenlies. That belongs to Paul's revelation. We're blessed with all spiritual blessings. We're sealed with Christ in the heavenlies. My, doesn't Paul have a wonderful message! Doesn't he thrill your heart with the grace of God, and fill your soul with joy and peace in believing?

In Rom. 6 we have Paul's baptism into death. In Acts 2 we are told that throughout the last days they were to speak with tongues. Note these statements now, brethren. They're not mine. Why don't you believe what Luke said? "It shall

come to pass in the last days . . ." When is this going to happen? "... In the last days, saith God, I will pour forth my Spirit." Did he say, "A part of the last days?" or "the beginning of the last days?" Or did he say, "The last days?" "I will pour out of my Spirit, saith God, upon ALL flesh (and when He does that) your sons and your daughters will prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit . . ." What is that pouring out in the last days? He has admitted that there is a baptism in Spirit. And he said, "In the last days I will show wonders in the heaven above." Has he done it? Has he brought to pass these marvelous signs in the earth. Has there been blood and fire and vapor of smoke? Where do they belong? In the last days. Well, when will those things come to pass? And when these things are come to pass God says in his Word the last days will come. The last days fulfill prophecy. And when the prophecy is fulfilled in the Book of Acts you will find that the last days are in God's divine order.

I thank you tonight for your kind attention. I thank God for all you mean to me in a debate like this, and for my worthy opponent. I praise God for the close of this particular part of our discussion. May God bless you. (Time).

September 4, 1953

Proposition III: The Scriptures teach that the Kingdom of Christ was established (or set up) on the first Pentecost after our Lord's resurrection, and that Christ now reigns on David's throne.

Bill L. Rogers, AFFIRMS

B. A. Baker, DENIES

#### ROGERS' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

I'm sure that we're all grateful for the rain that we've had even though it may have turned off just a little cool and I'm just afraid of getting hoarse in the damp night air. I'm grateful to the Providence of God for the privilege that we have of being here tonight to affirm the proposition that has been read in your hearing.

I believe with all my heart that the Scriptures teach that the Kingdom of Christ was established (or set up) on the first Pentecost after our Lord's resurrection. And I believe that

involved in that is the idea that Jesus Christ now reigns on David's throne.

The first thing that I have to do is define the terms of the proposition. By the term "Scriptures" I mean the Bible, the Book of God. By "teach" I mean that these Scriptures impart unto us this information. By the "Kingdom of Christ" I mean the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of the Son of God, that spiritual Dominion over which Christ rules as King. By "was established" I mean set up. I have that (defined) in the parenthesis. By the "first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ" I refer to that feast day of the Jews the events of which are recorded in the second chapter of Acts. By the expression "Christ now reigns on David's throne:" by "reigns" I mean that he rules on David's throne. By "David's throne" I mean that He exercises the power, the authority, of David. By "now" I, of course, mean that He does that in this present dispensation. Now, if that's not clear enough, I'll make it clearer if I possibly can. For we're here to teach the truth, and what we believe to be the truth upon this proposition, and, certainly, unless these terms are properly defined you'll not understand what we're getting at.

I might say here that I believe sincerely that the Kingdom of Christ is the Church of God. That's what I mean when I say the Kingdom of God was established—I'm referring to the Church of God or the Church of Christ. In Luke 22:29-30 Jesus said unto his apostles: "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom and sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Now, here we find that the "Lord's table" is in the Kingdom. But we find from 1 Cor. 10:16, 21 that the "Lord's table" is the Lord's Supper and that that thing is in the Church or Body of Christ. Now, since the Lord's table is in the Kingdom, but the Lord's table is in the Church which is his Body, then it follows by a demonstration that the Church the Body of Christ is the Kingdom of the Son of God. Now, that's involved, of course, in the definition of terms and ought to be discussed.

I have affirmed first that the Kingdom was established upon the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ.

## I. ARGUMENTS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF KINGDOM

1. The Kingdom and Power (Mk. 9:1). The first argument along that line to which I call your attention is based up-

on Mark 9:1. There Jesus says: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, that shall not taste of death, till they have seen the Kingdom of God come with power." You'll remember that the Bible says that "John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea saying, Repent ye for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:1-2). That term "at hand" means that it is near by or that it is approaching. I remember again that Jesus taught the same thing in Matt. 4:17. He called for men to repent, "for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand, it's near by, it's approaching." That thing that is called "the Kingdom of heaven" in Matt. 4:17 is called "the Kingdom of God" in Mk. 1:15. And again the Bible says there it's "at hand" or it approaches.

Now, after this thing came to pass, after they had preached that it was at hand or near by, Jesus said in Mk. 9:1: "There be some of them here that stand by, that shall not taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power." We realize that the Son of God has suggested that certain ones would not die, they would not taste of death, until the Kingdom of God did come. And not only that he tells how the Kingdom of God is going to come, it is going to "come with the power." But in Acts 1:6-8 the Bible says: "The disciples said therefore unto Him, Wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" Even here they did not thoroughly understand the Kingdom of Christ was to be a spiritual Institution so they asked concerning the restoration of Israel. "And He said unto them, It is not given for you to know the times or the seasons that the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in Judaea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Now, remember that Mk. 9:1 says, "The Kingdom will come with power." But whenever they asked when the Kingdom would come Jesus answered in terms of power and said, "You'll get the power when the Spirit comes." Well, since we understand the Kingdom was to come with power, and the power was to come with the Spirit, if we locate WHEN the Spirit came we'll know exactly when the Kingdom came. Well, turn to Acts 2:1-4 and the Bible say, "When the DAY OF PENTECOST was fully come they were all together in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as the rushing of

a mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Let us now notice that the Bible says it was upon the day of Pentecost that they were "filled with the Holy Spirit." Now remember the Bible also says that when the Spirit came they were going to get the power. Well, inasmuch as the Bible says the Spirit came on Pentecost, and the power was to come with the Spirit, when did the power come? Why it came when the Spirit came, on Pentecost. But we found also from Mk. 9:1 that the Kingdom will come with the power. The power will come with the Spirit. The Spirit came on Pentecost; therefore, the power came on Pentecost. But the Kingdom was to come when the power came, and, therefore the Kingdom came on Pentecost. Now that proposition is proven by a demonstration.

We understand, as we've suggested from Matt. 3, Matt. 4, and Mk. 1, that before the day of Pentecost the Kingdom of heaven was preached as "at hand," "it's near by," or "approaches." But after that time it is never preached as in the future. It's not in the future after that time, it is already an established thing. The Kingdom is going to come with the power, the power with the Spirit. The Spirit came on Pentecost, and, therefore the Spirit, the power, and the Kingdom all came upon that day. That's the thing I have affirmed and there we have it proven by a demonstration. Let us realize that after this time people are in the Kingdom. Before that time the Kingdom of heaven is in the future. The material is there being prepared, but the Kingdom is here established, it came with the power.

In Col. 1:13 Paul says that God delivers men out of the power of darkness, and he says that these Colossians were "translated . . . into the Kingdom of the Son of His love." Now, they had been brought out of darkness INTO the Kingdom of God's Son. What's my proposition? I've affirmed that the Kingdom of Christ was established. I've proven that it was established upon the first Pentecost after the Lord's resurrection. I've proven that after that day of Pentecost it's not future, but rather men are in it.

In Rev. 1:9 John says: "I, John, your brother and partaker

in the tribulation, and in the patience, and in the Kingdom that are in Christ." John said, "I'm IN the Kingdom." Now, he either was, or he was not. If the Kingdom did NOT come as the Bible suggests then John wasn't in it. But if John was in it then the Kingdom did come as Jesus had promised. And Jesus said that the Kingdom would come with power before some that stood by should taste of death.

Not only that, Paul said in Heb. 12:28: "Wherefore, receiving a Kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace whereby we may offer service unto God with reverence and godly fear." Now, we can understand that Paul says they were receiving the Kingdom then. But when did men receive the Kingdom? When they got the power. The Kingdom was to come with the power, but they got that when the Spirit came (Acts 1:8). So they received the Kingdom upon the first day of Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. And Paul preached that men were IN the Kingdom, that they received the Kingdom. And he was accused of preaching "another King, one Jesus" (Acts 17:17), and certainly never did deny it. He preached that Jesus is King. And, of course, we've pointed out conclusively that the (Kingdom) came upon that day of Pentecost.

2. The Lord's House And The Last Days (Isa. 2:2-4). The second argument is on the Lord's House and the last days. Isaiah prophesied and said: "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Now, there are several things about this prophecy that we need to note. First of all it is to come to pass in the last days. Upon this day of Pentecost, Acts 2:16-17, Peter said: "These men are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing that it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that that was spoken by the prophet Joel, It shall come to pass in the last days . . ." Now, Peter says, "The last days are here." Isaiah says that the House of God should be established at that time.

Not only that, but he said that it would embrace "all na-

tions." "All nations shall flow into it." But you'll remember in Lk. 24:46-47 Jesus says, "It is written . . ." He was referring to this very thing (Isa. 2:2-4). "It is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission should be preached in his name among ALL NATIONS (all nations are involved in this very thing here), beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things . . . But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." When are they going to get the power? When the Spirit came (Acts 1:8). He said, "You wait till you're clothed with it." And he said, "It will begin IN JERUSALEM. That's where you're going to begin." Well, they did the thing the Lord suggested. And upon that very day of Pentecost they were endued with that power and "the Word of the Lord went out of Zion and the law of Jehovah went forth out of Jerusalem." "Repentance and remission of sins in the name of the Lord" began to be preached right there. (Lk. 24:47; Acts 2:38). Let us remember that at the time the "Word of God went out of Zion" in the last days that then the House of God was to be established. But that came to pass upon that day of Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. And just as surely as that's true then the House of God, the Kingdom of God, was established at that time.

We need to understand that that is another reason for Peter's referring back to that (Pentecost) and saying concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit as it fell upon the household of Cornelius, "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell upon them even as upon us AT THE BEGINNING" (Acts 11:15). Pentecost is the beginning. We have proven that the Spirit came there, the power came there, the Kingdom came there, that's referred to as "the beginning." So the House of God had its beginning there. The Kingdom of God started on Pentecost in Jerusalem.

Let us notice something else. I have affirmed that Jesus now reigns on David's throne. I'm going to prove the part that he's on David's throne and then I'll get to the ruling part.

## II. ARGUMENTS ON CHRIST'S RULING ON DAVID'S THRONE.

1. The Throne of David And The Kingdom of Christ (2 Sam 7:12). In the second chapter of Acts you'll find there a quotation from one of the prophets of the Old Testament.



You'll remember in 2 Sam. 7:12-14 that Nathan the prophet said unto David: "When thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers I will set up thy seed after thee, that shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his Kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his Kingdom forever. I will be his Father, and he shall be to me a Son . . ." He then goes on to speak of the iniquity that he might commit thus showing that the prophecy is two-fold. That on one hand it referred to Solomon, but it had a deeper significance. It referred to Jesus Christ the Greater Seed of David. And in Heb. 1:5 the inspired writer quotes this very reference and applies it to Jesus Christ the Son of God. "For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? and again (from 2 Sam. 7:14) I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" Now, that refers to Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was the Seed of David. Now, the promise has been made that while David is dead, while he sleeps with his fathers, this Great Seed will be raised up to sit on the throne of David, and that he will establish the House of God and that God will have him to sit upon David's throne.

We need to understand also that in Psa. 132:11 there the Bible says (and David is speaking by the Holy Spirit. In 2 Sam. 23:2 we find there that he's speaking by the Spirit), "Jehovah hath sworn unto David in truth and he will not turn from it, Of thy seed will I set upon thy throne." A certain One of David's seed is to be seated his throne. That is the promise the Holy Spirit made by the mouth of Nathan the prophet and David also wrote it by the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

We must now understand that Jesus was of the Seed of David (Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8). Now Peter said in that second chapter of Acts upon that very day of Pentecost concerning the resurrection of the Christ: "It was not possible for Him to be holden of it (death). For David saith concerning him, I beheld the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved: therefore my heart was glad and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption . . ." He then points out that David was not speaking of himself. And in verse 29 he said: "Brethren, I may say unto you freely

of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, ana his sepulchre (or tomb) is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would raise up one to set upon his throne; he foreseeing THIS spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore (for this reason) by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Here the Bible says that He had received the PROMISE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. What was the promise of the Spirit? That the Seed of David should be seated upon his throne. That doesn't mean that Christ received the Spirit, for Christ received the Spirit without measure during his personal ministry (Jno. 3:34). But in the second chapter of Acts, upon that day of Pentecost, Peter pointed out that David foresaw that Jesus would be raised from the dead and he'd be seated at Gods' right hand on David's throne!

The Bible says that Jesus received the promise of the Spirit. And the promise of the Spirit was that he would be seated upon David's throne. "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and HAVING RECEIVED OF THE FATHER the promise of the Holy Spirit (or the promise the Spirit made) he has shed forth what ye now see and hear." So Jesus NOW sits upon David's throne according to the second chapter of the Book of Acts in fulfillment of the promise in 2 Sam. 7:12-14.

2. The Key of David (Isa. 22:21-22; Rev. 3:7). I also bring out another point, and that is upon "the key of David." To have "The Key of David" merely and literally means the government of David is committed unto anyone. In Isa. 22:21-22 the Bible says that a certain one would be king in the stead of David and it says David's "government would be committed" unto him (verse 21). "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." But the Bible says of Christ in Rev. 3:7: "This is he that is true and holy, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and none shutteth, he that shutteth and none openeth." Now, we've pointed out from Isa. 22:21-22 that to have the "key of

David" is to have the ruling power of David, that it is to have the government (of David) committed unto one. But the Bible says that Jesus has the **KEY OF DAVID**. Well, if Jesus has the **KEY** of David, then he has the **GOVERNMENT OF David**. To have the Key of David upon his shoulder is no more nor less than to have the power committed unto him to govern and rule as David had. And the Bible teaches distinctly that he has that.

But let us go just a little bit further. Not only does this indicate that he has the ruling power (that he has the key, the government, or power to rule that David had), but it also indicates that He is upon David's throne. The Bible says in Isa. 9:6-7: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the **GOVERNMENT SHALL BE UPON HIS SHOULDER . . .**" Now, to have the key upon the shoulder is the same as having the **GOVERNMENT** upon the shoulder. ". . . And the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace." Then the Bible says, ". . . **UPON** the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and uphold it with justice from henceforth even forever." Here the Bible says that to have the **GOVERNMENT** upon the shoulder is to be upon the throne of David. But we have pointed out that to have the key of David is to have the government. And the Bible says that Jesus has that key. Well, if Jesus has the key, then he has the government. But the Bible says if he has the government, then he's upon the throne. Now, since the Bible says he has the key (Rev. 3:7) he does have the government and he rules upon the throne of David.

Now, I've proven from Mk. 9:1; Acts 1:8; Acts 2:1-4 that the Kingdom was to come with power, the power with the Spirit, and that they all came upon the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, that the House of God had its origin there, that it had its commencement there. We've emphasized the fact that upon **THAT DAY** Jesus received the promise of the Holy Spirit, that he received David's throne, and that he had been seated at the right hand of God. He received the promise of the Holy Spirit as he had given it is Psa. 132:11. I pointed out from Rev. 3:7 that Jesus has the key of David, and that to have the key of David means to have the government (of David) committed unto him. But if he has the government upon his shoulder then he is upon the throne of

David (Isa. 9:6-7). And all of these passages combined together indicate very distinctly that Jesus now reigns upon David's throne, that he now has the power that David had. And that's the power of a ruling king.

3. Jesus is Ruling Now (Psa. 110:1-4). I now want to bring another argument upon the subject of ruling. Jesus is RULING NOW!! In Psa. 110:1-4 the Psalmist said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."

Now, here the Bible says that Jesus is to rule in the midst of his enemies while he is seated at the right hand of God. But Peter says in Acts 2:33: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted . . ." What day was that? Why the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ! Peter says, "Jesus is NOW exalted to the right hand of God." What does the Psalmist say? "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. (And during that time) RULE thou in the midst of thine enemies." At the very time that He is at the right hand of God He's ruling. But the Bible says in Acts 2:33 that He is sitting at God's right hand on Pentecost. Therefore upon the day of Pentecost he was RULING at God's right hand. That's just as clear as it possibly can be.

Not only that, there's something else that proves that it is for this time, that Jesus is now ruling. For the time that Jesus is to rule in the midst of his enemies is the time that he's to be priest, or high priest, after the order of Melchizedek (Psa. 110:4). "Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." And it will be at the time Psa. 110:4 says when he is priest after the order of Melchizedek. Well, Is he priest after the order of Melchizedek NOW? Turn to Heb. 6:20 where the Bible says of Him, "Whither as a forerunner JESUS entered for us, HAVING BECOME a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." And in 7:17 it says, "It is witnessed of Christ, Thou art a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."

Jesus is priest NOW after the order of Melchizedek! But at the time that he's priest after the order of Melchizedek the Bible says that he's to be RULING, that he's to be ruling at the right hand of God. We've already emphasized the fact that that would be upon David's throne, from these other passages (Isa. 9:6-7 and others). We understand that it was at God's right hand, that he's priest after the order of Melchizedek, and the Bible says that he is RULING! What's my proposition? That Jesus now RULES, and that he now rules on David's throne.

4. Christ To Rule While Sitting (Zech. 6:13). Let us also point out another passage. In Zech. 6:13 the Bible says "The man whose name is the Branch: and he shall grow up out of his place; and he shall build the temple of Jehovah; even he shall build the temple of Jehovah; and he shall bear the glory, and shall SIT and RULE upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both."

We need to understand this one thing, that here the Bible says the man whose name is the Branch is going to be PRIEST upon the throne. If we can find when this man whose name is the Branch is priest, we'll find him upon the throne. But the Bible says when he's upon the throne he's sitting. And it also says that when he's sitting upon the throne, he's RULING. Now if I can find who it is that is called the Branch, and just when he's priest, then I'll know when he's sitting upon the throne and I'll know when he's ruling.

You can turn to Rev. 22:16 and there Jesus says, "I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright and the morning star." Jesus Christ is the Branch (Isa. 11:1-2). We understand that. But the Bible says he is to be priest upon the throne. Is he priest now? In Heb. 8:4 the Bible says, "In the things which we are saying the chief point is this, We have such a high priest that is set down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." Now the Bible says he'll be priest upon his throne. But Jesus is priest now, and, therefore, he's on his throne now.

But the same Bible says, "He will sit and RULE upon the throne." Jesus is Priest now so he's on his throne now. And since he's on his throne now, the Bible teaches that he's RULING now. What is my opponent going to do with these arguments? Is he going to come up and take them up one by

one in the order that I have given them? (This is the sixth argument that I have given). Is he going to come up and investigate them and see whether or not they teach what I'm teaching. Or is he going to treat them with igNORance like he's been doing. Is he going to observe the "passover" and let them pass by, and talk about something altogether extraneous and not pertinent to the proposition? Will he come up and deal with them?

Now, let us go back and make the syllogism and see exactly what we're saying. The Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is to be priest upon his throne. But he's priest now, therefore, he's upon his throne now. But the same Bible teaches that when Jesus is upon his throne he's ruling. The Bible teaches that Jesus is upon his throne now; therefore, he's ruling now. And this man has signed his name to deny that. How can he deny it? He cannot deny it successfully.

5. Christ's Kingdom and Dominion (Dan. 7:13-14). But I pass to another argument. In Dan. 7:13-14 Daniel speaks of having visions. And he said: "I saw in the night—visions, and behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man and he came even to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And (at that time) there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Let us realize that Daniel is here having a vision. He is seeing One come in the clouds of heaven TO the Ancient of days. He's seeing One coming to God in the clouds of heaven. And when that One comes in the clouds of heaven even to God, there's given to him dominion, there's given to him power, there's given him glory, there's given him a Kingdom. And when that Kingdom is given unto him ALL NATIONS are to be subservient unto him. The Bible teaches in Acts 1:9-10 that "when Jesus had said these things, he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight." At the ascension of Christ he was taken up in the clouds of heaven!

In Lk. 19:11-12 it says that as they drew nigh to Jerusalem he spake a parable unto them because they thought the Kingdom of God should immediately appear. And this is what he said: "A certain man went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." The Kingdom

of heaven is like that. He says it's like a man that leaves this country, that goes into a far country, he gets the Kingdom over there and after he receives it he returns. Now, we can see and understand that Jesus is here pointing out that he is going to leave the earth, that he's going to heaven, and that in heaven he's going to receive the Kingdom, that the Kingdom will be given to him there. When will that be? When "all nations and all kingdoms" are subservient unto him. But in Matt. 28:18-20 Jesus said: "Go ye, therefore into all the world and teach ALL NATIONS, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world." This Great Commission involves all nations. That's also the thing that's involved in this Kingdom that is referred to here (Lk. 19-12). And the Bible says that it would come to pass when Jesus was received up into heaven (Dan. 7:14) when these things were seen in the night visions.

Let us emphasize the fact that when he went with the clouds of heaven according to this, THEN he received the Kingdom. He's not going to come back to earth and then receive it. But he's rather going to heaven, then he's going to receive it and after getting it and reigning he's going to return. Now we have here made seven arguments. I'm going back in the time that I have left and reiterate these so that they'll be clear in your minds.

First of all, the proposition is that the Kingdom of Christ was fully established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and that he now reigns on David's throne.

First was this argument of the Kingdom and the power. The Kingdom was to come with power (Mk. 9:1). But in Acts 1:8 the power is to come with the Spirit. On the day of Pentecost the Bible says the Spirit came (Acts 2:1-4). Since the Spirit came on Pentecost the power came. And since the power came and the Kingdom came with power, then the Spirit, the power and the Kingdom all came at the same time. And that was on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. It was upon that day of Pentecost that the law of the Lord went out of Zion and the Word of Jehovah from Jerusalem. That was in the last days. That was the time that Isaiah said the House of God would be established. That's the second argument (Isa. 2:2-4).

We emphasize the fact that Peter says that Jesus is now upon the throne of David (Acts 2:29-36). He received the promise of the Holy Spirit that was made unto David.

Then we showed that Jesus now has the key of David (Rev. 3:7), that he has the government committed unto him (Isa. 22:21-22). And to have the government committed unto him is to be upon the throne of David (Isa. 9:6-7).

I proved that Jesus is ruling now. For the Bible says that he was to rule in the day that he was seated at God's right hand. But he was seated there on Pentecost; therefore, he was ruling on Pentecost. He was to rule when he was priest after the order of Melchizedek. He's priest after Melchizedek now, therefore, ruling now.

Christ was to rule while he was seated (Zech. 6:13). That Jesus is to be priest upon his throne. He's priest now; therefore, he's seated now. But he was to rule on his throne. Since he is on his throne now, he's ruling now.

Then finally let us emphasize that when he ascended with the clouds of heaven he received "dominion, glory, and a Kingdom." And that Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom. It is a Kingdom where all nations are to serve him. But that is the one that began at Jerusalem (Lk. 24:46-47). "Thus it behoved the Christ to suffer and rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among ALL NATIONS beginning at Jerusalem."

I consider my proposition proven. I expect my opponent to take up the arguments in the order that they have been given. (Time). I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

#### BAKER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Rogers, and Brethren:

We are happy again tonight to declare from God's Word that Jesus Christ teaches that he is going to set up his Kingdom at his Second Coming. And I'm going to prove tonight from God's Word that this cannot be denied.

I'd like to call your attention to the second chapter of the Book of Acts, beginning with verse 18: "These are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing that it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: your sons and your



daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; yea and on my servants and on my handmaidens will I pour out of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in the heaven above, and signs on the earth beneath; blood, and fire and vapor of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood (now note this), BEFORE the great and notable day of the Lord come." Note: "BEFORE the great and notable day of the Lord come." Now, I want to show tonight that the "great and notable day of the Lord" is the beginning of our Lord's reign in power and great glory.

I'd like to have you turn to Matt. 25, if you will, where Jesus Christ tells us WHEN he's going to begin his reign in power and in great glory. There will be glory and great power when the Lord Jesus Christ Comes. For glory and power are connected together when the Lord Jesus Christ takes the throne of glory. In Matt. 25:31 I can show you that Jesus Christ said that his Kingdom is going to be set up at his Second Coming. And everything that our Brother has said has to do with the Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ except those places where Christ is now seated at the Father's right hand on the Father's throne. The Father's throne is NOT the throne of his glory, nor the throne of his wonderful power.

Matthew 25:31: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory . . ." There's glory and power in connection with the reign of Christ. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory . . . with all the holy angels with him." Now, let me read it again. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, THEN (then) shall he sit upon the throne of his glory . . ." Notice the word when, and the word then. The Lord is teaching us himself that WHEN the Son of man shall come in his glory, that THEN shall he sit on the throne of his glory.

Now, remember that we are told in the Book of Acts that this same Jesus who ye have seen go into heaven shall so come in like manner (Acts 1:11). Jesus told us in Matt. 25 that THEN will he sit upon the throne of his glory. When he sits on the throne of his glory before him shall be gathered all nations. "And he shall separate them one from another as the shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats." Now, note this: When the Lord sits on the throne of his glory he's going to gather all nations, and is going to separate them one from

the other. "He shall set the sheep on the right hand and the goats on the other. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. 25:33-34). Notice that this Kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world.

Brother Rogers said, "When Christ sat down on the Father's throne, then he sat down on the throne of his glory." And he said that the Pentecostal power was the power that Christ was speaking of. But I'd like to show you from Matt. 24 that the Lord Jesus Christ teaches that when he comes the second time, when he comes to establish his Kingdom, that these things are going to happen. Did the Lord gather all nations on the day of Pentecost before him? Listen to Matt. 24:27: "As the lightning cometh forth out of the east, and shineth even to the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Did that happen on the day of Pentecost?

Then notice again: "But immediately after the tribulation of those days . . ." Did the tribulation of those days come on the day of Pentecost? "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken: and THEN (and then) shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and THEN shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven WITH power and great glory. (When he comes to sit on the throne of his glory) THEN shall he send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24:28-31).

Then I'd like to call your attention to what John said in the Book of Revelation, in the eleventh chapter. But before we go to the eleventh chapter I'd like to call your attention to the apostle John's statement in Rev. 3:21: "He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne." Our Lord is to reign on HIS throne until his enemies are made his footstool. The Lord sat down at the right hand of God until. (Heb. 10:13). The until has to do with power and great glory.

In Rev. 11:15 the apostle John gives us this testimony:

"And the seventh angel sounded; (this angel did not sound on the day of Pentecost) and there followed great voices in heaven, saying, The Kingdom of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." "When the seventh angel sounded"—he did not sound on the day of Pentecost. When the seventh angel shall sound! The Lord said, "WHEN he comes in power and great glory THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations." In Rev. 11:15 the "kingdoms of this world become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." "And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their thrones fell upon their faces . . . saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy GREAT POWER, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shoudest destroy them which destroy the earth" (Rev. 11:16-18). (This is) when the Lord comes in power and great glory.

In Rev. 19 the apostle John speaks again. Verse 11: "And I saw heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and he that sat thereon called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war." Did that happen on the day of Pentecost? "And his eyes were as a flame of fire, and upon his head were many crowns; and he hath a name written which no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations (Did he smite them with it on the day of Pentecost?)." "When he comes in power and great glory THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." "He shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh, a name written, KING OF KINGS; AND LORD OF LORDS." (Rev. 19:11-16).

Then I'd like to call your attention to a great prophecy in the Old Testament. Isa. 2:1-4. This prophecy has to do with

the last days. "The word that Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (verse 1). It concerns Judah and Jerusalem. "It shall come to pass in the last days . . ." The same last days that our Brother Rogers spoke about. "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Now note: "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks . . ." Has that happened? Are you doing it today? Listen again: "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks: nation SHALL NOT lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore . . ." in the last days this tells us. I said that all these things were to happen BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord (Acts 2), and that the day of the Lord is the day that the Lord begins his righteous reign in great power, and sits upon the throne of his glory.

Listen: "He shall judge among many nations . . . They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

But I'd like to call your attention again to this same Book of Isaiah and chapter nine. Again we read in verse 6: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a child is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end . . ." When he sits upon the throne of his glory this will happen. He's on the Father's throne. He's now priest after the order of Melchizedek. And as a priest he's waiting for the day when he'll become the King of kings, and the Lord of Lord's. But in this text, notice in verse 7, "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, UPON the throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment . . .

even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Then in Isa. 11 we have a great prophecy that God makes concerning the glorious and powerful reign of the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God. Notice in Isa. 11:1 that this is that Branch. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, 'the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.'" Now notice verse 3: "And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove the hearing of his ears: But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." Did he do that on the day of Pentecost when three thousand were brought into that Church? "And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Did that happen, I ask you, on the day of Pentecost?

Let me turn with you again to the Book of Joel, the third chapter where we have the great prophecy of the coming of the King. In Joel 3:9 we have this wonderful prophecy. Notice again that Jesus Christ said as I pointed out in the beginning of my remarks—I said in the beginning: "If I can prove that Jesus Christ said he was going to set up that Kingdom WHEN he comes, then what Brother Rogers has said cannot be true in all the facts." I said that Jesus Christ said: "WHEN the Son of man shall come in power and great glory THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Not when he GOES; when he COMES! Not when he ascends, but when he returns, when he comes personally. Not when he GOES

to heaven, but when the Son of man comes in power and great glory.

In Joel 3:16 notice this prophecy takes us back to Joel 2. It has to do with the last days. He's going to deal with the nations in the last days. He says in verse 9: "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; Prepare for war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: beat your plowshares into swords and your pruninghooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord. Let the heathen be awakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about, Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, yet you down; for the press is full, the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision." (Joe 3:9-14). That's what we read in the Book of Joel. And all these things were to take place, that are recorded in the Book of Joel, BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord.

"Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heaven and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain; then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall be no strangers pass through her any more. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim. Egypt shall be a desolation . . ." (Joel 3:14-19). Did this happen, I ask you, on the day of Pentecost? The power and glory of Christ is yet to come.

Let me call your attention now to the Book of Zechariah, that wonderful fourteenth chapter of Zechariah. In this chapter God is taking us into the future, to that "great and notable day of the Lord." Notice the things that are said here about

the throne of Christ's glory. You know why Paul gave us the Lord's Supper? "Till he comes!" These things are going to happen after he comes. Paul said, "When ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye proclaim the Lord's death TILL he come." Praise God, we're going to be here till the Lord Jesus Christ comes if it's God's will.

But notice this, Zech. 14:1: "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. (Listen!) For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished . . ." Here's what he said in verse 3: "Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. (Listen!) His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives . . ." Did his feet stand in that day when he rent the mount of Olives? Notice what's going to happen in that day. "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal." (Zech. 14:1-5). Now, remember this has to do with that great and notable day of the Lord. "And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go forth from Jerusalem; And the Lord shall be King over ALL the earth IN THAT DAY shall there be one Lord, and his name one" (verses 8-9). Could that be stronger? That's when the Lord comes in power. There was power on the day of Pentecost, but that was before the great and notable day of the Lord come. With the day of the Lord comes the Lord in power and great glory. Then the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Let me call your attention again to the Gospel according to Luke. There the Lord Jesus Christ said in the twentieth chapter (and let us notice again that our Lord is very definite that he is going to have power and great glory.) The world hates him today. The world is full of violence. We know that Satan is the god of this age and the prince of the power of the air. When Jesus Christ reigns, the devil will be in the abyss. But now he is the blinder of them that believe not. The devil is still working and is using his power to deceive the nations.

We cannot say with Isaiah that we know war no more. We know that God has promised to make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, and that the apostle Paul says: "And so all Israel shall be saved, for there shall come a deliverer out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob . . ." (Rom. 11:26).

God has promised that there shall be a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Jacob. That new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Jacob is this, he says when this new covenant is in effect, you'll not have to say to your neighbor, "Know the Lord. For they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them." You'll not have to teach your neighbor to know the Lord. For God says, "I will forgive their iniquity. This is my covenant that I will make with them." When the Lord is reigning in power and great glory we're going to find that he's going to sit upon the throne of his glory. Not his Father's throne, but the throne of his glory. He's now seated on the Father's throne. He's going to leave that throne. He's going to occupy his own throne, the throne of his glory.

In the Gospel according to Luke the Lord Jesus Christ teaches what's going to happen just prior to the time that he comes. Notice in Lk. 21:23: "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath unto this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs of the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear . . ." Those things are now if the Lord Jesus Christ reigns in the nations of the earth. Is the righteousness from sea to sea? Is Satan bound with all his powers today? The Body of Christ is God's program. We are seated with Christ in the heavenlies up over every principality and power, might and dominion. And the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and in his own time he shall show who is the King of kings, and the Lord of lords.

Every time I sit down at the Lord's table and break bread I say that the Lord is going to come. And I know that when I break bread that He is speaking to my heart. "For as oft as



ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show forth the Lord's death TILL he come," the day of the Lord.

Let me come back to the Book of Acts again where I started. In that second chapter let us notice again that these things, the pouring out of God's Spirit, was to take place BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord come. Notice that again in Acts 2:18-19: "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord come."

Now, we notice again in the second chapter of the Book of Acts that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead. He's at the right hand of God. He's coming again. He's not going to stay at the right hand of God. Even the angel said: "Why stand ye gazing into heaven . . ." These two men that saw the Lord ascend into heaven said: "Why stand ye gazing here? This same Jesus as ye see him go so shall he come in like manner" (Acts 1:9-11).

The apostle Paul sets forth the blessed hope of the Church which is Christ's Body. "The Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout . . ." The Lord ascended on the day of Pentecost. He's going to descend with a shout. He's going to come in power and great glory.

Let me close with Matthew again. "When the Son of man comes in power and great glory THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."

I say that these things did not happen on the day of Pentecost. (Time).

#### ROGERS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

My worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm happy to be before you to continue the affirmation of the proposition that was read in your hearing a moment ago. But before I continue with that I want to point out to my opponent again that he has violated the rules that he has signed. The first agreement that he signed is this: "The Disputants agree to be governed by Hedge's Rules of Debate." And here is the seventh of those rules: "As truth and not victory is the professed object of controversy, whatever proof may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor, and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by the arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reason-

ing by wit, caviling, or ridicule is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy." My opponent has not . . . (The public address system began making a terrific noise here). (After it is stopped, Mr. Rogers continues): Well I hope that's settled now! I was beginning to think I'd swallowed a Jew's-harp or something! (Laughter).

This seventh rule of the debate says that my opponent must examine with fairness and candor all proofs that I advance on this proposition. He referred to one or two of the passages that I had quoted and this was from something that he had already prepared before he got here. I want to call your attention to some things that he never even mentioned. And I'm going to go back and re-affirm these things. Now, Mr. Baker, you're violating your own agreement. You're violating the rules of honorable debate in doing this. I know that you can't meet the arguments, but you're supposed to examine them and show the audience that you can't meet them. You're supposed to try to examine them, to try to find out whether or not you can meet them. And you're absolutely violating the rules of debate in not taking them up. Now, you signed an agreement that you would be governed by those rules, and yet you refuse to do it.

What have you said about Mk. 9:1? What did you say about Jesus and John both preaching that the Kingdom was "at hand" and near while they were upon the earth? What have you said about it? Jesus said the Kingdom would come with power (Mk. 9:1). He said the power would come with the Spirit (Acts 1:8). The Spirit came on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). What have you said? He hasn't dealt with it! Mr. Baker has not read these passages. He hasn't examined them. He signed an agreement to examine these things with fairness and candor. What's he done? Violated the rules that he agreed to be governed by. He will not be governed by the rules of debate. He hasn't been governed by them since this debate commenced. He did refer to Isa. 2 and I'll let that go as an answer to that.

But what has he said about 2 Sam. 7:12? about Peter's saying that Jesus had received the promise of the Holy Spirit to be seated upon David's throne? What did he say? Has he examined these with fairness and candor? Has he examined them period? Has he just examined them? He hasn't even mentioned them, much less examined them. And

that seventh rule of debate says that he must do that. And he signed to be governed by them, and yet he refuses to do it.

His method of debating is only calculated to make infidels. Hell say, "Rogers said something, but I'll read something that will contradict it." Now, that's the way to make infidels, Mr. Baker, but that's not the way to debate. You've violated every principle of honorable controversy here tonight. He's not coming up and taking up the arguments as they were given and dealing with them as the rules of controversy say.

Then I made the argument on the "Key of David." You have not heard the lock shake; you haven't heard the key rattle! He just isn't taking it up to look at it. The Bible says that Jesus has the key of David (Rev. 3:7). But the Bible also teaches that to have the key of David is to have the "government committed" unto one (Isa. 22:21). What has Mr. Baker said about it? Mr. Baker signed an agreement to examine these things to see whether or not he can meet them! But he refuses to do that. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'll let you decide why it is that instead of dealing with my arguments he gets up and starts out on his debate for tomorrow night. He got up tonight and made the speech that he was supposed to make tomorrow night in his first speech. What do you think is wrong? I can tell you what is wrong: The man cannot meet the arguments. He knows he can't meet them, and so he just violates the rules of debate by refusing to even try to examine the arguments that have been advanced.

We made the argument upon the "Key of David." He never mentioned the key of David. He referred briefly to Isa. 9. I'll deal with that when I come to it.

Then we come to Psa. 110 that teaches that Jesus would rule when at the right hand of God. What has he said about Christ ruling. He hasn't said a word, except he says, "I'm going to find something to contradict what Rogers said. If I find something over yonder then Rogers is wrong about it." Now, that's not examining with fairness and candor the arguments that have been made by an opponent. Now, here's my idea about honorable controversy: If I sign an agreement, if I make an oath I'm going to stick with it. You know the Bible says that a man that walks uprightly is one that "swears to his own hurt and changes not." Mr. Baker, it might HURT, but you ought to do what you said you would do.

What have you said about ruling—about Jesus being at

the right hand of God and ruling at the same time? And he rules at the time he's priest after the order of Melchizedec. Did you all hear him mention that? He signed an agreement to examine these things. He's not doing it. I know why, and you know why, he knows why, and his brethren ought to begin to learn. He just cannot meet the arguments. I'd call somebody else if Mr. Baker wouldn't debate.

What did he say about Zech. 6:13? That teaches that Jesus would be a priest upon his throne and sit and rule upon his throne. But he's priest now, and therefore he's ruling now. What did he say? Did he quote Zech. 6:13? Have you heard it? Outside of my quoting it have you heard it? My friend has not referred to it! He's not dealt with it at all.

He didn't quote Lk. 19:11-12. He merely referred to the idea that Jesus said that he is going to return, and (according to Baker) then the Kingdom is going to come. But he didn't deal with the argument that was made there.

Now, those arguments have been advanced, and yet my opponent has not attempted to answer ONE thing that I have said. He hasn't come up and said, "Here's the argument and here's the answer." Now, there's a reason for it. I know why. I'm going back and re-state these arguments and make them even clearer than I did the first time, and it will just be to his own hurt. That's all. When a man refuses to take up arguments the audience knows why. Mr. Baker knows that he has not answered them; hasn't tried to answer them, and this audience knows that he hasn't tried to answer them.

Now then, he said, "Jesus is going to set up his Kingdom at his Second Coming." Mr. Baker, that's the proposition for tomorrow night. Your position tonight is in the negative, not the affirmative. Instead of getting up and affirming something you were supposed to get up and deny. Instead of getting up and trying to sustain an affirmative proposition you were to get up and examine the proofs that are offered and prove that they don't teach the thing that I have suggested. That's your work tonight. But you haven't done it. You started out on your debate for tomorrow night. He's out of soap. He has already made his speech tonight that he is supposed to make tomorrow night. I wonder where he's going then. You'll hear the same record tomorrow night that you heard tonight in his first speech. He's not going to examine the arguments. He's in the affirmative tonight when in

reality he has signed to be in the negative. Why doesn't he do the part that he's agreed to do?

There's not a passage in God's Book from Genesis to Revelation that teaches that Jesus will set up his Kingdom when he comes the second time. This man will leave this debate without reading the passage that says it.

But he says that Peter said in Acts 2:15, "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that that was spoken by the prophet Joel, it shall come to pass in the last days . . ." Now, Peter says, "This is that." And therefore he was in the last days. Mr. Baker, of course, doesn't believe that God did what he said he would do in the last days. For He said that he would establish his house. Mr. Baker doesn't believe that.

But now then, he said that the Bible says that "the sun would be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before the great and notable day of the Lord come." And he emphasized the word before. And he said, therefore, the day of the Lord had not come. Why, Mr. Baker, if you'll turn to Mk. 15:33 you'll find that the sun was turned into darkness at the crucifixion of Christ! Yes, that was fulfilled there. And similar statements were made concerning the destruction of Babylon (Isa. 13) when he referred to the various things that took place at that time. And these are the very things that took place at the crucifixion of the Son of God as we have already referred to in Mk. 15:33.

Now then, let me notice something else. If this man takes the position that the "day of the Lord" (of Joel 2) has not come, he'll take the position that Paul's gospel is not in effect. Because Paul quotes from Joel 2, Mr. Baker, and says (and the next quotation from Peter is the same; Acts 2:21), "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." And Paul quotes that and says that's applicable in his day. But you must understand that Joel said these things were to happen (sun turned to darkness and the moon into blood) BEFORE whosoever should call on the name of the Lord should be saved (Joel 2:31-32). Now, he must take the position that they have happened, or Paul's gospel is not in force! Is Paul's gospel in force? Is Paul's gospel in force? Joel said these things must come to pass BEFORE the day of the Lord comes. And that is the time that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Paul says that's

NOW. Peter says it's NOW. Baker says, "Paul and Peter, you don't know. You haven't heard me. I say it's going to be over yonder somewhere." The trouble is they hadn't heard Mr. Baker; they hadn't sat at Baker's feet.

If Joel's prophecy has not been fulfilled then Paul's gospel—that "whosoever" gospel—is not in effect now! If you don't deal with it, I'm going to write it down and rub you with that from here until this debate closes! Now you're going to deal with it and you're going to notice it.

Let me state it again so that I'll know that you have it. The Bible teaches that these things should come to pass "before the great and notable day of the Lord come, and whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Now Paul emphasizes that that's the thing that he's preaching (Rom. 10:11-13). Now Joel said these things would come to pass BEFORE "whosoever should call on the name of the Lord should be saved." Are people that call on the name of the Lord saved today when they call on his name in the way that he has directed? Are they? Or have these things been fulfilled? He's not going to tell us. You need not to worry about that. Mr. Baker will be as silent as the tomb and observe the pass-over when he comes to that one.

But he said, "Jesus is going to begin his reign." Yes, he said, "He's going to begin his reign." He said, "I read that in Matt. 25—that Jesus is going to begin his reign, "When he comes in great power and great glory then he's going to begin his reign." Now your Book doesn't say that, Mr. Baker. Your Book doesn't say that. Yours reads just like mine. Do you see that verse that says, "Then will he begin to sit"? (Holds Bible opened to Matt. 25 for Mr. Baker to see). Yes, the Bible says that when Jesus comes in glory "then will he sit on the throne of his glory," but you said, "Then will he BEGIN to sit." Does it say, "Begin to sit," Mr. Baker? Shake or nod. (Laughter). Does it say, "Begin to sit"? Mr. Bert Baker said that. But does the Bible say that "then will he begin to sit"? Does it? Will you shake or nod or just bat your eye! Does it? Yet Mr. Baker is the man that has been answering things.

But he says Matt. 25:31 teaches that THEN (at the Second Coming) will he begin to sit. It doesn't say any such thing. I pointed out from Zech. 6:13 that Jesus is seated when he's priest. But he's priest now; and, therefore, he's seated



Where are you going to get your thousand years AFTER the Second Coming when the very passage you say refers to the Second Coming says the JUDGMENT will be then, and not a thousand years' reign. Where are you going to get it in? It (thousand years reign) will have to come in BEFORE the Second Coming, won't it? Won't it, Mr. Baker? If you get your thousand years in it'll have to be before the Second Coming. Yes, I'll prove that before this thing winds up.

But he said that everything I quoted is future. Well, Peter didn't know it, and these other writers didn't know it for they quoted them as fulfilled.

Then he said that Jesus is now on his Father's throne and not on the throne of his glory, and that Jesus will come in glory—that he doesn't have the glory now. Well, I'll admit that if he has the glory now then he has the Kingdom now. To receive the glory is to receive the Kingdom. I remember that the mother of the sons of Zebedee came to Jesus (Matt. 20:20-21) and said, "Command that these my two sons may sit one on thy right hand and one on thy left hand, in thy KINGDOM." And in Mark's Record they said, "Grant that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy GLORY" (Mk. 10:37). Now, did he receive the glory? The Bible says in 1 Tim. 3:16, "Great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." Mr. Baker, Jesus was RECEIVED UP into GLORY. But Mr. Baker says he doesn't have the glory now. Do you reckon Paul knew as much about it as Mr. Baker? Do you think that Paul could have written that if he had believed about it what Mr. Baker believes? Baker says, "He won't get the glory until he comes again." Paul says, "He was RECEIVED UP into glory." That was the very thing that Daniel had in mind when he said, "He came with the clouds of heaven, and there was given him GLORY, dominion and a Kingdom" (Dan. 7:13-14). Why, certainly, that's the very same thing. He has the glory now (1 Tim. 3:16). Now, he won't mention that after he has agreed to examine these things and see exactly what they teach.

Then he said that there is a difference in the "Father's throne" and the "Son's throne." The Father's throne, Mr. Baker, is David's throne, or David's throne is the Father's



throne. The Bible says in 1 Kings 2:11 that Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father. Now, whose throne is he on? On David's throne! The Bible says so. But in 1 Chron. 29:23 it says that Solomon sat upon the throne of the Lord ... all Israel obeyed him, and he prospered greatly. He sat upon the throne of David, but he sat upon the throne of the Lord. Then the Father's throne, the Lord's throne, is the throne of David. You've admitted that Jesus is on the Father's throne now, and since the Father's throne is David's throne, where is he? Eh? Where is he? I said that he's on David's throne. If he's on the Father's throne, then he's on David's throne. That's exactly what that is. He'll not deal with that either.

But he referred to Matt. 24, a passage that refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. If you'll go back to the first verse you'll find that Jesus made a suggestion to his disciples, "The time is coming when there will not be left here one stone upon the other. And they said, When shall these things be? what shall be the sign of thy coming and the end of the world?" They thought that when these things came to pass surely the world would end. They just misunderstood. Then Jesus explained to them concerning the "abomination of desolation" standing in the holy place, and concerning the destruction of the temple. This man takes a passage of Scripture that refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and applies it to the Second Coming of Christ.

There may be some verses in this twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew that do apply to the Second Coming, but I understand this (the first thirty-four verses) to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem. And I believe that in verse 34 (anyway it's in the latter part of the chapter) the Bible says, "This GENERATION shall not pass away, till ALL THESE THINGS be accomplished." Has that generation passed away? When the Second Coming of the Lord comes will that generation have passed away? There will be a great many generations that have passed away before the Lord comes again. But THIS took place before that generation passed away.

Then he spoke of "My throne" and the "Father's throne" (Rev. 3:21). He tried to make a big difference between the two. The Bible says in Eph. 5:5 that we ought to realize that no man that is unclean "hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of God and Christ." Do you think that there are two Kingdoms, one that belongs to God and one that belongs to Christ?

"The Kingdom of God and Christ" is just like the throne of God and Christ. It's the throne of God. It belongs to Christ because God has given it unto him.

Then he read Rev. 11:15. The Bible there speaks of the seventh angel sounding and saying, "The kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and his Christ." That's the wrong passage for you, Mr. Baker! This passage says, "They are become the Kingdom of our LORD and his Christ." The "Lord" referred to there is God, just as in Lk. 2:26 Simeon said that he should not die until he "had seen the Lord's Christ." Now, here is where God gets the Kingdom. But the Bible says in 1 Cor. 15:20-26, "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first fruits of them that are asleep . . . Each shall be raised in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then that that are Christ's AT HIS COMING. THEN COMETH THE END, when he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father . . ." And if that's the Second Coming (in Rev. 11:15) of Christ, it's when Jesus GIVES the Kingdom to God! It's not when he get's it like you said. That passage says, "They (worldly kingdoms) are become the Kingdom of our LORD and his Christ,." You'll notice verse 17. It says they praised him and said, "Thou HAST reigned." He had already done the reigning, Mr. Baker. He didn't start it there! He had already done it. It just shows the cumulative power of the Kingdom of God. It shows that the borders of our Lord's Kingdom are enlarged.

Then he referred to Rev. 19:11. And he thought that referred to the Second Coming of Christ. Mr. Baker, if your life depended on it you couldn't prove that refers to the Second Coming of Christ. The Being here referred to is suggested as coming on a white horse. The Bible says that Jesus will come back like he went away (Acts 1:11). Did he leave riding a horse? Did he leave saying, "Hi yo, Silver"? Eh? (Laughter) . The Bible teaches that Jesus will come back like he went away. How did he leave? In the clouds of heaven (Acts 1:9-10). How will he come back? Rev. 1:7, "In the clouds of heaven." Mr. Baker thinks he's going to ride a white horse back. Pshaw, man, what is wrong with you? You couldn't prove that's the Second Coming of Christ to save your life. When we get to Rev. 20 in your proposition I'll deal with it thoroughly, and it will not be your passage either. It doesn't teach what you think it does.

Then he talked about Jesus coming in power and great glory—"When he comes in power and great glory." You know he talked just like Jesus didn't have the power now, didn't he? Isn't that the way it sounded to you, that Jesus doesn't have any now? He said in Matt. 28:18, "ALL authority (all POWER, King James Version) has been given to me in heaven and in earth." If he gets any more than that, Mr. Baker, where will he get it from? He has all in heaven and earth NOW! What kind of power is he going to have then? Is he going to get some from somewhere else? There's not but one other place I know of—heaven and earth and somewhere else! Is he going to get any power from there?

But then he came to Isa. 2:2-4. And he said, "This concerns Judah and Jerusalem." Yes, but it doesn't say, "Judah and Jerusalem only." The fact is, it says it concerns "all nations." The first part of the passage says that it "concerns Judah and Jerusalem." And in verse 2 it says, "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, shall be exalted above the hills, and ALL NATIONS shall flow into it." All nations are involved, Mr. Baker, not just Judah and Jerusalem. Yes, Judah and Jerusalem are involved all right, but not Judah and Jerusalem ONLY. The Bible says, "All nations shall flow into it." When? In the last days.

Then he said the Bible says, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks . . . and shall learn war no more" (Isa. 2:4). Well, Israel was a temporal kingdom. They went about establishing their kingdom by fighting a carnal warfare. What kind of Kingdom does Christ have? He said, "My Kingdom is not of this world, if it were then would my servants FIGHT" (Jno. 18:36). It's not of the world; therefore, they don't fight. What have they done. Beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks! They don't fight anymore. We're not fighting a carnal warfare to spread borders of the Kingdom now. That's the kind they had there. But he's just pointing out that it's not the same kind of kingdom that they had back there. Certainly not. Can I spread the Kingdom by taking a shot gun and rounding folk up and taking them to Church? Why, certainly not!! How do I do it? I do it by peaceful means. I don't try to do like they did back there.

But he said, "When He GETS power. When he gets pow-

er." What did Jesus say he HAD over in Matt. 28:18, Mr. Baker? He said, "All authority (all power) hath been given to me in heaven and in earth." What is that? What do you mean by "When he gets power"? Is he going to get some other power than he has now? Will you tell us? Is he going to get some other power than what he has now?

Then he said of Isa. 9:6-7 that that just must refer to the Second Coming of Christ. If you'll notice, the Bible says, "The government shall be upon his shoulders." I pointed out that the government meant the power to rule just as the key of David upon the shoulder means the power to rule (Isa. 22:21-22), or to have the government committed unto him. But Jesus has that NOW (Rev. 3:7). Now, if Jesus has that power now, he's on the throne now. But the Bible says that when that government is upon his shoulder he upon the throne of David to establish it with justice henceforth forever.

Then he admitted that Jesus is priest now. But he said, "He's priest now and waiting to become King." Priest now and waiting to become King! You know Paul didn't know that! He was accused of preaching another King, one Jesus (Acts 17:7). Yes, he preached Him as priest. But he also taught that he is King. Mr. Baker doesn't believe Paul on that. Not only that, the Bible says in Col. 1:13 that we're "delivered out of the power of darkness and translated into the Kingdom of the Son of his love." We have a Kingdom without a King according to Mr. Baker. We have a KINGDOM without a KING! Mr. Baker, what's wrong with you? Paul said we "received" the Kingdom. John said, "I'm in it." (Rev. 1:9). Paul said we are "translated INTO the Kingdom." We have the Kingdom, and you say we have a kingdom without a king. That'd be like having a man without a country, or more, a country without a man!

But he referred to Isa. 11. Don't you realize that the branch there referred to that was to come up, and the time spoken of there Paul says is FULFILLED (Rom. 15:12)? Did you not notice that? Have you ever read the fifteenth chapter of Romans? Right there is this "ensign" that was going to rise up and rule over the nations according to Isa. 11:10-11. Paul says that this was fulfilled in his dispensation, at the time Paul was speaking (Rom. 15:12). That man says it won't be fulfilled until the Second Coming. He doesn't believe Paul. He doesn't even accept Paul's written ministry.

Then he said, "He shall slay the wicked." And, "Did he do that on Pentecost?" Yes, he did it in a sense. The Bible says in Col. 3:3, "We are DEAD, and our lives are hid with Christ in God." Paul said, "I am crucified" (Gal. 2:20). Certainly, God "kills" the wicked. Man needs to be "killed" in the sense spoken of here if he's wicked. We need to have ourselves crucified with Christ; we need to die with Christ, and then be raised with him (Cf. Isa. 11:4).

He referred to Joel 3:9 about the nations going to gather together to war. And he says that is to take place before the day of the Lord come. Well, that was to take place before Paul's gospel could be preached then (Joel 2:32). When he proves that Paul's gospel is preached now, he'll prove that this thing has already come to pass according to your own logic.

Then he referred to Zech. 14:2 and said there we have something about the Lord coming down on the Mount of Olives. At what time, Mr. Baker? At what time? He said and points out in verse 2 that it was at the destruction of Jerusalem. Many times the Lord is spoken of as coming in the person of those who go out and fight his battles for him. And he brought these people against Jerusalem because they had sinned, even as he spoke of Assyria as being his battle ax (Isa. 10). This is very true here that he was there in having the nation to punish Jerusalem for their sins in A. D. 70. That doesn't refer to the Second Coming of Christ.

But he quoted a passage there (verse 9), "At that time there shall be one Lord, and his name one." Well Paul said that's true now (1 Cor. 8:5-6). Baker says it won't be true until the Second Coming. You can take Paul or this man.

Then he said, "We have the Lord's Supper till he comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). The Lord's Supper is in his Kingdom till he comes, Mr. Baker. The Bible says, "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table IN my Kingdom . . ." (Lk. 22:29). The Lord's Supper is in the Kingdom. He said we must eat of it "till the Lord comes."

He then referred to Rom. 11:26, "So all Israel shall be saved, When the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, when God shall remember their iniquities no more." You'll remember that he had pointed out that the Gentiles were grafted in by faith (verse 23). And in verse 26 he says, "SO all Israel shall be saved." How? So is an adverb meaning "in the same

way." How? By faith. When Israel has enough faith to do what God requires they shall be saved. It doesn't say anything about this being at the Second Coming of Christ. Paul teaches that it's NOW. They have the privilege right now. What do they get? They get the same salvation that the Gentiles get, Mr. Baker. What's that? They get the same salvation the Gentiles get. That's remission of sins and not an earthly kingdom. There isn't an earthly kingdom mentioned in this passage as far as the Second Coming of the Lord is concerned. Thus "So all Israel shall be saved" means "They shall be saved in this way"—when they do what God requires.

Then he referred to Heb. 8:11. And that very passage points out that even now God forgives our iniquities and remembers our sins no more. And that's the very time that Paul referred to in Rom. 11.

But he referred to Lk. 21:23, "Woe unto them that give suck . . ." Why yes. And if you had read some of the other passages, those out in the country were told not to go into the city when they "saw Jerusalem compassed about with armies" (Lk. 21:20-21). That's also pointed out in Lk. 19:41-44. Did you not know that that referred to the destruction of Jerusalem? Would you take a passage that refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and apply that to the Second Coming of the Son of God? What's wrong with you?

Then he came back again to the idea that these signs must be performed before the great day of the Lord come. And it still says it was before "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

He referred to 1 Thess. 4:16, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a voice of the archangel, with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we that are alive shall together with them meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we EVER be with the Lord." He thinks we're going to stay on the earth with him, or he thinks He will come and get us and take us back and stay seven years and then come back. That passage says "And so (in the air) shall we EVER be with him."

I wish now to go back and review in the time that I have left. What has Mr. Baker said about Mk. 9:1? The Kingdom was to come with power. The power was to come with the Spirit (Acts 1:8). The Spirit came on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). Therefore the Kingdom came on Pentecost. We also under-

stand that the law of the Lord began in Jerusalem upon that day of Pentecost (Isa. 2:4), and that is the very time that Isaiah said the House of God would be established (2:2). And Jesus, according to Peter, is upon the throne of David. He enjoys the promise that God made back there by the Spirit (Acts 2:31-36). He has the key of David; and, therefore, the throne of David. He is ruling there.

According to Psa. 110:1-4 Jesus is ruling while at the right hand of God. But he's at the right hand of God (Acts 2:33). He is therefore ruling now. He's to rule while he's priest. He's priest now (Heb. 8:1); and therefore he's ruling now. Christ is to be priest on his throne. He's priest now; therefore on his throne now. What has he said about it?

And then, finally, Jesus came with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days and there he received the Kingdom. Mr. Baker thinks that it's when he comes FROM the Ancient of Days that he gets the Kingdom. And Dan. 7 says that it was when he came TO the Ancient of Days, even to God. That's when he received the Kingdom, when he goes TO God, not when he comes FROM him. Mr. Baker, will you tell us: When Jesus comes again will he come from God or to God? Will you tell us that? If he comes from God then Dan. 7:13-14 cannot be fulfilled at the Second Coming of Christ. It must have been fulfilled when he ascended in the clouds of heaven. (Time called). I thank you very kindly, ladies and gentlemen.

### BAKER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

You'll notice the proposition says Brother Rogers affirms and B. A. Baker denies. But I'm not supposed to deny! This is a debate. When he starts wrong he's wrong all the way along. That's why I had to point to the text that says "when" and "then."

I want to call your attention to the Gospel of Matthew again, chapter 25. You'll notice on the blackboard that he says the judgment comes after the Second Coming, or at the Second Coming. He says now the Lord Jesus Christ and God's people are reigning. Now look at Matt. 25 will you. Now notice what He says, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory . . ." (Matt. 25:31). Now, who said that? Christ. When is he going to sit on the throne of his glory? "When the Lord comes!"

Then notice verse 32. When he comes, "Then shall be gathered before him all nations . . ." The Lord has said that's the Second Coming. Now, what's going to happen when he gathers all nations? Notice verse 34, "Then (at the time he comes) shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom . . ." Now, when are they going to inherit the Kingdom? Before he comes, or after he comes? What does that text say to you? "When he comes then shall be gathered before him all the nations, THEN shall he say to the sheep, Come, inherit the Kingdom." Now, Brother, that's too plain. And if he wants to deny what Jesus Christ teaches, in this particular text, then that's up to Brother Rogers.

Then I'd like to call your attention to Rev. 19. He said that's not my Lord, not my Savior. And he ridiculed my Lord for coming on a white horse, my Lord. Let me read it to you, will you. You listen to it. You make up your mind whether this is your Savior or not. "I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God" (Rev. 19:11-13). In the Gospel of John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God . . . and the Word was God" (Jno. 1:1-4). That's my Savior, my Lord, my Redeemer that he was ridiculing.

Then notice again. He said, "Is the Lord coming on a pony?" Verse 11, "I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse . . ." The apostle John saw that and revealed it. Brethren, handle the Word of God reverently. It's inspired; it's God-breathed. And when my Father in heaven speaks of his Son in this way I urge you to put your faith in what my heavenly Father says. "His name is called The Word of God." And that's my Savior according to Jno. 1:1-4.

Then let me call your attention again to a certain passage. It is found in Matt. 8. Again I call your attention to the fact that I believe that Christ will have all the sure mercies of David to give you and that the key of David will be Christ's. I believe every thing that Brothers Rogers said about my Lord. I believe that he's now at the right hand of



God now as a priest after the order of Melchizedek and is the Head of the Church the Body. Now notice that the glory my Savior now has is the glory of the Head of the Church the Body. When he comes he the power that Paul said. "Which in His own time shall show who is the only Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:16). That's my Savior and my Lord.

In Matt. 8 I'd like to call your attention to another statement about our precious Lord. When I talk about my Savior I want you to know that I believe in his Word, not for debate's sake, but you asked me what the truth is in God's Word. In Matt. 8 we have these words, "And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of heaven" (verse 11). My Brother says the Kingdom of the heavens is the Church of God. Then Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall sit in the Kingdom of God and the sons of the Kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness and there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Let me call your attention to Matt. 13 and let me show you again that what Jesus Christ said is true. I believe every passage that our Brother Rogers has quoted tonight, but in its rightful place. In Matt. 13 our precious Lord speaks of the "end of the age." And I'd like to have you notice in Matt. 13 beginning with verse 36: "Then Jesus sent the multitude away and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is (when? when does the harvest come? In your Bible it says)—the harvest is the end of the world" (Matt. 13:36-39). Last night I said that Jesus Christ in the Great Commission promised to be with them always "even to the end of the age." He said I had no right to use that term. I have the Revised Version with me. I have a Greek Testament with me. I have sixteen different translations that bear out this translation. And all that I ask is that Brother Rogers to believe what I say is true in these translations. Notice in my text again. When does the harvest come? At the end of this world or at the end of this age. "The Son of man shall send

forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his Kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity" (verse 41).

In the text that I read in the Book of Isaiah it says, "Nations shall learn war no more" (Isa. 2:2-5), not the "Body of Christ." I didn't say that the Church would learn war no more. It says, "NATIONS shall learn war no more!" I point out again that in the end of the age all glory that belongs to Him (he will receive).

Then I'd like to call your attention again to another statement in Heb. 8. Again I quote to you this passage that deals with the New Covenant. It does not say in this text that God makes a New Covenant with the Body of Christ or with Israel as a nation apart from Judah. He includes "Israel and Judah" in the text. Let me call your attention to it again. Listen to it. "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord." What is he going to do with Israel? "I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts. I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. They shall shall not teach (listen now)—they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord. For they shall all know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant he hath made the first old. And that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (Heb. 8:10-13). The blood of that New Covenant has been shed. Christ is the mediator of that New Covenant.

And I'd like to call your attention again for the last time tonight to Luke 22:28-30. I said in the beginning that the apostle Paul is the apostle to the Gentiles, and that he gave to the Gentiles the Lord's Supper. Every time that we break bread we say that we are members one of another, that we are members of the one Body. The apostle Paul gave that Lord's Supper to the nations. Then you'll notice in 1 Cor. 11 the apostle Paul said, "Till He comes." "Ye who have continued with me in the regeneration . . ." (Matt. 19:28) "I appoint unto you a Kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes in Israel" (Lk. 22:29-30).

I pointed out that Christ has a plan for the earth and a

plan for the heavenlies and that we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ. And our citizenship is in heaven whence we wait for our Savior, that is the Lord of hope. And in this administration of the grace of God the Lord's glory is centered in the Church which is his Body. And when the Lord ascended on high and sat down at the right hand of God he became—I'm giving him the Word—he became our Intercessor. He prays for us at the right hand of God. He makes intercession for the saints in their suffering. Our Savior has glory, but there is yet more glory to come to our wonderful Christ, the lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. And I love him tonight. I love him with all of my heart. And I'm going to see my precious Lord some day.

Let me remind you of the text in Matt. 8:13, "Many shall come from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God." Where are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at this present time? Where are they? Are they in their resurrection bodies? Are they waiting for the resurrection? And when will they sit down and eat? And when will Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob be in the Kingdom of God? For they died long years ago. And Brother Rogers tells us that the Kingdom of God is the Body of Christ, that they are one and the same thing.

I pointed out in Matt. 25 that Jesus Christ says that his Kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world.

Let me read the eleventh chapter of the Book of Hebrews to you, will you? Take your Bibles and find where God began to prepare that Kingdom. Listen to this eleventh chapter and verse 4, "And Able offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Where will Cain be? or rather Able be? I know where Cain will be. He was lost. No man believes more than I do in the lake of fire, the second death. No man believes that a man is lost apart from Christ more than I do. But I believe that there are other saints in the Bible besides the members of the Body of Christ, and that these saints here mentioned in Heb. 11 were every one of them saved. They have hope; they have a blessing.

But let me read this in closing. "By faith Able offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his

gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should AFTER receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise . . ." (Heb. 11:4-9).

Now, I said in Matt. 8 that Jesus Christ said that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall be in the Kingdom. "And many will come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom." They're not in the Church, the Body of Christ. They're saints of God. They're in the place of great blessings. Abraham is going to be resurrected.

But notice again in verse 8. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should AFTER receive for an inheritance, went out and obeyed. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs of him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And that city has twelve (foundations). And the twelve apostles are the twelve foundations of the new Jerusalem. Is it not wonderful that Abraham saw the twelve apostles as the twelve foundation stones in the new Jerusalem that shall stand forever?

Then notice again, if you will, in verse 11. "Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised. Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable. These all died in faith NOT HAVING RECEIVED THE PROMISES, (notice what it says) but

having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But NOW they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God. for he hath prepared for them a city. By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the PROMISES offered up his only begotten son ... By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come! (Heb. 11:11-20).

Then notice, if you will, verse 26, this great man Moses. These men were saved. They were children of God. They're in the same chapter. They had promises. They died without receiving the promises. When will they receive them? I ask it reverently. Have they been raised from the dead. It was said by Brother Rogers tonight that David has not ascended. When will he ascend? In Acts 2, "David has not ascended." When will David be raised from the dead? He was a saint. When will David ascend? He has not ascended. Are you going to leave David in Sheol or Hades? Are you going to leave him where he is? His body has seen corruption. Why will there be a resurrection? I say that every promise that God made is yea and amen in the Lord Jesus Christ. My God can't lie. And every promise that God made in the Old Testament God will carry out, he will carry through.

Then I said that Jesus Christ said when he sits on the throne of his glory before him shall be gathered all nations. I said that reverently. And when I said that those on the right hand shall inherit the Kingdom it was after the judgment. And Brother Rogers has admitted tonight that the judgment can't come until the Second Coming of the Lord. I ask you again tonight, brethren, believe the Bible, not Baker. I've never asked you to believe a single word that I've said. I ask you to believe what God says in his Word. You're not going to be judged by what Baker says, or Brothers Rogers says. You're going to be judged by what God says in his precious Word.

Then let me close with you with these mighty heroes of faith that died long ago. Let me begin with verse 32. "And what more shall I say? for the time would fail me to tell of

Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, (David is mentioned as a great hero of faith) and Samuel, and of the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourging, yet, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. (Notice verse 39) And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received NOT the promise" (Heb. 11:32-39). When will they receive the promise? When will they enter into the promise? When will they enter into all their blessings, all these great saints of God?

Then I close with verse 40. "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The Hebrew saints in the Book of Hebrews are joined with these great heroes of faith.

Then he says in that wonderful, wonderful twelfth chapter that was referred to by Brother Rogers tonight in verse 22, "But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Then notice verse 28. "Wherefore we (not they have received) —we receiving a Kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire" (Heb. 12:22-29).

I rest my argument, not with Baker, but with the Scriptures.

September 5, 1953

Proposition IV: The Scriptures teach that the Kingdom of Christ will be established (or set up) after the Second Coming of Christ, and that He will reign for one thousand years on David's throne in Jerusalem.

B. A. Baker, AFFIRMS

Bill L. Rogers, DENIES

#### BAKER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Thank you. And I'm happy again tonight to bring you the final messages of our debate. We know that God has been with us in our study of the Word of God together. And as we come to the close we urge you again not to follow any man, not even your present speaker, but to examine the Scripture and find out whether these things are so.

In Rev. 20 we do have the word "thousand years" spoken by the Holy Spirit. You'll remember that Jesus Christ said, "There be some standing here that shall not be tasting of death until they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom" (Matt. 16:28). Peter, James, and John were present when the Lord Jesus Christ spoke those words. In Jno. 21 the Lord Jesus Christ told Peter that he was going to die and how he was going to glorify God when he was old. And then Peter said, "What about John? What about this man?" The Lord said, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Go thou, and preach the gospel." You'll notice that Jesus Christ said about John, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Peter was going to die. When he was old he was going to die. And Peter has died. And the apostle John has died. But in the Book of Revelation the apostle John saw heaven opened. Rev. 19:11, "I saw heaven opened." Now, the apostle John wrote the Book of Revelation. Everything that we know about the future concerning Israel and the nations concerning prophecy in the Greek Scripture is found in this great Book of Revelation.

The apostle John knew God's program. We called your attention in our first message to the fact that the apostle Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles and that he was separated for a special work for he nations. And Peter, James, and John were God's disciples (along with the others) for His purpose for the earth. And to Peter, James, and John were committed

these marvelous revelations that have to do with God's purpose for the earth and God's purpose for the nation of Israel.

Now in Rev. 20 we read in verse 1, "And I saw an angel come down from heaven . . ." John saw it now in vision. ". . . having the key of the bottomless pit . . ." Now, the bottomless pit is a place where creatures are going to come out from in the day of judgment. The bottomless pit is called the abyss in the Greek. And the abyss is not heaven. The abyss is a place the opposite of heaven. And notice that this angel having a key to the bottomless pit or the abyss and a great chain in his hand "he laid hold on the dragon . . ." You'll notice we have the dragon and his many angels and men. "He laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." You'll notice that Satan is bound by an angel that is come down from heaven. And this angel is going to bind Satan for one thousand years. Then you'll notice in verse 3 where Satan is going to be bound. "And cast him into the bottomless pit (into the abyss)." \_ Now, we know that at the present time the apostle Paul says, "If our gospel be hid, it be hid to those that are lost, whom the God of this age hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not" (2 Cor. 4:4). Satan is called the god of this age. Then in Ephesians we have where Satan is called "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. 2:2). He's the prince of the power of the air and the god of this age. Those are both passages of Scripture that you'll find in your Bible. But you'll notice in verse 3 that Satan is going to be in the bottomless pit or in the abyss. And he's going to be shut up and "set a seal upon him that he should deceive the nations (not Christians, not the believers, but that he should deceive the nations) no more."

We know that Satan's business is to deceive the nations. And when Satan is bound then the nations shall no more be deceived "till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he (Satan) must be loosed for a little season." Now, remember that this is the apostle John speaking. He has received it from the Lord. He was in Spirit on the Lord's day. He was on the isle of Patmos when the Lord showed him this.

Then in verse 4 we read, "And I saw thrones." These are the thrones that we called your attention to when we said that the twelve apostles were going to sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. John is going to occupy



one of those thrones. And John says, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years—they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" (Rev. 20:4).

Then I'd like to call your attention to the fifth chapter of Revelation and verse 10. Notice these wonderful words: "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nations; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth." I'd like to call your attention again to Rev. 20:5, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

We called your attention to the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are going to be in the Kingdom. And many are going to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom. And Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not in the Church which is Christ's Body. But they are saints of God. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob have not been resurrected. We know that David has not been resurrected (Acts 2:34). David has not ascended. We know then that the resurrection of the saints that have died has not yet taken place.

Then notice in verse 6, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Now, I have proven from the fifth chapter that the reign will be on the earth. And I've proven that Satan is going to be bound for a thousand years, and that they're going to reign with Christ for a thousand years. And this reign is in harmony with what Jesus Christ said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of the heavens, and whatsoever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16:18-19). The Lord gave to Peter the keys of the Kingdom of the heaven. We've proved that

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are going to be in the Kingdom. Therefore the Kingdom and the Church are not the same. We've proven that the Church, the Body of Christ, is a revelation committed to the apostle Paul in this administration of the grace of God.

Then I'd like to call your attention to what Brother Rogers said last night. He said that the judgment can't begin until the end of the world. And I said last night that Jesus Christ will reign on the throne of his glory when he comes in power and great glory. I said that Jesus Christ is now seated at the right hand of God, that he is priest after the order of Melchizedek, chief priest—high priest in the heavens making intercession. I said that Jesus Christ is priest in the Book of Hebrews at the right hand of God. And in the Book of Ephesians he is "head over all things to the Church, which is his Body." And since he is Head over all things to the Church which is his Body we are waiting for the day when we shall be conformed to the image of God's Son.

In 2 Timothy 4 the apostle Paul says that the Lord shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his Kingdom. Not now, but at his appearing and his Kingdom. And in that same chapter Paul says, "He shall preserve me unto his heavenly Kingdom" (verse 18). He's going to judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his Kingdom. We are looking for the blessed hope of the appearing in glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ (Tit. 2:13). And when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory (Col. 3:4). So we know that Christ is going to have glory, not only in the heavens, but in the earth.

Brother Rogers said that in the Book of Matthew, "All power is given unto me . . ." And that power is "in the heavens and on the earth" (Matt. 28:18). And our Lord must have all power, not only in the heavens, but on the earth. And he must reign until every enemy is under his feet. And when the devil is in the lake of fire, and when all the ungodly are in the lake of fire suffering the torments of the lake of fire they're under his feet. And when Jesus Christ delivers up the Kingdom to the Father the last enemy shall be destroyed. For the last enemy to be destroyed is death. And Jesus Christ is going to destroy death so that there will be no death in the new creation. We know that Christ's Kingdom is not only heavenly, but it is earthly. It has to do with the new heavens and the new earth as well as heaven.

The Lord Jesus Christ is going to reign. And Paul says, "If we suffer with him, we shall reign with him." If we suffer, we SHALL reign. We're not reigning now. We're suffering now. And if we suffer with him, we SHALL reign with him.

Then I'd like to call your attention to the Gospel According to Matthew.

But before that let me call your attention to Zech. 14 where we called your attention to the Lord's two feet "in that day standing on the Mount of Olives." Brother Rogers said last night that this was at the destruction of Jerusalem. But in verse 11 it says, "Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." So instead of Jerusalem being destroyed when the Lord comes in Zech 14 Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited. And there's a lot of difference between being destroyed and being safely inhabited. So when the Lord comes the second time he's coming to restore, not to destroy, when he comes to the children of Israel and especially in Jerusalem.

Then he said in Zech. 14:9, "And the Lord shall be King throughout all the earth in that day." The Lord shall be King throughout all the earth in that day.

Now, I'd like to have you turn with me to the teachings of my Lord and show you he planned that the earth should come under his control, and that the earth is going to be the place of inheritance of the children of Israel. The twelve tribes are going to be restored. The twelve apostles are going to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Now, in Matt. 5 notice the teachings of our Lord. He says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Jesus Christ said, "They shall inherit the earth." Then when the Lord taught his disciples to pray, he taught them to pray in this way: "Our Father who art in heaven . . . Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done (where? in the heavens? where?) in earth." So then Christ's Kingdom will not only cover the heavens but the earth as well. That's the Lord's prayer: "Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done." So our Lord's will has to be done. "Blessed are the meek, they shall inherit the earth." So in the prayer of our Lord he has taught them to pray for a Kingdom.

Then I'd like to call your attention to Matt. 5:34-46, "But

I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: (Where is God's throne? Heaven.) nor by the earth; for it is his footstool." The earth is his footstool. The Lord Jesus Christ is at the right hand of God. He must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet. And when the Lord gets all the wicked in the lake of fire, suffering their torment because of their sins because there is no right, and they're going to judge by the Lord, then we are told that the Lord Jesus Christ is going to bring in new heavens and new earth. And these in the lake of fire will never be in the Kingdom of God. The Lord is going to gather out of his Kingdom all them that offend.

Notice if you will Matt. 5:35, "Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King." Jerusalem is the city of the great King. These are the words of our Lord, the words of the Son of God that we have given you in this our last proposition.

First we declared that in this present administration of grace God is saving Jews and Gentiles, making them members of the one Body, and they are blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies. The apostle Paul said, "Set not your affections on things on the earth." The Lord said, "Blessed are the meek, they shall inherit the earth." The apostle Paul says our citizenship belongs to the heavenly, out of which we look for a Savior, the Lord. Paul says, "He shall preserve us unto the heavenly Kingdom." So the heavenly Kingdom has to do with the Body of Christ, those that are saved by the grace of God, blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ.

Then we want you to notice that in Rev. 20 when these saints are reigning on earth with the Lord that Satan is in the abyss. I'm glad that he's going to be there for a thousand years. And then he's going to be cast into the lake of fire. The Lord must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet.

And I'd like to have you turn to Hebrews just for a moment if you will. Heb. 1, and again we have the statement of our Lord. He is above all. We are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ if so be we suffer with him. If we suffer with him, we shall reign with him. I want you to notice in Heb. 1 here Jesus sat down at the right hand of God, the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. The Lord Jesus Christ

leaves that place. The Lord Jesus Christ will not put all of his enemies under his feet. Verse 8, "Thy throne, O God . . ." Here the Father calls the Son God. This is Deity. "Thy throne, O the God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy Kingdom." That's why we as members of the Body of Christ are already seated with Christ in the heavenlies. We've been transported out of the kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of the Son of God's love. We are already seated with Christ in the heavenlies. But our reign is future. "If we suffer with him, we SHALL reign with him."

Then Heb. 2:5-6, "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come . . ." The word for world here is "inhabited earth." And notice that he says in verse 5 that the angels hath not the power in the world (inhabited earth) to come. "Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the inhabited earth to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him." There is more to come—more glory for the Lord, more glory for Jesus Christ when he comes in power and great glory.

Then I want you to notice 1 Cor. 15 where we have resurrection in view. Remember: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not in the Kingdom now. We are in the Body of Christ. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob have not been resurrected yet. The Lord said they will be resurrected and they're going to be in the Kingdom, and they're going to eat and drink in that Kingdom. What did Paul say? "The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17). Why did Jesus Christ say to his disciples, "In the Kingdom I will eat with you and drink with you—in my Father's Kingdom"? But in this administration of the grace of God the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

The apostle Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:23, "Every man in his

own order . . ." Every man in his own rank, not everyone at one time—every man in his own rank. "Every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end (the consummation), when he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all authority and power." Satan is the god of this age. He's not in the abyss. He's not in the lake of fire. Satan opposes God's people. He's our enemy. Satan is not bound. Satan is working every where in the world today. He's deceiving the nations. But when Jesus comes that's through. With his Kingdom God's will is done in earth and in heaven. Every enemy of the Lord will have been dealt with, and put under his feet. Even Satan himself is in the lake of fire, the second death, and Jesus Christ is going to do it by the grace and power of God.

In 1 Cor. 15 Christ delivers up the Kingdom to God. He's going to deliver up that Kingdom WHEN Satan has lost his power, when Satan is where he's going to be, not in the abyss, but in the lake of fire! The lake of fire is not the abyss. When the devil goes in the lake of fire, he won't come out. When he gets in the abyss he'll be there a thousand years. Then he'll be set loose a little season. When the devil gets in the lake of fire he'll be tormented day and night for ever and ever! But when the devil gets in the abyss he's going to be let loose for a little season. Now, notice the difference between heaven, and the abyss, and the lake of fire.

When I deal with Christ's Kingdom I see all of the Lord's enemies put under his feet. And when I see the enemies of the Lord under his feet then our Lord delivers up the Kingdom to God. When that Kingdom is given up, then the members of the Body of Christ will be in that Kingdom. We're in the Body of Christ now. If we suffer with him, we shall reign with him. The glory of the Lord is wonderful in the future. He has all authority in heaven, and someday in earth. That's what he says. "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth." And when the Lord puts the devil in the lake of fire then his authority over Satan will be exercised and Satan will have lost his power and will no longer (have power over) any man on the earth redeemed by God.

## ROGERS' FIRST NEGATIVE

My worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm happy that we're able to be here again to investigate the proposition that has been affirmed for the first thirty minutes in your hearing. That proposition was not defined even though the rules of debate say that they must be. However I think that it is fairly clear, and I think that you will get the idea that Mr. Baker is affirming. "The Kingdom of Christ will be established." It is not established now; no one is in that Kingdom. But it is altogether future. The Kingdom of Christ will be established at his Second Coming. This my friend is affirming. And when that Kingdom is established Jesus will reign in Jerusalem, "the city of the great King" as he quoted a moment ago, for one thousand years.

I'm not going to do my opponents argument's like he does mine. He gives mine the "silent treatment" and doesn't deal with them at all. I intend to take up every argument that my opponent has advanced and show you that he has perverted the Scripture, that he has corrupted the passages and taken them out of their setting and that they do not mean what my worthy opponent has tried to make them mean.

You know last evening he said that he believed the passages that I read in their right place. Mr. Baker's work was to show that I had taken them out of their right place, if indeed I had. Instead of doing that, he just got up and contradicted the things that I said went on about his business of affirming the proposition for tonight instead of denying and instead of working in the negative. I'm not going to do that. But first I'll introduce a negative argument, then I'll answer the affirmative speech that he made last night (the last affirmative speech that he made last night) and the first affirmative speech that he has made tonight.

But I call your attention to the fact that in Matt. 1:12 and Lk. 3:27 the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is of the seed of Coniah or Jechoniah; of Salathiel or Shealtiel; and Zerubabel. And we find in the Old Testament in Jer. 22:29-30 that because Coniah or Jechoniah had sinned and violated the law of God that God said he was a "despised and broken vessel." And he said, "Write ye this man childless . . ." This didn't mean that he wasn't going to have any physical children because he did. I've named them here, Salathiel and Zerub-

babel. But the Bible says this man "shall not prosper in his days; for no more shall a man of his seed prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling in Judah."

Now, Jesus is of the seed of Coniah. But the prophet said, "No more shall a man of Coniah's seed prosper, sitting upon the throne of David and ruling in Judah." The Bible does not say that a man of Coniah's seed could not sit upon David's throne. It doesn't say that a man of Coniah's seed could not sit on David's throne and prosper. But it does say that a man of Coniah's seed cannot sit upon David's throne and prosper, ruling in Judah. Now, where is Jerusalem, Mr. Baker? It's in Judah, isn't it? Since Jesus is of the seed of Coniah, Jeremiah says that he cannot—he CANNOT—sit upon the throne of David and prosper, ruling in Judah! Mr. Baker comes along and says, "Jeremiah just doesn't know what he's talking about! He hadn't heard 'Dr.' Baker from Grand Rapids, Michigan, so he just didn't know that. I'm going to teach Jeremiah a lesson now that the seed of Coniah can prosper sitting upon the throne of David and reigning in Judah." It's just Mr. Baker or the Word of God.

Mr. Baker is not going to deal with that. Ladies and Gentlemen, I pointed out to you the first night that this man is not debating. He didn't come down here to debate. He hasn't taken up the arguments. He hasn't examined the points that have been brought forward. He'll not deal with this argument. And I'll tell you the difference between a gospel preacher and a false teacher and you'll see it in just a moment: A man that's teaching the truth has no fear whatsoever of taking up all the arguments that are advanced and examining them with fairness and candor to see whether or not they teach what has been affirmed. I'm going to do that. But this man doesn't. And I think that you can begin to see just exactly why he doesn't.

But now to the speech that he made last night in the affirmative when he should have been in the negative. He said that in Matt. 25:31 the Bible says, "When Jesus comes in power and great glory THEN he's going to sit upon the throne of his glory." And he says that Rogers does not believe that. He says, "Rogers doesn't believe it." Yes, Rogers believes that. Rogers believes that passage just as deeply and just as fervently as any man living today! But what does Mr. Baker say? He didn't say what the Bible says. He said,



"When he comes then will he BEGIN to sit." Did you find it, Mr. Baker? Come on, now, shake or nod! You said last night that He will BEGIN to sit at that time. Does this passage (Matt. 25:31) say, "Then he will BEGIN to sit"? Does it? Can you find it in the Book of God that at the Second Coming then he will BEGIN to sit? Can you? Do you know where it is? You've affirmed it tonight and you affirmed it last night; yet you haven't read a passage that says it. This passage doesn't say, "Then will he begin to sit." I believe that when he comes then he will sit. But it doesn't say he will begin to sit. And I've already proven from Zech. 6:13-14 that he is already sitting. The Bible says that he will be a priest upon his throne, and he will sit and rule upon his throne. He's priest now, and, therefore he's sitting on his throne now. What has he said about it? He's been as silent as the tomb.

Let us notice something else. He said after this (Second Coming) all nations will be gathered before him, and there will be the judgment and then these will receive the Kingdom. And he suggested that here is the Kingdom after the Second Coming. Well, Mr. Baker, according to your theory you have (1) the Second Coming of the Lord. Then after that (2) you have the thousand years' reign. Then after that (3) you have the judgment. But in your passage that you have already given, the Bible gives us (1) the Second Coming of Christ. Then we have (2) the JUDGMENT—not the thousand years. Man, what's wrong with you. Don't you realize this passage contradicts your own contention? Let us realize that the Kingdom here referred to is the heavenly Kingdom. This is heaven, Mr. Baker. In 2 Tim. 4:18 Paul said, "He will preserve me unto his heavenly Kingdom." (I'm going to deal with something else about that. He said that I said the Kingdom always meant the Church. I didn't say that.) But in 2 Pet. 1:11 the Bible says that if we add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and love we'll have an abundant entrance "into the everlasting Kingdom of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." That's heaven, Mr. Baker. That's not a Premillennial reign on earth. Don't you see that? And when it (Second Coming) comes to pass there'll be a judgment instead of a thousand years like you've been affirming. That's speaking of heaven, a heavenly country.

But you can see that his argument tonight has contradicted what he said last night. Tonight he said there will be the Second Coming, then the judgment, then the thousand years' reign. But last night he said in Rev. 19 we have the Second Coming, then the thousand years, and in Rev. 20:14-15 we have the judgment. Mr. Baker was wrong last night or tonight one. He has contradicted himself. A Premillennialist can't talk fifteen minutes without contradicting both himself and the Bible. And he has done that here himself tonight.

Then let us notice some other things. He says that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be in the Kingdom, but that they are not in the Church. I did not say that the Kingdom, every time you find it, refers to the Church. I said the Kingdom of my proposition. Did I not say in defining my proposition, "This Kingdom is the Church"? I also pointed out that the Lord's Supper is in the Kingdom. And he admits it. But he says it's in the Church. Didn't you say that it's in the Church? Eh? Didn't you admit that it's in the Church? But the Son of God says that it's in the Kingdom. If the Lord's Supper is in the Kingdom, and the Lord's Supper is in the Church, then the Kingdom is the Church; as it's used in my proposition last night. I did not say that every time it's found it refers to the Church. No man that knows anything about the Bible would affirm that. And I think that Mr. Baker knows I didn't affirm that. He just had him a dodge there.

Then he said that at that time (Second Coming) there would be thrones. He's not noticing the punctuation of Matt. 19:28. Jesus said, "Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Now, when is that going to be? In the regeneration—in the period that men are regenerated. Are men regenerated today, Mr. Baker? Jesus said that they would be there at the time of the regeneration. Are they regenerated today? Tit. 3:5 says that men are. Therefore they're on the thrones today, and that's not future as Mr. Baker would have us believe.

Then let us notice also Col. 1:13. There the Bible says, "Who delivered us out of the power of darkness and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love." What did you say about that, Mr. Baker? Can you be in something that

doesn't exist? Can you? Paul said that they were in the Kingdom in his day. I just wonder if they were or were not!! Who is right, Mr. Baker or the apostle Paul? Paul said the Kingdom was in existence then! Mr. Baker says it won't be until the Second Coming. Who is right, Paul or Baker? And in Rev. 1:9 John said, "I am in the Kingdom." Was John in the Kingdom or out of it? John said that he was in it. Mr. Baker says he's not in it and will not be until the Second Coming.

In Heb. 12:28 he tried to make the "receiving of the Kingdom" refer to the Old Testament saints (at the resurrection). But if you'll notice the King James Version it says, "Wherefore WE receiving a Kingdom . . ." And that's present tense. That's not future tense, that's present tense. "Wherefore WE receiving a Kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace whereby we may offer service to God with reverence and godly fear." So Paul says, "We are receiving it." Yes indeed! Mr. Baker says it's not so.

Then he said that Rogers said Rev. 19 did not refer to the Lord. And I thought Mr. Baker was going to shed some crocodile tears when he got to that. Rogers had ridiculed the Lord for riding a horse! Now, Rogers didn't say that is not the Lord, Mr. Baker. I said, "That's not the Second Coming of the Lord!"

Mr. Baker speaks from his seat: "We've got the tape recording. Do you want to hear it?"

Mr. Rogers continues: I know exactly what I said, and I told you last night (privately). And we'll play it after the speeches are over tonight. I said, "it is not the SECOND COMING of Christ." Mr. Baker is just in hot water. That's all that's wrong with him. I said that that's not the SECOND COMING of Christ. And I reduced his argument to an absurdity by pointing out that Jesus went with the clouds of heaven and he's coming back just like he went away. And I asked you, "Did he ride a white horse when he went away?" I said, "It's not the Second Coming." And it's on the TAPE and I have no fear whatsoever of having it played back.

Now we come to another point. He says, "Baker believes every passage that Rogers read." No. I deny that. Mr. Baker doesn't believe every passage that Rogers read! You'll remember that he said last night, "I believe that Jesus WILL HAVE ..." I wrote it down and it's upon the tape, Mr.

Baker. "I believe that Jesus WILL HAVE the key of David." But in Rev. 3:7 the Bible says, "He HATH the key of David." Do you know the difference will have and hath, Mr. Baker? Hath is present tense. "He hath the key of David." You say he doesn't have it, but he will have it in the future. Do you believe Rev. 3:7? He hasn't referred to, and he'll not have referred to it when this debate is over. Mr. Baker does not believe Rev. 3:7. John says he has the key of David now. He has it. Mr. Baker says, "I believe he WILL HAVE it." Now, can't you see the difference between "will have" and having it? If you can, you can see the difference between the Word of God and Mr. Bert Baker from Grand Rapids, Michigan.

But he also said that he believed that Jesus will receive the "sure mercies of David." Paul says in Acts 13:34 that he received the sure mercies of David in the resurrection. You don't believe that one either. No, Mr. Baker doesn't believe these things.

But he said that Christ isn't King now. Why he quoted the very passage that says that he is. In 1 Tim. 6:14-15 the Bible says, "Which in its own times he shall show (Who is this Person?), who IS the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." Why, Paul says he IS. Can't you see that Mr. Baker? What's wrong with you? Paul says that He is going to show something. Who is it that's going to show something? "Who IS the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, the Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:16). Mr. Baker says, "He's not, but he will be some day." He isn't, but he will be! Can you see the difference in "is" and "will be"? The Bible says he IS; Mr. Baker says he WILL BE.

He says that Rogers said that Baker had no right to say that in Matt. 28:20 Jesus referred to the end of the age. Mr. Baker is misunderstanding me. I said that Mr. Baker didn't have any right to say that that does not refer to the end of the World. He said he has sixteen translations and his Greek Testament. Well I have some different translations here and my Greek Testament. And I'd like to tell you to go to the translations or the Greek (it doesn't make any difference to me) and I'll follow you wherever you go. But he said that I said he didn't have a right to say (it means) the "end of the ages." No. I said you didn't have a right to say that the "end of the ages" is not the "end of the world." That's what

I said you didn't have a right to say that inasmuch as we have forty-seven translators of the King James Version and one hundred and one of the Revised Version that say it DOES mean that. That's what I said. Mr. Baker apparently isn't understanding these things that are being said.

I also pointed out that it does mean the "end of the world" because in Matt. 13:39 the Bible says that the "harvest is the end of the world." What takes place? "He will send forth his angels and they will gather out of his Kingdom all those that offend and they that do iniquity, and they will cast them into a furnace of fire." He admitted tonight that when they get into the fire that's the end of them. So he might as well just come on and yield the proposition.

Then he said of Isa. 2:2-4, "What nations would learn war no more?" He said the nations! Yes, but I want to know what nations. The Bible says that all nations shall flow into the House of God, and those are the nations that are referred to—the nations in the House of God that learn war no more. It doesn't say "all nations in general." It's referring to those mentioned before that are IN the House of God. Mr. Baker follows the Russelite position in that and teaches that "all nations" there refers to others than those in the Kingdom.

Then he said that the New Covenant was to be with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not with the Body. Well then the question turns on what is the house of Israel and the house of Judah. The Bible says in Phil. 3:3, "WE are the circumcision, that worship God in the spirit . . . and have no confidence in the flesh." Now, who is the Jew today? who is the circumcision? who is Israel today? Paul says, "We are that have no confidence in the flesh, who worship GOD according to the spirit." In Rom. 2:28-29 he said, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Now we can see that this thing is in the heart, that it's not in the flesh. The Bible says that that's the man that is a Jew. Now that might enlighten you upon that. And Paul says, "I have been crucified . . . And far be it from me to glory save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, through which I have been crucified unto the world, and the world unto me. And as many as walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and upon the

Israel of God" (Gal. 6:15-16). Mr. Baker, I think, will say that the "Israel of God" there refers to the Body. And in Gal. 3:29 the writer says, "If we are Christ's—if we belong to him—then are we Abraham's seed—Israelites, Jews—we are heirs according to the promise."

Is the New Testament in force now, Mr. Baker. Do we have the New Testament? I suppose that he thinks that is still future. Paul said, "We are made ministers of a new covenant" (2 Cor. 3:6). It was in force in Paul's day.

But he emphasized the fact that it said, "They shall not teach every man his brother . . ." (Heb. 8:11). No, because you can't be a "brother" in this Kingdom without first being taught! In the old Israelitish kingdom they were born into it and then taught. They were born by a natural birth into it and then taught. In this one, we are first taught and then born into it by a spiritual birth. That's the difference.

Then he said that the promises of the Old Testament are to be fulfilled. And he read the very passage that says, "They died not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off." What were they looking for? Mr. Baker says, "An earthly home in Palestine." The Bible says, "They looked for a BETTER country, that is an HEAVENLY!" They were looking for heaven, Mr. Baker. They were not looking for that old earthly land of Palestine. "And for this reason, wherefore, God is not ashamed to be called their God." If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob hadn't known anymore about it than Bert Baker God would have been ashamed of them! But the Bible says he was not because they were looking for a better country, that is an heavenly. "Wherefore, God is NOT ashamed of them." In other words, he would have been ashamed to be called their God if they hadn't known any better than Baker.

Then he referred to verse 39, "These all died in faith not having received the promises, God having provided some better thing for us that they apart from us should not be made perfect." The promises there referred to those they enjoyed by the blood of Jesus Christ. Heb. 9:15, "For this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for this redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, those that have been called may receive the PROMISE of the eternal inheritance," Mr. Baker, not a thousand years' reign on earth, and not something in

Palestine or Jerusalem. What is it? It is a heavenly Kingdom, an eternal inheritance. That answers the affirmative speech that he made last night when he was supposed to have been in the negative.

I now come to the affirmative speech that he made tonight.

He said that we ought to follow no man. Well, you can't believe the proposition that Bert Baker is affirming without following the doctrine and commandments of men. He can't find it in the Bible. He hasn't read the passage, and I'll take up each one of them and show you that it doesn't say it.

Then he said that in Rev. 20:1-6 we have the word thousand years. Yes, but he doesn't find anything about the Second Coming of Christ. He doesn't find anything about Jesus upon earth. He doesn't find anything about us being there. He doesn't find anything about anybody in this proposition except those that had their heads cut off for the testimony of Jesus and the Word of God. He doesn't find a bodily resurrection. It says, "I saw the SOULS . . ." Did you not read that, Mr. Baker? "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the Word of God . . . and THEY lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Have you had your head cut off for Jesus, Mr. Baker? Have you? He's had his head cut off theologically in this debate! I know that. But that's not what this is talking about. No, that's not what this is talking about. These people that John saw here are those that were beheaded for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus. And these were SOULS, not bodies that had been raised from the dead, but SOULS "of them that had been beheaded for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." He says, "Upon the earth." The Bible doesn't say it! Bert Baker said it. And you can't believe it without believing what Baker says about it. You can't believe the Bible on that point.

Then he said, "Don't you realize that the devil is the god of this world." Yes. But I realize that the devil can't get any body without he wants him to, Mr. Baker. You'll remember that Peter wrote in 1 Pet. 5:8, "Be sober, be watchful, your adversary the devil as a roaring lion walketh about seeking WHOM he may devour." He'll get the man that wants to be gotten by him. He'll not deceive you unless you want to be

deceived. Jesus said in Jno. 12:31-32, "Now is the judgment of the prince of this world, and now is the prince of this world cast out." What time is that, Jesus? "And I, if I be lifted up from the world, will draw all men unto myself. And this he spake signifying by what manner of death he should die." When was the prince of the world judged, Mr. Baker? Jesus said he did it when he was lifted up. Mr. Baker thinks that hasn't come to pass yet.

But he says in Matt. 16:28 that Jesus taught that there were some that would not taste of death until they saw him coming in his Kingdom. And he suggested that Peter, James, and John were there and it was indicated that Peter would die before the Lord should come, but it was suggested to Peter about John, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." The Bible doesn't say that John would tarry until Jesus should come. He said, "If I will . . ." In other words, "It's none of your business how long John stays." And he didn't say, "John will stay till I come." They said that about it, but John said, "That's not so. That's not what he said." That's in the very next verse, Mr. Baker.

But let us notice something. In Mk. 9:1 and Matt. 16:26-28 we find that Jesus said to those that were in his immediate presence, including Peter, James, and John his disciples, "Verily I say unto YOU there be some here of THEM that stand by that shall not taste of death till THEY see the Kingdom come with power." Peter, James, and John were of the "YOU." But did Jesus say, "You will not die till you see the Kingdom"? No. He said, "I say unto you that some of THEM that stand by shall not taste of death till THEY see the Kingdom." Now, who was it that saw the Kingdom. He says, "John!" John was of the "you," not of the "they." But Jesus said, "They shall see." He has his pronouns mixed up! Mr. Baker, do you know anything about grammar? Jesus said to Peter, James, and John, and those in his immediate presence, "I say unto YOU . . . THEY shall see the Kingdom." He says John got the revelation. Then "THEY" did not see the Kingdom, because John wasn't of the "they." Can't you see that now? If you can't, I'll take you aside and give you a grammar book that I brought up here in my car. I have a Rigdon's English Grammar that I think I'd be willing to give you and buy me another if you can't see the difference between you and they. Jesus said, "I say to YOU . . . THEY shall see



the Kingdom." And John was of the "you". So when John saw what he did in Rev. 20 it did not refer at all to Mk. 9:1.

Now the question comes that since Jesus said, "Some of them that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power," are they living now? Are they, Mr. Baker? Or has the Kingdom Come? The Kingdom has come or they're still living.

Then he said, "I saw thrones" (Rev. 20:4). Yes. But who was it we found on the thrones? The Bible says, "The SOULS of them that were beheaded for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus."

He said he finds in Rev. 5:10 that the reign is upon the earth. If you'll consult the Revised Version you'll find that John said, "They REIGN . . ." That's present tense. They're already doing it, Mr. Baker. "They REIGN upon the earth." That's present tense in the Revised Version, not over yonder some time in the future, but the reign is now. That's present tense. And in Rev. 1:6 the Bible says, "God made us a Kingdom of priests" or a "Kingdom to be priests."

Then he said that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not been raised from the dead. He said also that all will not be raised at the same time, that sometime He'll get the righteous and later on He'll get others. He says that we'll not (all) have a resurrection at the same time. Well, in Jno. 5:28-29 Jesus said, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which ALL that are in the tomb shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth: those that have done good unto a resurrection of life, and those that have done evil unto a resurrection of damnation." When is that going to be? That is going to be in an hour in which ALL that are in the tomb, both the good and the bad, those that have done good and those that have done evil, ALL of them in the same hour will come forth. Also in Jno. 6:40, 47, 54 we find that the righteous are going to be raised in the last day. But in Jno. 12:48 the Bible says that the judgment of the wicked will take place in the last day. Therefore the resurrection of the righteous and the judgment of the wicked will take place at the same time. And there'll not be a thousand years between them as Mr. Baker has affirmed.

But he said on 2 Tim. 4:1-2 that Jesus will judge the world by his appearing and his Kingdom. Yes, but the Kingdom is already there, Mr. Baker. He'll judge them by his appearing

and his Kingdom. And notice also that there is going to be the judgment, not a thousand years' reign at his appearing. He already has the Kingdom, and we're going to be judged according to laws of that Kingdom (Rom. 2:16). We'll be judged according to Paul's gospel.

But he said that in 2 Tim. 4:18 Paul spoke of a heavenly Kingdom. Yes, but not an earthly kingdom in Palestine!! He said we are to appear with him in glory. Yes. And Paul said, "Set not your affections on things that are upon the earth, but on things that are above" (Col. 3:3-4). He thinks we ought to set our affections upon Palestine.

Then he said that all power was given unto Christ. But he said that He is going to get some more. He said He was last night. He has all of it now (Matt. 28:18), but he is going to get some more!

In 1 Cor. 15:21-26 we find, "Each man shall be raised from the dead in his own order, Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's at his coming." There we have the coming of Christ. What will happen? "Then cometh the END." Mr. Baker says, "Now, Paul, I tell you you're mixed upon that. At the Second Coming of Christ, when Christ comes again, there'll be a thousand years, and not the end." What's wrong with Paul? He hadn't heard Mr. Baker. He didn't know anything about Dispensationalism. Each man will be raised from the dead at the Second Coming of Christ, and then will come the END, not the thousand years as Mr. Baker would have us believe.

But he says that Christ's Kingdom will be upon the new earth, and we "shall reign with him if we suffer with him." That doesn't mean that we're not reigning now, Mr. Baker. It certainly doesn't mean that we're not reigning now for Paul says in Rom. 5:17, "We reign in life, through the one, even Jesus Christ." We reign. That's present tense. Suppose there is a future reign that we'll have in heaven that doesn't prove anything about Palestine and the earth in the after awhile.

But he said that Zech. 14 does not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem. Well the first verse says that it does! Zechariah says that it does; this man says that it doesn't. But he said that verse 11 says that Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited. Now, if that's referring to Jerusalem it would have to refer to the heavenly Jerusalem inasmuch as verse 1 said that Jerusalem would be destroyed. And in Jer. 19 he pointed out

the fact that Jerusalem would be broken as a potter's vessel that could NOT be made whole again. Mr. Baker is going to patch it up though the God of heaven said it cannot be done. Heb. 12:22 says, "We . . . have come unto the heavenly Jerusalem." That's the only Jerusalem that we're going to dwell safely in. It has a spiritual application, not a literal application.

He says, "Jesus will be King over all the earth." 1 Tim. 6:14 teaches that he is King now, and that "he is King of kings, and Lord of lords."

Then he said, "The meek shall inherit the earth" (Matt. 5:5). Yes, but it will be the "new earth" (2 Pet. 3:13).

He says the disciples prayed, "Thy Kingdom come" (Matt. 6:10). Yes, but that was during the personal ministry of Christ. But Paul said they were translated into it (Col. 1:13). John said, "I'm in it" (Rev. 1:9).

He said that heaven is God's throne. Yes. He's going to take Jesus off his throne and put him upon the earth—his footstool. Talking about inauguration day! You're going to dethrone the Son of God. Take him out of heaven and put him on his footstool!

But he said the city IS the city of the great King (Matt. 5:34). The city IS the city of the great King. Yes, but that was during the personal ministry of Christ and before Jerusalem had been destroyed and before the Jews had been rejected.

He quotes, "Our citizenship is in heaven" (Phil. 3:20). Well, forget about Palestine then, Mr. Baker.

He refers to Heb. 1:13 that Christ is at the right hand of God. Yes. And notice the Bible says, "A scepter of righteousness IS the scepter of thy Kingdom." Don't you see that that's present tense? (Heb. 1:8).

Then to Heb. 2:5, that unto angels he did not subject the world to come. He is pointing out the fact that when God created the world he did not subject it unto angels, but unto man. And he quoted the eighth Psalm to prove it had been given unto man. That referred to God's work in the creation. He subjected the world unto man THEN. You ought to know that. You said you had debated a Jehovah's Witnesses and you have to meet them on that very point.

He says the "Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking." No. But Paul says, "It IS—it is, not will be, but is—it IS righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17).

It IS that, not will be, but IS. Do you reckon he has it?

Then he said the Bible says something about Christ ruling in the midst of his enemies. In Psa. 110:1-4 he's ruling in the midst of his enemies when he's at God's right hand. But he's at God's right hand now. Therefore he's ruling in the midst of his enemies now. And in Heb. 6:20 it says he's priest after the order of Melchizedek now. And Psa. 110:4 teaches that he is ruling in the midst of his enemies at that time. Now, if he's ruling in the midst of his enemies now, how long is he going to rule? Until he comes! Then what is he going to do? Deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, and not start something new as Mr. Baker here has affirmed.

I've referred to a!l the things that he has said, and I'll be glad to deal with anything else that he might bring up. (Time called). I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

### BAKER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I want to thank you very kindly for all of your hospitality that I've enjoyed since I've been down here with you folk. I appreciate your kindness, and I appreciate all that you have done to make our stay down here very comfortable. We rejoice together that we have this privilege to come here and have this debate with our Brother Rogers. This will be my last opportunity to thank you from the depths of my heart for the opportunity of being with you, and opening up with you the Word of God.

Shall we turn tonight to Jno. 14 where the Lord Jesus Christ spoke to his disciples just before he went away. In Jno. 14 we read these words: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. (Now, note this). And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again . . . (When are you going to receive them, Lord?)—I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." "When I come again I will receive you." You see the Lord said that he was going into a far country to receive a Kingdom and then to return.

Then in this passage of Scripture that Brother Rogers referred to concerning the apostle Paul's statement in 1 Tim. 6:14-15. Let me read it to you, will you. He says, "That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, un-

til the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times . . ." Now, brethren there is a time element. It's in your Bible. "Which in his times he shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of Lords." He's going to do it in his time. And the time is the Second Coming. "I'll come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." Paul said, "Looking for that blessed hope." "The blessed hope of the appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ" (Tit. 2:13).

Brother Rogers says that he's reigning with Christ, that the saints are reigning with Christ now. Brethren, Paul says, "If we suffer with him . . ." This is the time of suffering. And again Paul says in Rom. 8:17, "We are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him." There are sufferings with the saints of God today, and the reigning will come when we see our Lord when he comes in glory for the members of the Body of Christ. I never said that I am going to Jerusalem. I said the Lord Jesus Christ said Israel is going to Jerusalem.

I'd like to call your attention to Zech. 14. And I'm sure that he will agree that this can't be in the new Jerusalem. There are not going to be pots in the new Jerusalem, and bells on the horses in the new Jerusalem. Notice in Zech. 14:9 it says, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one. All the land . . ." L-a-n-d land, not heaven. "Land" is the land that God promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. God said, "Abraham, I'm going to give you this land." All of those saints have not been resurrected. You'll notice that Brother Rogers didn't place them either. He didn't tell you where they are going to be raised to get into the Kingdom.

Now in Zech. 14:10 he says, "And all the land shall be turned into a plain . . ." Then he says in verse 11, "And men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited. And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord shall smite the people that have fought against Jerusalem . . ." They had fought against Jerusalem. "This is the plague: Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them; and

they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbour. And JUDAH . . ." Now, God's Word says that he's going to make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. That's what God says in Heb. 8. Judah is not the Body of Christ.

He said we are the circumcision made without hands. I told you that in the first part of my message—that we are the circumcision "who worship God in the spirit and have no confidence in the flesh." Abraham was not a Jew. I told you that we follow Abraham's footsteps before he was circumcised. I told you that Abraham was not an Israelite. The first Israelite in the Bible was not Abraham. The first Israelite was not Abraham, but Jacob. God changed Jacob's name to Israel. And the first Israelite in the Bible is Jacob. God changed his name to Israel. So Abraham was not a Jew. Abraham was not an Israelite. We follow Abraham in uncircumcision, not in circumcision.

Then in Zech. 14 notice what he says in verse 14. "Judah also shall fight Jerusalem; and the wealth of all the heathen round about shall be gathered together, gold and silver, and apparel, in great abundance." Is that heaven? "And so shall be the plague of the horse, of the mule, of the camel, of the ass, and of all the beasts that shall be in these tents, as this plague. And it shall come to pass that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain" (Zech. 14:14-17). Now, I'm telling you that's God's Word!

Notice it again: "It shall come to pass that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto JERUSALEM to worship the King the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain. And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, where-with the Lord will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the FEAST OF THE TABERNACLES." (Verses 17-18). This is not the Body of Christ. We are a heavenly people, and in the heavenlies. We're blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ. This is not heaven; this is earth. "This

shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of the nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles." Notice verse 20. "In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD: and the POTS in the Lord's house shall be like the boles before the altar." What is the Lord's house? The Lord said, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise." What is the Father's house. In this text he says, "Every pot in JERUSALEM and in JUDAH shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them . . ." Now, brethren, this is not heaven. This is earth. This is Jerusalem.

Then you'll notice that he never touched the fact that Satan is going to be bound for a thousand years in the abyss. He did not bring out what Satan is doing now. He said, "The Lord is reigning now." I said the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church the Body, raised up over every principality, power, might and dominion. And the Lord must reign until he has put every enemy under his feet. And when the Lord finally delivers up the Kingdom of God the Father the devil will be—where?—in the lake of fire. Now, where is the devil tonight? In the lake of fire? I said before that he is the god of this age and the prince of the power of the air. He's a soul when Jesus Christ is on earth. He's the adversary. I don't care where you go in Paul's epistles you'll never find the apostle Paul saying that Satan is in the abyss. In the Book of Ephesians we are told that we "wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against wicked spirits (if you please) in heavenly places." And in the Greek it's "in the heavenlies." (Eph 6:12). That's the conflict of the saints of God today. That's why we need the whole armor of God. We're not having the power of the Lord Jesus Christ manifested yet in Russia. You can't say that Satan is not deceiving Russia and all the nations of the earth today. The devil is the deceiver of the nations! Those of us who are losing our sons understand that are the tactics of the enemies. We know that Satan is not bound. We know that every where we go we run up against the power of Satan. He's the god of this age, and Paul says he is. He's the prince of the power of the air. And if he's the prince of the power of the air he's not in the abyss and he's not in the lake of fire. The lake of fire is where he's going to be. He's going to be let out of the abyss. And our Brother hasn't touched that a bit

yet. He's going to be there a thousand years. And when the devil is in that abyss the nations will learn war no more for that thousand years.

Then I pointed out to you last night that the apostle Paul has already seated us in his messages, in his revelation, he has already seated us together with Christ. Already we are Messed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ. I'm not telling the members of the Body of Christ to look to Jerusalem. We're not Israel. I told you that James wrote to the twelve tribes scattered abroad. I told you that the twelve apostles are going to sit on twelve thrones in the regeneration with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and all those prophets in the Kingdom. And they shall eat in that Kingdom.

I called your attention to the fact that to the apostle Paul we go for the Lord's Table today. And every time we break bread we do it "till the Lord comes." And we're waiting for our Lord to come. And the Lord said to his disciples, "I will not eat with you and I'll not drink with you until I eat with you and break with you in my Father's Kingdom."

I called your attention to what the apostle Paul said concerning the heavenly Kingdom. I know that we have a heavenly Kingdom. That's what the Body of Christ is for. But our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is going to be King over all the earth. And I'm not going to rob him of that glory. His will is going to be done on earth as it is in heaven. I'm not going to rob him of that glory.

He said Jerusalem is the city of the great King. I have proven from Zechariah that it's not the heavenly Jerusalem, but is the earthly Jerusalem.

Then I'd like to call your attention to 1 Cor. 15 again where the apostle Paul is dealing with this administration of grace, and what we have to look forward to when cometh the consummation when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God. What is the last thing even that he's going to destroy? The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. When is the Lord Jesus Christ going to destroy death? You'll notice that Brother Rogers said, "Look! He hath the key of David." The Lord Jesus Christ has the keys of death and Hades. Has the Lord Jesus Christ destroyed death? Has the Lord Jesus Christ taken every man out of the grave? We are saved by the grace of God. The Lord Jesus Christ has the keys of death and Hades, but he hasn't USED those keys yet to raise



the dead. He hasn't yet raised Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Then our Brother said that there is no thousand years between the two resurrections. Let me call your attention to Rev. 20. This great apostle John said, "They shall reign **ON THE EARTH.**" That's what he said now. And then in this twentieth chapter he tells you when they are going to reign on the earth: when the devil is in the abyss. Now, where will the devil be in the new creation? In the lake of fire! Where will he be for a thousand years? In the abyss. When will he be in the lake of fire? When God creates a new heavens and a new earth. Notice this again in Rev. 20. I want you to notice not what I say, but what God says. (And I wonder, Brother Rogers, if we couldn't have all the debate published in book form, and all the rules of the debate put right into that book? I would appreciate that. I'm sure that when people read the rules of the debate they'll understand who did break the rules of the debate. I'd like to have that in the book, if you will).

Mr. Rogers speaks from his seat: "Yes, sir. We will do that."

Mr. Baker continues: Then in Rev. 20 notice I'm calling your attention not to what I have. Thank God, I'm not in any denomination. I'm a believer only, a member of the Body, seated with Christ in the heavenlies. I represent no denomination. I'm only joined to Christ. So I haven't anything to lose by believing God's Word. I'm not defending anything but what the Bible teaches.

Now, look at it again will you. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." Now, I say that when the devil is bound a thousand years they will **REIGN** a thousand years. The nations won't be deceived for a thousand years. The nations are deceived right now. It won't be long until we find out how deceived the nations are. Whenever we say that the devil is bound and the nations are not deceived we are certainly contradicting the text that we have before us here. That time has not come for Christ to deliver up his Kingdom to God.

I showed you in the Book of Hebrews, "He hath not **YET** put all things in subjection to him." There is a time coming yet when everything will be put under subjection of the Lord

Jesus Christ. He must reign until he hath put all things, a!i enemies, under his feet. And the last enemy that he shall destroy is death. Then he delivers up the Kingdom to the Father. What's the last thing he does? When does the Lord Jesus Christ destroy death? In the new heavens and the new earth there is no more death. All the unsaved are in the lake of fire that second death.

But notice again in Rev. 20. "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." John said that! "And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more until the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that (thousand years) he must be loosed a little season." Now, brethren, something is going to happen when Satan is let loose for a season. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God . . ." He said, "Are you beheaded, Pastor Baker?" No. I'm in the Head, the Lord Jesus Christ, in the heavenlies. I have a Head in my perfect Savior. And I'm already seated there at the right hand of God. I'm not beheaded. I'm not a martyr. I don't live in the great tribulation. I don't live in the time of Jacob's trouble. I live in the administration of the grace of God for the Gentiles.

Now, notice that it says that these who are going to reign with the Lord Jesus Christ "they had not received the mark of the beast in their foreheads, or in their hands." Now, who are they? Where is the Lord going to destroy the other class? In the Book of Thessalonians Paul says, "He shall destroy him with the brightness of His coming." When is he going to destroy the anti-Christ? "With the brightness of his coming." With the very epiphaneia of his appearance.

Then we are told in the Word of God that the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. How does he destroy death? By resurrection. The Lord was raised from the dead, hath immortality, is seated at the right hand of the Father. Not one will be out here in the grave yard. Every body is going to be raised. Do you believe in a bodily resurrection, that the saints are going to be raised? Do you believe that these precious souls that lie out there under the sod will have a resurrection? Every time we take them out to the grave yard

and bury them we say, "We sow this body, and there's going to be a resurrection."

I'd like to have you notice Rev. 20:5. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Note: "The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the FIRST resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the FIRST resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and they shall reign with him a thousand years. (Now listen) When the thousand years are expired . . . (Are they expired?)—when the thousand years are expired Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations . . . (How can he do it if there are none there? If this is heaven how come there are nations there? After the devil has been bound for a thousand years, where do those nations come from? Can he deceive nations if there aren't any nations there? After he's been in the abyss for a thousand years he's let loose. And listen)—he shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of (heaven?) the earth!!" How did those nations get there after Satan was bound for a thousand years that he should deceive the nations no more? It says in the next part of the text, "Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the BELOVED CITY . . ." What is the beloved city? This is after the devil has been bound for a thousand years. What is this beloved city. Not the new Jerusalem! Satan isn't going to disrupt the new Jerusalem that comes down out of heaven from God. In the place where the beast and the false prophet are the devil will be.

Notice verse 9: "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. And I saw a great white throne judgment."

I never said that the judgment of the nations is the "white throne judgment."

Mr. Shaver says: "A-men."

Mr. Baker continues: I never said that. Our Brother

Rogers said that! I said that the nations were going to be gathered in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. I find that in the Book of Joel. I said the Lord is going to plead with them there in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. And there the Lord is going to judge them. God is going to carry all the nations to a place called Megiddon in the Plain of Esdraelon. And I said the nations are going to be judged. The nations have to be judged. Then we know that the lake of fire will be for every one that's not saved, no matter who the man or the woman is. That's why we urge men in this administration of grace and will to be saved or washed in the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ in order that we might flee from the wrath to come and be saved from condemnation. I believe this wonderful twentieth chapter of the Book of Revelation.

Let me sum it up will you. The great apostle John who was with the Lord for all those years, taught by the Lord, the aged apostle who died long years ago wrote these words. Now listen. When God says that Satan is going to be bound first in the abyss and then he's going to be let loose and deceive and then be cast into the lake of fire you're going to have here a time element that you cannot escape. And the Lord Jesus Christ is going to be King over all the earth as well as King in the heavens. And when the Lord Jesus Christ delivers up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, every member of the Body of Christ will be in that Kingdom. Israel will be in that Kingdom. And when that Kingdom is delivered up to the Father all of God's people will be in that Kingdom. When the Kingdom is delivered up to the Father I've pointed out that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are going to be in that Kingdom. Not because I understand it, but because I believe it. And many will come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom. Brother Rogers admits that the Church, the Body of Christ, and the Kingdom are not one and the same thing. He must come to that conclusion. He must admit that the Kingdom of God is not heavenly only, but is earthly, having a new heavens and a new earth and that Jesus Christ is going to deliver us back to the Father.

I want to close with these words: I believe in the thousand years' reign of the Lord Jesus Christ because he's coming again, because his two feet are going to stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives. I believe in the thousand years'

reign of Christ because he says, "If I go away, I'll come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." I believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is going to have a thousand years' reign because he said he's coming in flaming fire to take "vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel." I believe he's going to be admired in by all of his saints.

Now for my last statement I want to take you clear back to the wonderful days of Enoch. In the Book of Jude that man of God that did not see death saw the Lord coming. Now, notice this in my closing remarks if you will. Jude in the first chapter (for there's only one), and verse 14: "And Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints." And what's he coming with? Ten thousands of his saints. He saw the Lord coming with ten thousands of his holy ones. What for? "To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage." This is the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and it takes us clear back to the days of Jude and back to the days of Enoch, the seventh from Adam who prophesied and saw the Lord coming.

The apostle Paul said in his word that we are to look for that blessed hope. And if we look for it then we will have a reward. Remember the words of Paul before his death: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that—1-o-v-e—love his appearing" (2 Tim. 4:7-8). The apostle Paul was emphasizing that he will receive his reward at the appearing of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. In 1 Pet. 5:4 we read, "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." When will Peter get his crown of glory? When the great Shepherd shall appear. The Lord Jesus Christ has not appeared.

Did you ever consider what Peter said in his epistle just

before he was taken out of this world, put off his tabernacle, even as the Lord showed him? He said, "Peter, you're going to die." And in this epistle he writes his last word. And he tells of his coming death. And before he dies this is what he said in chapter 3: "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance: that ye be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour: Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come . . ." "The day of the Lord will come." We've already noted Acts 2 where it says these things were to happen before the great and notable day of the Lord come. And here he said, "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless (notice this now) we, according to his promise look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Where will the devil be in that new earth? In the lake of fire. Where will the devil be after the thousand years? Let loose. When the devil is let loose for a season, then God will

deal with Satan and after that he'll never again deceive the nations any more.

Again in closing remember I said that for a thousand years Satan will be bound, then he will be let loose, then Satan will be cast into the lake of fire and there he will be tormented day and night for ever and ever. I've made the statement that when the devil is bound, then the Lord Jesus Christ will be reigning, that he is putting his enemies under his feet. Satan is an enemy. Death is an enemy. And in the new heavens and the new earth there is no more death.

Now I am dead with Christ, buried with Christ, risen with Christ, seated with Christ, we are one in Christ, accepted in Christ. These are all the words of the apostle Paul. (Time called). Thank you. And may God bless you.

### ROGERS' SECOND NEGATIVE

My worthy Opponent, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I now appear before you for the last speech in this debate. I'd like to join my opponent in tendering to you my appreciation for the hospitality that we have enjoyed, for the splendid attention that you have given each night, and for the opportunity that you have afforded us of discussing the Bible in your presence. When I came here, I came here a stranger. I had brethren whom I had not seen and yet I loved. They invited me to come here to defend the faith, to defend the truth, and meet Mr. Baker in this discussion. I certainly have enjoyed the discussion. I appreciate the invitation that was tendered unto me. I've certainly enjoyed meeting my opponent.

As he suggested, the rules of the debate will go into the book. These rules insist that every thing that is brought up must be taken up and examined with fairness and candor to see whether or not they teach what one's opponent has suggested. I submit to you tonight that my opponent has not done that, and I'll deal with that again in the latter part of the speech.

The first verse that my opponent referred to when he came to the platform was Jno. 14:1-4. There Jesus said, "In my Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and

receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." So he says we're going to get it (Kingdom) when the Lord comes again. Yes. But what is it? an earthly kingdom? Why, no. The Bible says that he is going to prepare a place. He's going to heaven to prepare that place and he'll come and receive us unto himself that we might be with him also.

But he said something just before he sat down that I wish to call your attention to about the devil being bound and the devil being in the abyss. He said that Rogers never dealt with the devil being in the abyss. Well, I dealt with the devil being bound and that's the very time that the devil is in the abyss, Mr. Baker. So when I dealt with the devil being bound I certainly dealt with the devil being in the abyss.

But you'll remember that just before he sat down he said, "When the devil is bound, Christ is reigning." "When the devil is bound, Christ is reigning." Let us see now. If Christ is reigning now, the devil is bound now. Well, the Bible says in Zech. 6:13 (and Baker hasn't mentioned it), "The man whose name is the Branch shall arise . . . and shall build the Temple of Jehovah . . . and he shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne." Notice where he's going to rule. He's going to do his ruling upon his throne. He shall be a priest upon his throne and he shall sit and rule upon his throne "and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Now, my opponent says, "When Christ is reigning, the devil is bound." That's what Baker said about it. "When Christ is reigning, the devil is bound." But the Bible says that he is going to "sit and rule upon his throne" when he's priest. Is he priest now, Mr. Baker? Is he priest now? Please tell me. Is he priest. He is! All right, he's priest now! But the Bible says that he will sit and rule upon his throne when he's priest. So he's on his throne now, isn't he? Since the Bible says that he'll be a priest on his throne and sit and rule on his throne, since he's priest on his throne now, he sitting and ruling now! Isn't he? And since he's sitting on his throne now, he's ruling now, and the devil is bound! Isn't he, Mr. Baker? Isn't he? This is according to Mr. Baker's own argument.

He says that when the devil is bound, Christ is ruling. All right, when Christ is ruling, the devil is bound. But I pointed out that when Christ is seated upon his throne he's



ruling. The Bible teaches that he will be priest at the same time. If Jesus is priest, he's seated upon his throne, he's ruling. But Baker says that's when the devil is bound. But the Bible says that Jesus is priest now and that he's seated now. Then he's ruling now, and the devil's bound now. Mr. Baker, your own argument convicts you. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee." Certainly, the man ought to be able to see that if Jesus is ruling now the devil is bound. That's what he said. Of course, he ought to understand the sense in which the devil is bound. He doesn't understand that apparently. And he gives a meaning to that that the Bible doesn't.

Then he said that in 1 Tim. 6:14-15 there is a time element involved. There's a time element as far as the Kingdom is concerned. There's also a time element involved as far as the Second Coming is concerned. There is also a time element involved when Christ is King. Notice the Bible says, "Which in its own time he shall show . . ." Well, we find that something will be shown some time. Who is it that shall show it? ". . . who IS the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords." He will show a certain thing in its time. But he IS now (Mr. Baker, that's present tense), he IS (not will be like you say), but "he IS the King of kings, and the Lord of lords." It seems to me that a man ought to be able to see that. Can you not see the difference, Mr. Baker, between "he will be King of kings, and Lord of lords" and "he IS King of kings and Lord of lords"? Do you not know the difference between "IS" and "will be"? Do you not know the difference in those? The Bible says, "He IS." Mr. Baker says, "He WILL BE. I know he WILL BE." Now, somebody is wrong about it, either Paul or Mr. Baker. I like Mr. Baker fine. I like him just fine and I'm not trying to be hard with him. But I cannot be faithful to the cause of the Son of God unless I press these issues. I'm not trying to be hard with him in this. I'm just trying to bring the truth out where you can see and understand.

Then he said that I said we're reigning now. I didn't say that, Paul did. In Rom. 5:17 the Bible says that we "reign (that's present tense, Mr. Baker) in life through the one, Jesus Christ." We reign in life. The Bible says we do. Bert Baker says we don't. Which are you going to accept? Are you going to accept what Mr. Baker says, and his THEORY

about what Rev. 20 means, or are you going to accept what the Bible says? Notice again in Rev. 5:10 I pointed out that in the Revised Version it says, "They REIGN (present tense) upon the earth." He never dealt with it. He never referred to it. And you know why.

Then he referred to Zech. 14. I've insisted that verse 1 says that this is the destruction of Jerusalem. He knows that's in the Bible. He knows the first and second verses say it in his Book just like they say it in mine. Why does he deny what Zechariah says about it? He has a theory to prove. He has a hobby to ride about what he thinks Rev. 20 means. He doesn't know what it means! But he has a theory about it and he's going to prove it by perverting Scripture. Zech. 14:1-2 says that it is the destruction of Jerusalem. Either Zechariah or Bert Baker is wrong.

But he says that the latter part of the chapter says that they would come up to Jerusalem and observe the feast of tabernacles. And he said that they would have the altar and that they would have the tabernacle. He also pointed out that they would sacrifice there. Mr. Baker, the Bible says (you quoted the passage) that the house of Israel would have a NEW covenant. They're not under the old covenant, or under one like they had back there when they came out of the land of Egypt. They will NOT have the feast of tabernacles. They will NOT have the sacrifices. They will NOT have the things that you referred to here—the altar and tabernacle.

This passage must be two-fold, even as I pointed out that there are many passages and prophecies that are two-fold in the Old Testament. I pointed out from 2 Sam. 7:14 that God said, "I will be to him a Father and he shall be to me a Son: if he commit iniquity I will chastize him with the rod of men." When God said, "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be my Son: if he commit iniquity I will chastize him . . ." Paul said he referred to the Son of God (Heb. 1:5). That passage is two-fold. The first part, "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son" refers to Christ. The last part refers to Solomon. Now since a prophecy may be two-fold even as this is here, this passage may be. It seems to me that the only thing that's involved in it is that this is figurative language pointing out the enjoyments that we will have in the NEW JERUSALEM in the after awhile. And it's not literal at all, but a two-fold prophecy. Mr. Baker ought to be able to see

that. He never did deal with 2 Sam. 7:14 where I pointed out that a prophecy may be two-fold.

But he said that God promised to give the land to those of the Old Testament and that they haven't been resurrected. They don't have to be resurrected to receive that promise, Mr. Baker. They don't have to be resurrected to receive that promise. They GOT that. The Bible says in Joshua 21:43-44 that "there failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; ALL came to pass" and "not ONE thing failed thereof" (Josh. 23:14). The Bible says that he gave them the land. Mr. Baker says they didn't get it, and won't get it until the resurrection. The Bible says TWICE (Josh. 21:43-44 and 23:14) that God gave them the land that he swore unto their fathers to give them. Mr. Baker gets up and says they'll get it in the resurrection. Well, either Joshua or Baker is wrong.

Then you'll notice he talked about the Jews. And he said that he wasn't talking about himself. You remember that he said that Isa. 2:2-4 referred to a future kingdom? That says, "ALL nations shall flow into it." That's not just the Jews only, Mr. Baker. If Isa. 2:2-4 refers to that (future kingdom) as you suggested in the first part of the debate, then ALL nations are involved and not just the Jew. One time he says it's just the Jew, and sometimes he has all nations involved. The man doesn't know what he believes about it. He has a THEORY based upon a passage that doesn't say anything about what he believes. Rev. 20 does not mention the Second Coming of Christ. It does not mention Jerusalem. It does not mention Jesus Christ upon the earth. It does not mention a bodily resurrection. It doesn't mention the Jews. No, it doesn't mention them! It mentions those "that were beheaded for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus . . . and THEY lived and reigned with Christ for a thousand years."

Now, whatever Rev. 20 refers to I've pointed out time and time again MUST take place before the Second Coming of Christ. For 1 Cor. 15:23-26 says, "Each man shall be raised in his own order. Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's at HIS COMING. (What takes place then?) Then comes the END . . ." Mr. Baker, do you not know the difference between the end and a thousand years? Do you? The Bible says that at the Second Coming of Christ there will be the END. Mr. Baker says, "No, there'll be a thousand

years." Well, either Mr. Baker or the Book of God is wrong. I believe what Rev. 20 SAYS. I do not believe my opponents THEORY about it. I do not believe his guess-work. He's just guessing about what Rev. 20 teaches. Now, he hasn't found these things of his proposition in it, and yet he says it teaches his proposition. How can it teach it without saying it? It doesn't say it. And since it doesn't say it, I therefore conclude that it doesn't teach it!! Mr. Baker realizes that he cannot find the terms of his proposition in the passage. It's an inadequate proof text. It does not say what he means; it doesn't mean what he says. Whatever it may refer to MUST take place BEFORE the Second Coming of Christ.

Then let us notice something else. He referred again to Satan's being bound and in the abyss. What did he say about Jno. 12:31-32? There Jesus said, "Now is the judgment of the prince of the world, now is that being cast out." Then he pointed out, "If I be lifted up from the earth, then will I draw all men upon myself" at this time. What is he talking about? "This he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should die." The devil's been judged, Mr. Baker. And you've admitted that when the devil is bound Christ is reigning, or that when Christ is ruling, then the devil is bound. And I have proven from the Book of God that he's reigning now, therefore the devil is bound now according to your own argument.

But he wanted to know when the Kingdom will be delivered. The Bible says at the Second Coming of Christ. He's reigning now. I've already proven that upon the black board here. (Referring to diagram: RULING when SITTING—SITTING when PRIEST—PRIEST now.) And the Bible says that he must "reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (1 Cor. 15:25-26.) When Jesus comes again the Bible teaches that there will be the resurrection. Jno. 5:28-29 says, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that are in the tombs shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth: those that have done good unto a resurrection of life, and those that have done evil unto a resurrection of damnation." The Bible teaches that at the Second Coming of Christ that will take place, and then at that time will come the END and he will deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father instead of taking it over (1 Cor. 15:24). Mr. Baker says that he's going to take over the Kingdom and begin his reign. The

Bible says he'll give up his reign. That's the difference between the Word of God and Bert Baker. The Bible says that he will deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, at the Second Coming and the END comes. And Baker says that God will give the Kingdom to Christ and he'll BEGIN to reign! Did you find in Matt. 25:31, "Then will he begin to reign"? Did you? Now, he's the man that answers. Yes. He's the man that doesn't answer, unless you can say that by ignoring the man is answering. That's the only way that he has "answered" anything that I've said.

But he said that James wrote to the twelve tribes. I started out in the beginning of this debate trying to get Mr. Baker to notice Jas. 5:14 where it says, "Call for the ELDERS of the CHURCH." Mr. Baker, do you remember my saying that? I've tried and tried and tried to get you to refer to Jas. 5:14. He's writing to Jews who are members of the Church. The Bible says in Jas. 5:14, "Let him call the elders of the Church." And you never mentioned that. Do you know why? He knows that he can't answer the argument. He's just hopeless, helpless, and hapless and hunts up something else to talk about.

But he said (of the twelve apostles), "They're going to sit on twelve thrones." Mr. Baker, the Bible says, (if you'll note the punctuation of the Revised Version), that Jesus said unto the apostles, "Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me . . ." Then we have a comma. "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28). "In the regeneration" modifies Christ sitting upon his throne and the apostles upon their thrones. Now, when is this going to be? "In the regeneration"—at the time men are regenerated. I asked him, "Are men regenerated now?" Paul says in Tit. 3:5, "God saved us by his mercy, by the washing of REGENERATION and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Paul says that we are in the age of regeneration now. And Jesus said, "In the regeneration—during that time—they reign." Mr. Baker says it will be over yonder in the future some times after that time of regeneration has ceased.

Then again he referred to death, and said that death would be put under the feet of Christ. Yes. And that's the very thing that Paul referred to when he said that there is

something that is not yet subjected unto Christ. He referred unto death. But it will be. And when Jesus Christ raises the dead at the Second Coming then will come the end (1 Cor. 15:23-26). I ask you again: Can you tell the difference between the end and a thousand years?

Then he said that he is in the Head, that he is in Christ. I'm in Christ. He said he's not a member of a denomination. He's a member of a denomination called The Grace Bible Church sometimes, and The Grace Fellowship Church some other time. He's a member of a denomination that is dispensational in its teaching. He's a member of a man-made organization. That's all in the world there is to that.

Then he said that Jesus will destroy the anti-Christ at his Second Coming, at the epiphaneia of his coming. Well, suppose he is, Mr. Baker, that's what I'm trying to prove—that when he comes there will be the end, there will be the judgment, the punishment will be meted out, not a thousand years' reign like you've been trying to teach us.

Then he asks if I believe in a bodily resurrection. Yes. But I'll tell you what I'll do. As I suggested the other night, I'll try to find a golden pumpkin bug and give you if you'll find a bodily resurrection in Rev. 20:1-6! The Bible says, "I saw SOULS . . ." Do you know the difference between a body and a soul, Mr. Baker? John said, "I saw souls . . . and THIS is the first resurrection." The things John saw were souls, Mr. Baker, not bodies. He said, "Does Rogers not believe in a bodily resurrection?" Yes. I believe in a bodily resurrection. But Rev. 20:1-6 doesn't teach a bodily resurrection. It doesn't say anything about a bodily resurrection. Who said that? Mr. Baker. Who put that in there? Mr. Baker. Yet he says he's the man that speaks where the Bible speaks, and he's silent where the Bible is silent. He has the thing mixed up. He speaks where the Bible is silent, and he's silent where the Bible speaks. That's what is wrong with Mr. Baker.

Then he said that the judgment of the nations is not the same as the "white throne judgment." And somebody said, "A-men!" Yes, somebody said, "A-men" when he said that the judgment of the nations is not the white throne judgment. Well I find in Rev. 20:15 at this white throne judgment, Mr. Baker, that if any were found who were not written in the Lamb's book of life—had not done the thing that God required—they were cast into the lake of fire. That is the place

of eternal punishment. What happens at the judgment of the nations in Matt. 25? He says, "These shall go away into eternal punishment." When do they get eternal punishment, Mr. Baker? At the judgment of the nations! And it's in this second death which is the lake of fire. But the Bible says in Rev. 20:10-15 that you get this at the white throne judgment. Now since you go into hell at the white throne judgment, and you go into hell if you're wicked at the judgment of the nations, they are the same. Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. Certainly you ought to be able to see that.

I want you to be able to see clearly that there are not two judgments referred to here. In Matt. 25 at the judgment of the nations the Bible teaches that that is the time that the wicked go into eternal punishment. But eternal punishment is in the lake of fire. And the Bible says that at the white throne judgment in Rev. 20:14-15 the wicked will be cast into the lake of fire. They go into into eternal punishment in the lake of fire at the judgment of nations, and also at the white throne judgment, so they're one and the same judgment. There's not any difference in them, Mr. Baker.

But he says that Rogers admits that the Church and the Kingdom are not the same. I admit that sometimes the word Kingdom does not refer to the Church. But I never have said that the Church never means the Kingdom or that the Kingdom never means the Church. The fact is, you've admitted that the Lord's Supper is in the Church. Mr. Baker admits that the Lord's Supper is in the Church. And yet the Bible says it's in the Kingdom. Mr. Baker, is it in the Kingdom like the Son of God said? Is it in the Church like you said? If it's in the Kingdom like Jesus said, and in the Church like you said then the Church is the Kingdom. Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. It looks like Mr. Baker would finally catch on.

But he said he wanted to refer us to Jude 14 going on back to the days of Enoch. There Jude said he saw the Lord coming with ten thousands of his saints. What for? "To inaugurate a thousand years' reign." Is that what Jude said? No. He says, "He came with ten thousands of his saints to execute JUDGMENT . . ." That's the judgment, Mr. Baker, not the thousand years' reign. "He came ... to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their

works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him" (Jude 15). That's the judgment, Mr. Baker. That's not the thousand years reign. You'll have to "go back" and look some more. And after you look some more you'll still not find it.

And then, of all things, he referred last of all to 2 Pet. 3. In referring to 2 Pet. 3 (he affirmed) that the Kingdom will be established at the Second Coming of Christ, that it will be established in Jerusalem upon this old temporal earth. And yet the Bible says in 2 Pet. 3:10, "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be BURNED UP." Mr. Baker says, "Well, I'll tell you, Lord, I'm going to squeeze Jerusalem by and I'm going to get Palestine out of it. I know that's a big fire, but I'm going to save Jerusalem and Palestine because I've got to have some place for my thousand years' reign. For I've affirmed with Rogers in debate that it'll be in Jerusalem."

By the way, while we're upon that point, what has my worthy opponent said about Jesus being the seed of Coniah, and that the Bible says the seed of Coniah could not "prosper anymore seated upon David's throne and ruling in Judah"? What did you say about that? The Bible teaches distinctly that Jesus cannot reign in Jerusalem—in Judah—and prosper. For the Bible says that he is of the seed of Coniah (Matt. 1:12-13; Lk. 3:27). Jesus is the seed of Coniah. But the seed of Coniah cannot rule and prosper in Judah. It doesn't say he can't rule. It doesn't say he can't prosper. But he can't do it in Judah. He may do it in heaven as we've already suggested and emphasized time and time again. But he's not going to do it upon the earth at the Second Coming, as Mr. Baker has so effectively pointed out from 2 Pet. 3. For then will come the end and the world will be destroyed, not a thousand years' reign in Jerusalem like his theory has it. Not at all.

But he referred to Paul (2 Tim. 4:6-8) and said that he would receive the crown that the Lord will give to those that love his appearing. Then to 1 Pet. 5:4, "When the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away. I suppose therefore, that since the Bible says that at the Second Coming of Christ we will receive



a crown of life—therefore the Kingdom will be established at the Second Coming of Christ and he will reign for a thousand years in Jerusalem! That doesn't have one thing on earth, Mr. Baker, to do with your proposition. It doesn't touch it top, edge, side, or bottom.

And that covers everything that my opponent has said with the exception that he mentioned the thousand years in connection with 2 Pet. 3 and said that it will be on the new earth. Now, he may have slipped, but that is the expression that he made a moment ago, that the thousand years will be upon the new earth after this one is destroyed. There'll be a new Jerusalem. He's shaking his head and saying that he didn't say it. Well Peter did—(That is, he said there will be a new heavens and a new earth after the Second Coming.) If it's all right with Peter, it's all right with me. (2 Pet. 3:13).

So that covers every passage, every Scripture, that my opponent has introduced since this debate began. I haven't let one argument go by. I haven't let one Scripture slip that I haven't examined carefully and prayerfully in your presence to see whether or not they teach the things that Mr. Baker tries to prove. I have proven to you from the Book of God that he is wrong at every point in these propositions that we have been discussing.

How much time do I have left?

Moderator Davis: "You have about six minutes."

Mr. Rogers continues: Thank you.

I wish to go back and review the arguments that I made concerning the Kingdom that he has never even mentioned much less attempted to answer.

Remember in Mk. 9:1 Jesus said, "Verily I say unto you, there be some here of them that stand by that shall not taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power." Here we find the Kingdom of God was to come with power. In Acts 1:8 Jesus said, "The power will come with the Spirit." But in Acts 2:1-4 we find that upon the day of Pentecost the apostles were "all filled with the Holy Spirit." But the Bible says the power will come with the Spirit. The power then came on Pentecost. But the Kingdom is to come with the power. The power came on Pentecost, therefore the Kingdom came on Pentecost. What has he said about it?

You'll remember that I emphasized that Jesus said, "It's at hand." John preached the same thing. And Jesus said,

"You'll not die till that thing comes to pass. You'll see it." There were certain ones that were to see it besides Peter, James, and John. You never answered that argument either. The Kingdom was to come with power, the power with the Spirit. The Spirit came on Pentecost; therefore the Spirit the power and the Kingdom a! I came at the same time.

I emphasized that before Pentecost the Kingdom was future. But after that Paul says that we are in the Kingdom (Col. 1:13). John said, "I'm in the Kingdom" (Rev. 1:9). Mr. Baker says, "You're not! The Kingdom has not been established and will not be until the Second Coming." Heb. 12:28, "Wherefore receiving a Kingdom . . ." That's present tense. "We receiving it . . ." He hasn't dealt with it. Acts 17:7 Paul preached another "King, one Jesus."

And the same Bible teaches in 1 Tim. 6:14-15 that he IS the King of kings and the Lord of lords. He has a Kingdom. It came on Pentecost. And Mr. Baker's proposition is altogether wrong.

I pointed out that the house of God would be established in the last days when the Word of God went out of Zion and the law of Jehovah from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:2-4). I pointed out that that happened on the day of Pentecost, and that the Kingdom of God began then. It was in the last days (Acts 2:16). It was when all nations were involved (Lk. 24:47). It began in Jerusalem upon that day of Pentecost after the ascension of Christ. Yet my opponent hasn't even dealt with the argument.

I also pointed out that Peter said in Acts 2 that Jesus had received the promise that the Holy Spirit made when he suggested that he should receive the throne of David. Jesus has received that promise. And therefore he's on David's throne according to Peter. But he hasn't dealt with it.

Then I pointed out also from Rev. 3:7 that He hath the key of David. He said, "Well, he has the key of death and Hades, but he hasn't used it." I suppose that he meant by that that Jesus has the key of David, but that he hasn't used it. We!!, last night you said he doesn't have it, but he WILL have it. Now you say he does have it, but he hasn't used it!! You were wrong either last night or tonight. To use the key of David means that he is to have the power of David. But what is the power of David? The government!

To have the key of David means to have the government of David committed upon one (Isa. 22:21). So Jesus has the government. And the Bible says that he's ruling. (Psa. 110:1-4; Acts 2:33). He's ruling and exercising the power that he has. What has he said about it?

Remember also I pointed out that Jesus is ruling now. Psa. 110:1-4, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the days of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Jesus was to be ruling in the midst of his enemies at the time that he's at God's right hand. Yet the Bible says in Acts 2:33 that he was at God's right hand on Pentecost. Therefore he was ruling on Pentecost. But that passage also says that he is to be ruling when he's priest after the order of Melchizedek. He admits that he is priest after the order of Melchizedek now. And therefore he's ruling now. He has yielded up his entire proposition.

And then I pointed out that Christ is to rule while he is sitting. This is the point that I brought out in connection with the binding of Satan. He said when Christ is ruling then Satan is bound. We find in Zech. 6:13 that he is to be a priest upon his throne and he is to sit and rule upon the throne. The Bible says that he is priest now. Therefore he's on his throne now. But since he is on his throne now, and since he's to rule upon his throne he's ruling now. Then the devil is bound. And the Bible also indicates to us that Jesus is ruling, that he is reigning. Mr. Baker cannot successfully deny it. He hasn't dealt with the arguments that have been brought forward.

Then we come to Daniel's vision. I pointed out that Jesus referred to that when he said that he was going to a far country to receive for himself a Kingdom and to return (Lk. 19:11-12). And "having received it" he returns (Lk. 19:15). Mr. Baker teaches that he will come to the earth and then get it, that the Kingdom will not be set up until after the Second Coming of Christ. He gets it before that time! He gets it when he ascends in the clouds of heaven. He did that in Acts 1:9-11. And Peter says that he had that power in Acts 2:33.

Now it seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that the pro-

position is clear, that the arguments are clear. You need to go home and study your Bible and see just exactly what it does teach upon these sacred things. We love the truth. I'm interested in the truth. I love Mr. Baker and I'm not angry with him one bit. I haven't been since this debate began. But in pressing these issues I'm aware of this: I have an obligation to you and to my God, you must see the truth! I cannot allow error to be taught and not press the issue. I haven't attempted to be rude or ugly to him in any way. I wasn't intending to be. But I have pressed the issue. I've taken up every passage of Scripture that the man has introduced and I have shown beyond the possibility of a doubt that they do not teach what he says. It seems to me that you ought to be willing to accept the truth. He suggested to you last night that you ought to accept the Bible. And I leave you with that prayer tonight that you'll do what the Bible says. (Time called.) I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

### CONCLUSION

Mr. Elmer Shaver: Brother Moderator, it has been suggested that as to the statement that Mr. Rogers made last night, whether he did make it or didn't make it. Brother Baker says he did. We are to play the record to see. Our debate is through otherwise. We'll play, we will have prayer and announcements and dismiss. Brother Phillips do you have that? (the recording).

At this point Mr. Baker withdrew his request that the tape be played. Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Rogers if that would be all right with him. Mr. Rogers replied that he knew what he had said and inasmuch as it would appear in the book for all to read who might be interested it would be all right not to play the tape. The controverted statement may be found on pages 202 and 227.