

Religious Debate
on Pentecostal
Doctrine

between

Elmer Moore

&

D.L. Welch

**RELIGIOUS DEBATE
ON
PENTECOSTAL DOCTRINE**

**Elmer Moore --- Church Of Christ
D.L. Welch --- United Pentecostal Church**

RELIGIOUS DEBATE

Elmer Moore, Christian D.L. Welch, Pentecostal

8:00pm

D. E. R. A. Building (Across from DuPont Plant)

Orange, Texas

MARCH 15-20, 1965

These are the rules and propositions for the debate. They were debated in order of occurrence.

1. The Scriptures teach that there are three persons in the Godhead; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Moore Affirms.

2. The Scriptures teach that there is only one person in the Godhead and that person is Jesus.

Mr. Welch Affirms

3. The Scriptures teach that a baptismal formula must be said when one is baptized and the only name to use in the formula is the name of Jesus.

Mr. Welch Affirms

4. The Scriptures do not teach that a baptismal formula must be said; and we are at liberty to use the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in scriptural statements when one is baptized.

Mr. Moore Affirms

5. The Scriptures teach that Holy Spirit Baptism has ceased and no one today is receiving the Holy Spirit in the baptismal form.

Mr. Moore affirms

6. The Scriptures teach that men are being baptized in the Holy Spirit as were the apostles on the day of Pentecost.

Mr. Welch Affirms

The Rules

1. Time and place to be agreed on.
2. Speakers to be ruled by Hedges Logic.
3. Five written questions may be submitted each night before the session begins. (At least ten minutes before the session begins)
4. Either debater may publish the debates in written form provided it is published as delivered: without any addition or subtraction from the original speech

TABLE OF CONTENT

GODHEAD DEBATE

Part One: Three Persons In Godhead – Monday Night

Moore's First Affirmative -----	-----	001
The Proposition And Definition Of Terms-----	--	001
Welch's Questions -----	--	004
Admission Of Facts -----	--	005
Method For Sustaining Proposition -----	--	006
Ten Absurdities If Not A Plurality In Godhead----		006
The Mediator-Ship Of Christ -----		009
Mediator Defined -----		010
Father, Son and Holy Spirit -----		012
Summary -----		014
End Of Speech -----		015

Welch's First Negative -----	-----	016
Persons or Beings -----		016
Rebuttal To Mediator-Ship -----		018
Rebuttal To Absurdities -----		019
Moore's Questions To Welch -----		021
My Father Is Greater Than I -----		022
The Holy Spirit – Sending-----		023
Isaiah Passages -----		024
End Of Speech -----		026

Part Two: Three Persons In Godhead

Moore's Second Affirmative -----	-----	027
Questions Four and Five Not Answered -----		027
One Person of God -----		028
God Sent Forth His Son -----		028
Job 13:8 -----		029
Mediatorship of Christ -----		030
The Trinity Doctrine -----		031

Isaiah 44:24 -----	031
Seen Me, Seen The Father -----	032
In The Days of His Flesh-----	034
Ephesians 4:6, “One God and Father”-----	034
Answers To Questions -----	035
Husband and Wife -----	037
Father and Son -----	038
Isaiah Passages -----	039
Philippians 2 “Name above Every Name”-----	040
reducto ad absurdem -----	040
End Of Speech -----	041

Welch’s Second Negative -----	042
Questions 4 and 5 -----	042
John 12:44-45 “God Sending His Son” -----	042
Mediator-ship -----	043
Matthew 11:27 -----	044
The Word “Both” -----	045
Fused Together -----	046
Husband and Wife Relationship -----	047
Isaiah Passages On One God -----	048
End Of Speech -----	052

End Of First Proposition

Part Three: One Person In Godhead – Tuesday Night

Welch’s First Affirmative -----	053
Proposition Defined -----	053
Proof Argument -----	054
Answers To Moore’s Questions -----	054
Will Christ Appear in Bodily Form?-----	055
Godhead Bodily -----	057
Some Historical Facts -----	059
The Trinity Doctrine -----	060
Catholic Faith on Trinity -----	060

Jesus The Almighty-	061
The Mystery Hidden	062
End Of Speech	062

Moore's First Negative	063
Double Talk	063
The Law of Rationality-	064
Absurdities of the Oneness Doctrine	065
Questions Mr. Welch Has Asked	066
Definition of Person	068
Answers To Moore's Question.....	069
The Words Both and Also	072
The United Pentecostal Manual.....	073
Catholics catechism vs. the Pentecostals Manual	074
"Let Us Make Man"	075
" God was in Christ"	077
End Of Speech	078

Part Four: One Person In Godhead – Tuesday Night

Welch's Second Affirmative	079
Both and Also	079
Two Witnesses	079
Everlasting Father	080
Husband Of The Church	080
"Is The Holy Ghost The Spirit Of Christ?".....	080
Mediator-ship	081
Psalms 17:15 "In His Likeness"	083
The Holy One	083
One God. Isaiah 45:21	086
Philippians 2:8-9 "Highly Exalted"	087
The Pentecostal Manual	088
End Of Speech	089

Moore's Second Negative -----	-----	090
No Person In Old Testament? -----	-----	090
The Word "One" -----	-----	090
Both and Also -----	-----	092
Two Definitions On Person -----	-----	093
The Husband Of The Church -----	-----	094
Everlasting Father -----	-----	094
Spirit Of Christ -----	-----	095
The Resurrection of Jesus -----	-----	096
Joint Action -----	-----	096
The Mediator-Ship -----	-----	097
Contrast of Priesthood of Christ And Aaron -----	-----	098
Did Deity Die When Christ Died? -----	-----	099
Matter Of Implication -----	-----	099
The Son Reveals The Father -----	-----	100
Two Natures Of Christ -----	-----	101
John 14:6-9 -----	-----	102
The First And The Last -----	-----	103
Humanity Blended With Divinity -----	-----	103
End Of Speech -----	-----	104

BAPTISMAL FORMULA DEBATE

Part One: Formula For Baptism – Wednesday Night

Welch's First Affirmative -----	-----	105
Proposition Defined -----	-----	105
God's Name Is Reverend -----	-----	106
Questions For Mr. Moore -----	-----	107
Jesus, The Everlasting Father -----	-----	107
Questions For Mr. Welch -----	-----	107
Proverbs 30:4: "What Is His Name" -----	-----	109
Matthew 1:21 "Sons Name Is Jesus" -----	-----	109
The Highest Name -----	-----	110
Matthew 12:21 "Include Gentiles" -----	-----	111

Baptism Argument -----	111
The Day Of Pentecost -----	111
The Samaritans -----	112
Cornelius' Conversion -----	112
Saul's Conversion -----	113
Husband And Wife Relationship -----	113
Three Witness -----	115
Hated For My Names Sake -----	115
End Of Speech -----	116

Moore's First Negative -----	-----	117
Proposition Not Properly Defined -----	-----	117
"Still Discussing Godhead" -----	-----	118
Blunders And Absurdities -----	-----	118
Welch vs. Welch -----	-----	119
Welch's Questions -----	-----	119
Formula Not Defined -----	-----	120
Hedge's Rules of Controversy -----	-----	120
Proposition: "A Formula Must Be Said" -----	-----	121
Name Of The Father -----	-----	121
Name Is Reverent -----	-----	122
Everlasting Name -----	-----	122
The Word "Name" -----	-----	123
Names Of The Son Of God -----	-----	123
Answers to Moore's Questions -----	-----	124
No Titles Allowed In Formula -----	-----	126
Names -----	-----	126
Acts Chapter 4 -----	-----	127
Parallel Passages; Luke 24; Mat 28; Mrk 16-----	-----	128
Liberties Taken On Text In Paul's Conversion --	-----	129
Wearing the Name Of Christ -----	-----	129
None applicable -----	-----	130
What Is The Formula? -----	-----	130
Three different Propositions -----	-----	131

End Of Speech -----	131
Welch's Second Affirmative -----	----- 132
Names Of God -----	132
Welch's Questions To Moore -----	134
Historical Facts About Trinity Baptism -----	135
Proverbs 30:4 "What is his name?" -----	137
"Jesus Is The Holy Spirit?" -----	138
Apostles Baptism -----	138
Conversion Of Saul -----	140
Conversion Of The Gentile, Cornelious -----	141
Acts 19:1-6 "12 Disciples of John" -----	141
Christ Is The Husband Of The Church -----	142
Baptized Into Christ -----	143
End Of Speech -----	144
Moore's Second Negative -----	----- 145
The Affirmative's Proposition Not Defined? -	145
A Challenge -----	146
Baptism Passages Have Titles In Them --	147
Philippians 2:8-9: Highest Name -----	147
Ephesians 1:19: Power, Rule, Authority --	148
Argues Everything But The Proposition -----	150
No Formula Found In The New Testament --	150
Proposition: "Scriptures Teach" -----	151
The Manual -----	151
Proverbs 30:4 Implies Two -----	152
Colossians 1 And First John 4 -----	152
Baptized into somebody -----	153
Name And Authority Not From Same Word --	154
The Word Trinitarian -----	154
Acts 2:38: Baptized Into One Being -----	154
No Mention Of Authority -----	155
Acts 19:1-6: A Contrast -----	156

Church And Husband -----	157
Baptized Into Him -----	157
The Formula -----	158
The Name JESUS -----	159
End Of Speech -----	159
Preview For The Next Proposition -----	160

Part Three: No Set Formula In Baptism - Thursday

Moore's First Affirmative-----	-----	161
Proposition and Terms Defined -----	161	
Clarifying Statements Of Proposition -----	162	
Possible Ways Of Refuting My Argument --	162	
Welch's Questions -----	162	
Absurdities, Contradictions, and Blunders --	164	
First Affirmative Arguments -----	165	
Mt. 28:18-20, Mk. 16:15-16 Lk. 24:46-48 -----	165	
"Baptism In The Name Of Jesus" -----	167	
A Contrast -----	168	
Matthew 28.18-19.-----	169	
What Baptism Requires -----	169	
What Baptism Does Not Require -----	171	
Second Timothy 4:2 -----	172	
In conclusion: -----	172	
End Of Speech -----	173	
 Welch's First Negative-----	 -----	 174
Is Baptism in Jesus Name Or Trinity? -----	174	
Discussion Of Questions To Moore -----	174	
Woman Takes Husband's Name -----	176	
Use Of Name In Baptism Vs. Church Name -----	176	
Thayer's Chart (The Word "In") -----	177	
The Contrast Of Acts 19 -----	178	
First Corinthians 1:12 -----	179	
Authority -----	179	

Would Become A Catholic -----	180
Baptismal Formulas -----	180
Catholic Encyclopedia And Trinity Doctrine --	181
Commission Of Matthew 28:19 -----	181
Conversion Of The Samaritans -----	182
Point Of Order -----	182
Answer To Questions -----	182
Acts 10: Gentile Conversion -----	184
Do All In The Name Of Jesus -----	184
Husband, Wife Question -----	185
Moore Challenged To Produce Instance Of Trinity Baptism -----	186
End Of Speech -----	187

Part Four: No Set Formula In Baptism - Thursday

Moore's Second Affirmative -----	-----	188
Comments On Welch's speech -----	188	
The Godhead -----	188	
Welch's Questions -----	189	
Rule, Power, Authority, Dominion And Name----	190	
Philippians 2:5-10: Every Knee Should Bow -	190	
Isaiah 63:2"Everlasting Name"-----	191	
What Is A Scriptural Baptism? -----	192	
The Church Name -----	193	
Welch On Thayer -----	193	
The Lord's Names -----	194	
Title And Name -----	195	
Contrast In Acts 19:1-5. -----	196	
Parallel Passages: Mt. 28, Lk. 24 , Mk. 16 --	197	
Trinity Formula -----	198	
The Encyclopedias -----	198	
Trinity Named: Acts 2:22-23 -----	199	
Examples -----	199	
Moore's Questions To Welch -----	199	

Husband Wife Relationship	-----	201
Not Ashamed Of His Name	-----	202
Closing Remarks	-----	202
End Of Speech	-----	203

Welch's Second Negative	-----	-----	204
The Highest Name Is Jesus	-----	204	
Philippians 2:8-10 Revisited	-----	205	
Acts 9 Revisited	-----	205	
Proverbs 18:10 Revisited	-----	206	
Moore And Catholicism	-----	206	
Adam Type of Christ; Eve Type of The Church	--	207	
Names	-----	208	
Baptism	-----	208	
"Name Does Not Mean Authority"	-----	209	
Galatians 3:27: Not Into Trinity	-----	209	
Philippians 2:10 Revisited	-----	210	
Trinity Baptism In Encyclopedia Not Bible	--	211	
The Samaritans Revisited	-----	212	
Gentile's Conversion Revisited	-----	212	
Back To Paul's Conversion	-----	213	
Acts 19 "The 12 Disciples" Revisited	-----	214	
Closing Appeal	-----	214	
End Of Speech	-----	215	
Preview of the Next Debate	-----	216	

HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM DEBATE

Part One: Holy Spirit Baptism Has Ceased - Friday

Moore's First Affirmative	-----		217
Proposition And Terms Defined	-----	217	
Filled With The Spirit Is Not Holy Spirit Baptism	--	218	
Manner Of Establishing The Proposition	--	219	
Welch's Questions	-----	219	

“To Whom Was The Promise Made Concerning Holy Spirit Baptism” -----	221
Holy Spirit Promised To The Apostles Only --	221
The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism-----	222
Purpose Was To Empower Apostles --	223
Cornelius An Exception -----	224
Fulfillment Of Holy Spirit Baptism -----	225
Inspiration -----	227
The Duration Of Spiritual Gifts -----	228
Duration Of Holy Spirit Baptism -----	229
Summary -----	230
End Of Speech -----	230

Welch’s First Negative----- 231

Answers To Moore’s Questions -----	231
Two Elements In Holy Spirit Baptism -----	232
The Comforter-----	233
About The Holy Spirit Teaching Or Revealing	234
John The Baptist? -----	234
The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Challenged -----	234
Two Elements Of New Birth -----	234
Philip In Samaria -----	237
Direct Operation Of Holy Spirit -----	237
Still Referencing The Samaritans -----	237
The Twelve Disciples Of John, Acts 19 -----	238
Duration Argument Refuted -----	239
On The Word “Perfect” -----	240
Laying On Of Hands -----	241
End Of Speech -----	243

Part Two: Holy Spirit Baptism has ceased - Friday

Moore’s Second Affirmative----- 244

Who Has The Holy Spirit? -----	244
Answers To Moore’s Questions -----	244

Baptism With Fire (Mt. 3:11) -----	246
Direct Operation -----	247
On The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism: --	248
Gifts Of The Spirit: -----	249
Measure Of Holy Spirit: -----	250
Differences In The Gifts Of The Holy Spirit: --	250
Laying On Of Hands -----	252
Saul's Conversion In Acts 9: -----	253
The New Birth -----	254
Critique Welch's Reasoning Procedure: --	255
Mediator-Ship Of Christ -----	256
Being filled With The Spirit -----	256
Laying On Of Hands -----	257
Summary Of Speech -----	257
End Of speech -----	260
Welch's Second Negative-----	261
Cessation of Holy Spirit Baptism -----	261
Johns Baptism -----	261
The Comforter Promised -----	262
Describing Events On Day Of Pentecost --	263
Prophecy Of Joel Fulfilled? -----	264
The Kingdom Is Set Up -----	264
Cornelius Was Baptized By Holy Spirit -----	266
The Door Of Faith Opened To The Gentiles --	266
The Samaritans: A Dilemma For Moore --	267
The 12 Disciples Of John -----	268
That Which Is Perfect -----	270
Church And Kingdom Are Synonymous --	271
Two Parts Of Birth -----	271
Holy Spirit In Those Before Pentecost -----	272
End Of Speech -----	273
End of Proposition -----	274

Part Three: Holy Spirit Baptism Still - Saturday

Welch's First Affirmative -----	275
The Proposition -----	275
Answers To Moore's Questions -----	276
Welch's Questions To Moore -----	277
Baptize And Born Is Synonymous -----	277
Holy Spirit Promised -----	279
Two Ways Things Can Be Sent -----	279
Christ Came As the Comforter -----	279
The Establishment Of The Kingdom -----	280
The 120 In An Upper Room -----	282
On Pentecost-----	281
Water And Spirit -----	283
The 12 Disciples Of John -----	284
The Spirit And The Church -----	286
Speaking In An Unknown Tongue -----	287
End Of Speech -----	287
Moore's First Negative -----	288
Reply To Welch's Questions -----	288
Summary Of debate Thus Far -----	289
Definition Of Person -----	289
One God Argument -----	290
On Water Baptism -----	290
On the Baptism Of The Holy Spirit -----	291
Ten Blunders And Absurdities -----	291
Distinctions Regarding The Spirit -----	294
Welch Versus God -----	295
Baptism And "To Be Born" Are Synonymous --	296
Answers To Moore's Questions -----	297
Nicodemis And The New Birth -----	299
Baptism Of Holy Spirit And Fire -----	300
Holy Spirit Baptism And Receiving Holy Spirit --	300
Direct Operation Of Holy Spirit -----	301

Indwelling Of The Spirit	-----	302
Worship In Spirit	-----	303
Luke 24 And the 120 Of Acts 1	-----	303
The Word "Gift"	-----	304
Unknown Tongues	-----	305
Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism	-----	305
End Of Speech	-----	306

Part Four: Receiving Holy Spirit Baptism Still

Welch's Second Affirmative	-----	-----	307
Refutation That Holy Spirit Baptism Ceased	-----		307
Word, Water And The New Birth	-----		307
Greek Words Meaning Gift	-----		308
Receiving The Holy Ghost	-----		313
Baptism Of Holy Spirit Will Never Cease	-----		314
That Which Is Perfect, 1Cor. 13	-----		315
Must Be Baptized In Water And Spirit	-----		316
Ordination And Recognition	-----		317
Praying In An Unknown Tongue	-----		319
End Of Speech	-----		319

Moore's Second Negative	-----	-----	320
Ananias Laying Hands On Paul	-----		320
Moore's Imagination Read From The Book	-----		322
Full Of The Holy Spirit (Acts 6)	-----		323
The Bible Written By The Holy Spirit	-----		324
Born Of Water And Spirit	-----		324
Moses And The Israelites	-----		325
Cornelius' Conversion	-----		328
Direct Operation Of The Spirit	-----		331
Compiling The New Testament	-----		333
Closing Remarks	-----		335

End Of Speech

336

End Of Debate

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

Godhead Debate: Part One-A

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen both of the audience here and of the radio audience and Mr. Welch. I assure you that it is with a great deal of humility that I stand before you at this time, in the presence of such a huge listening audience, to discuss with you these matters that I believe to be the truth. I want in the outset of the discussion to express my personal appreciation for the vote of confidence on the part of brethren here in asking me to take part in this discussion. I want to express my appreciation to those of you in the audience who are present to listen. It’s certainly a pleasure to be associated with Mr. Welch in this discussion. Several years back I met Mr. Welch, not in debate? I heard him in debate. I learned to appreciate him then as a debater, and I still have that respect and appreciation for him as a disputant. We don’t agree on this proposition; there are some things that we agree on, but I have respect and appreciation for him and I want you to know that and I want him to know it. I have no personal animosity toward him whatsoever and the things that I’ll be discussing this evening and, the Lord willing, throughout this week will not be things personally to injure Mr. Welch but will have to do with doctrinal difference. I respect the Pentecostal people because you have conviction, far to many religious people lack the conviction that you manifest in being willing to discuss these matters publicly. I appreciate having you in the audience and I know that we’ll have a good discussion.

The Proposition And Definition Of Terms

I want at this time to read the proposition and define the terms as clearly as I know how. Then I want to answer some questions that Mr. Welch has given me. I would answer them now, except that I believe that a definition of the proposition is in order before I present an answer to the questions. The proposition is as follows: “The Scriptures teach that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” Being in the affirmative I’m obligated to give a clear definition of the precise terms that are involved in the proposition. By teach I mean to

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

say in so many words, either by command, approved example or necessary inference. Not that I can read the exact statement of my proposition. Could I do that it would not be a debatable one, but that the Bible sustains the truth of my proposition. By three I mean one more than two and one less than four. By persons I mean beings, existing individuals. I want at this time to call your attention to a chart that is on the board and I’ll try to describe the chart in such a manner that those who are listening in the radio audience will be able to grasp the discussion.

Person:

The word person is on the following chart and is a very significant word as will be seen in the process of this discussion, and I want you to know in the outset what I mean by it. The word person is defined to mean, “in theology, a term applied to each of the three beings in the Godhead.” This definition is taken from Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary, page 1219. Again, one of the three individuals in the Triune God.

Chart 1 ----- PERSON-----
Def. “In theology, a term applied to each of the three beings in the Godhead” Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary Pg 1219
Being: “Existence in the widest sense, anything or everything that is, that exists in actuality” Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary Pg 159
Person: “Existing Individuality”

You will note that I have the word “being” also defined on the chart #1, inasmuch as the word “being” occurs in the first definition. The word being is an English word and is defined to mean “existence in the widest

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

sense, anything or everything that is. Also anything or everything that exist in actuality, has existed or may exist or may be conceived.” Webster’s Dictionary page 159. Observe then, by the word person I mean, as it is used in my proposition, simply “an existing individuality.” Make a note of that because that’s what I mean by the term person. By the term Godhead I mean deity, the state of being God. By Father, Son, and Holy Spirit I mean that these are the three existing beings or individuals. Hence, in substance then, very briefly, I am affirming that the Bible teaches that there are three existing beings or individuals in deity, and that they are the Son, the Holy Spirit, and the Father. I want to further clarify the issue. You know to clarify the issue is very vital in any discussion and it is in the discussion this evening. I want you to know exactly what I am affirming and what I am not affirming. I’m not affirming that there are three Gods. I do not believe this; I have never believed it. My brethren do not believe there are three Gods. I believe that there is only one God. To attribute to my brethren and me a belief in three Gods is to act in a fashion that’s contrary to rules of honorable controversy.

I am not affirming, observe closely, that there are now or that there ever were three human beings in deity. I am not affirming this. What I am affirming: I want you to note this closely, I am affirming and I believe with all of my heart that these three are one. That they are one in work, that they are one in plan, that they are one in doctrines, that they are one in protection and that they are plural in person. Note if you will this chart.

Chart 2 THE ISSUE
<u>IT IS NOT:</u>
1. That There Are Three Gods 2. That There Are Three Human Beings In The Godhead.
<u>IT IS:</u> “THERE ARE THREE EXISTING INDIVIDUALS IN DEITY”

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

In an effort to clarify the issue I want to keep this before you, what the issue is and what the issue is not. It is not that there are three Gods. That is not what I am affirming. It is not that there are three human beings in the Godhead, I do not believe this. It is that there are three existing individualities in deity. I want at this time, before I go any further, to take up the questions that Mr. Welch has handed me, and answer them.

Welch’s Questions

- (1) “Is God the Father invisible?”

In Colossians the first chapter and verse 15 we are told that he is, that Jesus is the express image of the invisible God. So my answer is yes.

- (2) “Is the Holy Ghost the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ?”

Now, words will have a very definite bearing in this discussion, and it is important to know what is meant by a term. There is an expression known as ambiguity, which means that a word may be used by me to mean one thing and by Mr. Welch to mean something else. That’s why I’ve taken the time to define the term person as I have. So, it depends on what’s meant by the term Holy Ghost. Observe if you will, I recognize that Jesus possessed a spirit and it certainly was holy and not evil. So if you mean by that; was the Holy Spirit, as it occurs in my proposition, the spirit of Jesus then of course I’m denying that. So it depends on what’s meant by that term. Certainly Jesus had a spirit and it was holy.

- (3) “Could God the Father, who is omnipresent, send someone on a mission and at the same time go with the one he sends?”

In the first place the discussion this evening is not a question over what God could or could not do. The power of God is not under consideration. That isn’t the question involved in the discussion. It’s not a question of what God could do; it’s a question of what he did do. But I want you to note the wording of this question. If this were so it would not sustain Mr. Welch’s contention, but rather mine. I

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

want you to note what he says. “And at the same time go with the one that’s sent.” Do you know what the word “with” means? It means in the company of. And so the very wording of the question itself indicates a plurality of beings or individualities.

- (4) “The Bible says that the man, Christ Jesus, is the mediator between God and man. Did he finish his work at Calvary or is he still interceding to God the Father on behalf of men?”

In Heb. 7:25, the writer affirms: “Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that drew near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.”

- (5) “Can the person Jesus Christ be seen bodily now?”

I don’t know Mr. Welch. In 1John 3:2, (in a moment I want to talk about this matter of knowledge) John affirms, “Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is.” John said we don’t yet know, so I don’t know whether he can be seen or not, but there is one thing I do know because the Bible teaches it, I know that he was seen when he ascended, Acts 1:11. The Bible affirms in Rev.1: 7 that he will be seen when he returns. I trust that that will suffice as an answer to the question.

Admission Of Facts

There are certain facts that I want to admit at the outset of the discussion. I do this that you can see that if these matters are brought up they are completely irrelevant. They are immaterial so far as the discussion is concerned. Observe if you will. I freely admit and recognize that the Bible ascribes deity to all the persons in the Godhead. The Bible affirms that the Holy Spirit is God. Acts 5:3-4. The Bible further affirms that the Son is God, (Hebrews 1: 8). Observe that the Father is said to be God. John 6:27. Here is another fact that I want to admit in the very outset of the discussion. I’m mindful of the fact that the adjective holy is applied to all three persons in the Godhead. For instance, in Acts 5:3-4, the Spirit is said to be holy. In the second place, in John 17: 11, the

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

Father is said to be holy. “Holy Father, keep them in thy name...” The Son is called holy in Acts 5: 30, “Signs done in the name of the holy Servant Jesus.” So these facts are admitted in the very outset of the discussion.

Method For Sustaining Proposition

I want to suggest to you how that I propose to sustain my proposition. I will divide it into two categories. I want first of all to suggest to you that the Bible demands a plurality of beings in deity or in the Godhead that there must be a plurality. I then shall proceed to show that this plurality consists of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit.

Ten Absurdities If Not A Plurality In Godhead

I want to show, first of all, that a failure to recognize that a plurality exist in the Godhead will reduce the Bible to an absurdity and do away with the mediator-ship of Jesus Christ. I want now to present ten arguments that are referred to as “Reducto ad-absurdum.” This is a figure that simply means a process by which a position is shown to be absurd. I want by this process to show that for one to argue that there is not a plurality of beings in the Godhead would reduce the Bible to an absurdity.

- (1) Observe now, in the first place, in Matt. 1:18-20, we have this reading, “Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise: When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph. Before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit. An angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream saying Joseph fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit.” Now observe if you will. The passage affirms that Jesus was conceived of the Holy Spirit. If Jesus and the Holy Spirit are one and the same person, then he conceived himself.
- (2) In the second place, in Luke 1:32, the record says, “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David.” Now if you will. The Most High, or Father, promised to give unto the Son the

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

throne of his father David. In the second place, if the Father and the Son Jesus are one and the same person, then Jesus is going to give the throne to himself. But now observe. If they are all the same person it would have been needless for him to have given the throne to himself, for he would have already possessed it.

- (3) In the third place, in John 12:49, Jesus affirms, “For I spoke not from myself, but the Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.” Now ladies and gentlemen, if the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying, “I don’t say what I want to say, I told myself what I should say, and what I should speak.”
- (4) Note further in connection with this, in Matt.26:39, “And went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed saying, My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.” Now notice, if the Father and the Son are one and the same person, the following would be true: Jesus went out and prayed to himself, he told himself that he did not want to do what he wanted himself to do, but that he just wanted to do what he wanted himself to do.
- (5) Note if you will in, Mark 13:32 the record affirms, “But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Now note if you will. If the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying that here is something that he did know, but that he didn’t know.
- (6) In John 14:28, “Ye have heard me and how I said, I go away and I come unto you. If ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced, because I go unto the Father, for the Father is greater than I.” If the Father and the Son are the same person, then Jesus was going to himself because he was greater than himself.
- (7) In 1Cor. 15:24-29 , “then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even to the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

abolished is death. For he hath put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith all things are put into subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did put all things under him. When all things have been subjected to him, then shall the Son also be subjected to him, that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all,” Now watch this. The Son is going to deliver the kingdom to the Father. Secondly, someone has put all things under his feet. Thirdly, the one who put all things under his feet was excepted, in that he was not put under his feet. Fourth, after all things have been subdued by Jesus, he himself will be subjected to the one who put all things under his feet. And this was done that God may be all in all. Now I want you to consider this, ladies and gentlemen. If the Father and the Son are one and the same, then Paul is saying Jesus was going to deliver the kingdom to himself, that he put all things under his feet, that he excepted himself so he hath not control over himself, and that when he hath subjected all things to himself, he’ll then control himself. This he’s going to do that he may be all in all.

- (8) Observe Luke 23:46, “And Jesus crying with a loud voice said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” If the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying unto himself, I commend myself into the hands of myself.
- (9) John 6:38, “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” Now notice if you will. If the Father and Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying I did not come to do my will. I just came to do mine own will.
- (10) Then in Hebrews 9:24. “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us.” Now notice. The Son entered heaven. To do this he left earth. He entered heaven to appear in the presence of the Father. Now consider if you will. If the Father and the Son are the same person, he left earth to appear in his own presence, which is unnecessary if he and the Father are one

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

and the same person, for he would have already been in his own presence.”

The Mediator-Ship Of Christ

The second argument that I want to advance concerns the mediator-ship of Christ. I want you to observe that this is a formulated argument:

First Timothy 2:5:

In 1Tim.2:5 the Bible affirms, “For there is one God, and one mediator between men and God, himself the man Christ Jesus.” Then note again if you will in Acts 17:25,26, “And he made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation.”

Galatians 3:20 “One God:

“Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one.” From these statements there are certain facts that are affirmed. The first one is this, that God is one. I’ve listed some 12 or so passages that I want to call your attention to that affirm that God is one, and every other passage that Mr. Welch can produce I’ll accept them also, without reservation. This is the list:

Deut. 6:4	Deu4:35	Deu 4:39	Isa.44:6	Isa.44:24	Isa55:18
Mal.2:10	1Kg 8:60	Mrk 12:29	Jn 10:30	I Cor.8:4	Jas 2:19

All of these passages unequivocally affirm that there is one God and that is what I believe. Now observe if you will, that not only does the Bible affirm that there is one God, ladies and gentlemen, but the Bible also affirms that there is one humanity.

Acts 17:26 “One Humanity:

In the passage that I read a moment ago in Acts 17:26, the apostle affirmed that “he made of one nation of men that dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

their habitations.” Then note again in connection with this, in Heb. 2:11, the writer affirms that he that is sanctified and he that sanctifieth are all of one, and the context indicates of ONE humanity. Observe if you will then, that the Bible teaches that there is but ONE humanity. There is one God and there is one humanity.

And that is what this verse affirms. Observe if you will, and I want to register this point: that if because the Bible ascribes deity to Jesus makes him all there is to deity, why would not the fact that the Bible ascribes humanity to Jesus prove that he was all that there was to humanity? Let Mr. Welch tell us about that. Note if you will, there is but one humanity, that is what the Bible teaches. Yet there is more than one person in humanity. The Bible affirms that Jews and Gentiles make up humanity. So, there is but one humanity and the Bible is just as emphatic on there being one humanity as it is about there being one God. And yet in one humanity there is more than one person. That also is true in regards to the one deity. There is one deity, yet there is more than one person in deity.

Mediator Defined

I want you to note in connection with the mediator-ship of Christ. I call your attention to chart #3 that I have here. And I’ll try to explain the chart so that the radio audience will be able to grasp what’s being said. In the first place I want to define what a mediator is, and I want to note this very clearly.

Chart 3

--Mediator--

Def. “One who intervenes between two, either in order to make or restore peace and friendship, or for ratifying a covenant”

Thayer Page 401

A mediator is said to be “one who intervenes between two, either in order to make or restore peace and friendship, or to form a contract, or for

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

ratifying a covenant.” This is taken from Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon on page 401 with reference to 1Tim.2:5. Thayer also said, with regards to a mediator, “every mediator, that is, whoever acts as a mediator does not belong to one party but to two or more.” And so the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is a proper mediator, that he sustains the right relationship because the Bible affirms that Jesus Christ is divine, that he is deity. In John 1:1-2, “In the beginning was the word and the word was with God, and the Word was God.” In Heb.1:8 the record says, “Thy throne O God.” And so the Bible tells us that Jesus Christ is God. But the Bible also affirms that Jesus Christ is human for in Heb. 2:14-18, the writer is talking about the humanity of Christ and the fact that Christ came in the flesh. In Heb.4:15 he makes this same affirmation. Note if you will, it was necessary for Christ to sustain the same relationship to both parties, that is, to deity and to humanity. Now observe the chart if you will, and I trust that everyone will be able to see it. The mediator-ship of Christ, 1Tim. 2:5. These are the passages that we talked about, and I cited many others that affirm this fact that there is one deity or one God. But just as surely, ladies and gentlemen, as the Bible affirms there is one God or one deity, that’s how surely that it affirms that there is one man or one humanity. I want you to grasp the significance of this, and I trust that Mr. Welch will come to grips on the mediator-ship of Christ, because I’m firmly convinced that to deny plurality of persons in the Godhead would do away with the mediator-ship of Christ. You watch and see. Just as the Bible affirms that there is one mediator. Now, watch this very closely. A mediator is not of one. Thayer says, not of one party. A mediator is one who interposes between two parties. Jesus sustains the right relationship to deity. He sustains the right relationship to humanity, and therefore occupies the right position of being a mediator. Here is something I want you to note. As the debate progresses tonight, and throughout the discussion, if you have difficulty in understanding how that there can be one God and yet three persons in God, or in deity; friends, just think about this; if you can understand how that it is possible for there to be one humanity, and yet there be more than one person in humanity; you

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

ought to be able to understand how there can be one God more than one being in the Godhead. I freely acknowledge the fact that there are many things that the Bible does not make known concerning the matter of God or deity. But there is enough revealed that I don’t have to take a position that would cause me to deny the mediator-ship of Christ. I want you to notice this. It was necessary, and you observe this very closely, it was necessary for Jesus to sustain the same relationship to both parties, to deity as well as to humanity for him to be a mediator. And that’s what this verse affirms. Now notice that the first party, if you please, is God and the second party is humanity; and the third party, the Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. And it’s utterly impossible for one to affirm there being only one person in the Godhead and at the same time the mediator-ship of Christ.

Father, Son and Holy Spirit

I want now to present an argument centered around the fact that this plurality consist of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. First of all, I suggest to you the three are often mentioned together. In John 15:26 Jesus said, “The comforter whom I will send from the Father.” The three are mentioned in John 14:16-17, “I will pray the Father, and he shall give another Comforter.” The three are mentioned, in Acts 10:38, “God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit.” The three are mentioned, in Eph.2:18 “Through him” (talking about Christ,) “Both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.”

Observe if you will that the Bible, as I have suggested to you earlier, ascribes deity to each of the three beings in the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is said to be God in Acts 5:3-4. The record affirms, “But Peter said, Ananias, why has Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit? Thou has not lied unto man, but unto God.” Not only does the Bible affirm that the Holy Spirit is God, but the Bible affirms that the Father is God. John 20:17, “I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and your God.” The Son is said to be God. Acts 7:59, “And they stoned Stephen,

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

calling upon God, and saying Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” I want you to note this. The Bible not only affirms that these three are God, but they are distinct, one from the other. Note if you will. The Holy Spirit is not the Father for the Bible says in John 14:15, “If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth. But the Comforter who is the Holy Ghost, which the Father will send in my name.” And so the Bible affirms that the Holy Spirit is God but that the Holy Spirit is not the Father. The Father is distinct from the Holy Spirit, in that he sends the Holy Spirit, so the Father is the sender and the Holy Spirit is the sent. Observe if you will. The Father is said to be God and yet the Father is not the Son. In I Peter 1:3 the record said, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” - the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In John 8:16, “And yet if I judge, my judgement is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.” Note the Father is distinct from the Son. Also Jesus said, “I and the Father that sent me.” The Son is said to be God. Acts 7:39, “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” But the Son is not the Holy Ghost for, in Acts 10:38 the record says that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power. And in John 15:26, “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceeded from the Father.” Note the Son distinct from the Holy Ghost, the Son is said to be anointed with the Holy Ghost, also that the Holy Ghost is sent by the Son.

I wanted to go through those for the sake of the radio audience and I want to call your attention to the chart where these same passages and the same argument is advanced. The Bible affirms, for instance, that the Father is God. But the Bible denies that the Father is the Son. I have Mr. Welch on this. I listened last week very closely to a debate that Mr. Welch had where he said that so far as the Father is concerned, “he has an invisible person; and the Son a visible one.” And so I have him that

Monday Night – Moore’s First Affirmative

the Father is not the Son in connection with that. And also on that same tape, I call your attention to the fact that he denied emphatically that the Holy Spirit was a person. So observe if you will. The Father has an invisible person, but the Holy Spirit is not a person. Therefore, the Father is not the Holy Spirit. So, not only do I prove it by Scriptures, but I prove it by my honorable opponent. Observe if you will, the Father is said to be God, but the Father is not the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is said to be God, but the Holy Spirit is not the Son. And the Son is said to be God, but the Son is not the Father. How much time do I have left? (Moderator: 3 Minutes)

Summary

All right. I want to summarize the things that have been suggested. I call your attention to the fact that there are certain things that we do not deny, that we freely admit; that there is but one God, I do not believe in three Gods. Now let me say this kindly. I certainly recognize that a man has the right to try to argue that I believe such. But to charge me with believing such is dishonorable. I do not believe it. Now, let Mr. Welch, if he affirms such, prove that my arguments necessarily reach that conclusion. Watch him as he deals with the matter of there being one humanity as well as there being one God. We freely admit and affirm and believe that there is but one God. Observe very closely as he comes to the stand and takes up these arguments that were presented, that reduces the Bible to an absurdity if one refuses to accept a plurality of persons in the God head. I want to suggest to you that this is not what is commonly referred to sometimes as a matched preaching affair. There maybe those in the audience who have never attended a debate before, I don't know. If that's the case, and I'm not saying this for Mr. Welch's benefit, but for your benefit, in a debate the negative is honor bound to take up the arguments that's been presented by the affirmative, and to examine them with fairness and candor. In the second place, in the mediator-ship of Christ, just as surely as the Bible affirms that there's one God, that's how surely that the Bible affirms that there is one humanity. And if there can be a plurality of persons in humanity, and still

Monday Night – Moore's First Affirmative

be one humanity; there can be a plurality of persons in God, and still be one God.

Let him deal with this when he comes to the stand and the fact that the Bible makes a clear distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I invite you to hear Mr. Welch.

The End of Speech

Godhead Debate: Part One-B

Mr. Moderators, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Moore. It is indeed with a sense of obedience to almighty God that I stand in your presence tonight in Orange, Texas, to engage in a Bible discussion in an investigation of Bible truth. And tonight, in as much as the greatest subject the Bible speaks of, that is, God Himself, is under consideration, I do feel a sense of humility and my inability to explain fully to you all about God. I am happy to have Mr. Moore as my opponent tonight. I believe we are going to have a good discussion. I want to say in the very beginning of this debate that it affords me pleasure to examine the Bible teachings on this subject and to delve into them

In the book of 1Tim. 3:16 the Bible tells us, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." It is a mystery, a deep mystery. I am of the opinion tonight, after discussing this for many, many years, that anyone needs to take in consideration all parts of the Bible to try to understand the God of the Bible.

Now, in the affirmative speech of my opponent tonight, I don't think there's anything that Mr. Moore has presented that I can't face. Anything that he's brought before you I can face; and where he leads I'll do my very best to follow.

Persons or Beings

The first argument on his chart here, "Persons or Beings" (and I call your attention to it) is a definition by Webster of the teachings of the trinity doctrine, the theology of it. Anyone that would define the teachings of the trinity theology would naturally support the theory of it; but should Mr. Webster define the teaching of us, he would support what we believe about it. But we'll leave language as it is; we won't try to cut it off or do away with it. I want to say tonight about persons and beings, I believe the Bible sustains the fact that there is only one person of God and one

Monday - Welch's First Negative

of the main reasons why I believe it is, the language of the Bible throughout from beginning to end. The first command of God in the Bible is "hear o Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." In connection of God the Father, eternally and omnipresent, that begot a Son, His Son was the Son of the Father begotten and born, not eternal as the Trinitarians teach. The Bible said in Gal. 4:4, "When the fullness of time came, God sent forth his Son, made of woman, made under the law". There was a time and a day that God begot a Son – the invisible God.

Mr. Moore, in answering my questions, acknowledged that God is invisible. I believe that he quoted the scripture in Col. 1:15 that He is the express image of the invisible God. Then, since God is invisible, God is a spirit. The Bible said so in John 4:24. When you speak of God and his Son, you must remember that you cannot liken that to a man and his son. In the first place, when a man and his son come into your presence, or a man has a son, that means that there are two people or persons that you can look upon or identify them. But with God and His Son, it is quite different. God has never been seen by anyone. The Bible, in two places, says that. Since that is true, then we must seek to find what is that connection between the invisible omnipresent God that made the world, and the Son that was born of the woman that became His visible person. In the 17th Chapter of St. John, Christ was praying, in the days of his flesh, Paul said when he wrote to the Hebrews, that He prayed. And His prayer went like this, "Glorify thou me with thine ownself ..." and that's exactly what happened. Since that did happen. Then the eternal God took this one that was His Son, born, begotten, and made that Son the visible person of the invisible God. Thus, by that you have the person of God brought forth from the Bible, and not any theology or Trinitarianism in the book of God Almighty. In Job 13:8 the Bible said, "Will ye accept his person? Will ye contend for God?" The verse under that says, "He will surely reprove you, if ye do secretly accept persons"; more than one. There's only one person of God.

Monday - Welch's First Negative

Rebuttal To Mediator-Ship

Now to deal with this next chart here. On the mediator-ship I asked him a question: "Is Jesus still praying to God the Father in heaven like the Trinitarians teach He is?" In the book of Hebrews the 10th Chapter, the Bible tells us that this man finished his work. The Bible said, the Scripture Mr. Moore used, "There's one God, one mediator, between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Then in Hebrews the 10th chapter and I call your attention to it, it says that He finished his work in that field. Beginning with verse 9, "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." That's not nearly right that's exactly right. Then the next verse says "But this man," listen, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down..." He stopped his work in that field Mr. Moore. He sat down, that work is over, and eternally over, as far as his son-ship and his praying for sin is concerned. The Bible said these words, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Now mind you just a moment, if the Trinitarian theory that Jesus Christ, one person of God is in heaven pleading with another person of God for the salvation of man, and especially for the apostate brethren of you folks, you'd have to say one of two things: that is he doesn't pray for everybody, or God doesn't hear his prayer all the time. And in the 11th chapter of St. John when He raised Lazarus from the dead He said His prayers are always heard. I'll stay with you on that mediator-ship, Mr. Moore, don't you worry about that.

All right! Notice here, between God and man there is no problem for us to explain, the Bible tells us what it is. There's one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. Now Mr. Moore has got two things there. Either God himself was incarnated in Christ, or one of the Gods was. Now when this trinity doctrine started, you can find it in any encyclopedia, I just ask you to examine any of them. It doesn't matter which one you pick up. Listen, the terminology they use there, Godhead Debate

Monday - Welch's First Negative

person, from the Greek word *presopon* there were three separate divine persons of God from time to eternity. God had a Son they teach back yonder. I've asked many, "How did he have him back there? Where did he come from?" Only in the mind of God, when God said "Let us make man ..." The Trinitarians will take that Scripture to try to prove that there was more than one of God there in the beginning; hence, to substantiate the theology of trinity in their light of looking at it. But the positive proof of it is this. There's no such thing as that because God said in Isaiah 44:24, "Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens A-L-O-N-E; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself;" Now the Trinitarian doctrine goes begging there in creation doesn't it? Mal. 2:10 says, "Have we not all one father and hath not one God created us all?"

Rebuttal To Absurdities

Now he talks about this doctrine being absurd, how foolish it is. All right! He asked in part of his argument, (and I don't say that critically of him, I'm attacking his theology) about Jesus praying to himself, and about him offering the church to himself, and things like that. Well he said he raised Lazarus from the dead in the 11th and 12th chapters of St. John that the voice came because of those who stood by. That's right. There was an acknowledgment of this child, this man, that he was the son of deity, and this acknowledgment was that the eternal invisible God was the Father of this man Christ Jesus, yet he was in this man Christ Jesus. Paul said to wit, to know that God was in Christ not one of the Gods, not one of the persons of God, but God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. Jesus said, and this is my point, that the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Every word that was spoken according to Christ's teaching, and his prayer and all I am going to stay within it. He said that in the 14th chapter of St. John when they asked him a question, show us the Father, He said these words, "He that seeth me has seen the Father", then he said, "the works that I do, I do not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth" not one God or persons of the

Monday - Welch's First Negative

Godhead. Now if Christ had been a separate person, as much God as God was God, he could have said these words, it's this part of God doing the work. But that was not true. There is only one God. That being the command of the God's Bible, it had to be that God in this man Jesus Christ.

Now he talks about his praying in St. John the 14th chapter and the 15th chapter, about praying for the comforter. In the 14th chapter of St. John, Jesus said these words, "I'll pray the Father". Well Paul said he prayed in the days of his flesh. Then he was glorified by the Father. "That he may send you another comforter." All right! Then he went on down and said these words, "I will not leave you comfortless". He's talking about the Comforter, "I will come to you", not some other one, not some other person in the Godhead. But it's actually the spirit of Christ coming in, in the omnipresent coverage of God, into the believers that God has who are his children. Eph. 4:6 said these words, "there is one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Now listen to the teachings of the Trinitarians.

They would actually have, if there are three separate individuals of God or beings of persons, if God is in them, and then Christ is in them, they would have at least the spirit of two different ones in them. The Bible said, "There is one spirit", (1Cor. 12:13), "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body..." Now the Bible said in John 4:24 that "God is a Spirit..." Now since that is true, then Mr. Moore introduces a passage about the birth of Jesus Christ.

Now I'm going to prove that God is that Spirit and that He is the Father of the child, Jesus Christ, and my Father too. Eph. 4:6, "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Now the Scripture Mr. Moore introduced about the birth of Christ said, "The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with

Monday - Welch's First Negative

child of the Holy Spirit." Now if God and that Spirit are not the same Spirit, then Jesus Christ is not the Son of the eternal Father, God. He's the son of somebody else! That's why it can't be. You talk about things that can't be, Mr. Moore, that can't be.

Moore's Questions To Welch

Now, the questions he asked me, I want to note them.

- (1) "Do you agree that God used the word method of revelation, that words convey ideas?"

Yes, Mr. Moore, I agree that words of languages teach us things, but yet at the same time there are different languages and the revelation of God's truth perhaps could be brought back from the original and sometimes you have to go back to even original languages. You couldn't take one language, even the English language, and by that prove everything about God like you could that two and two makes four. You can't do that.

- (2) "Is it possible for two things or more to be one in one sense and more than one in another?"

Yes. The church can be many people in one body as far as the church is concerned; and God himself and Christ is one body as far as the Godhead is concerned. Col. 2:8-9 "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." I won't detour around that one either.

- (3) "Is the Father the Spirit and the Son the flesh?"

The Father is eternal God. God is a Spirit, and this child was born like any other child except he didn't have an earthly father. He had a human spirit, a human soul, and a human body. He was perfect humanity. The eternal invisible Spirit was the Father of that child, and yet in the end that eternal Spirit glorified that man Christ with himself and he became the express image and person of the invisible God. All right!

Monday - Welch's First Negative

My Father Is Greater Than I

Now you talk about something that crosses a man up, Mr. Moore said our doctrine would disprove the Bible teaching. But there is one scripture that he produced there, in the trinity realm of thinking and theology, and that is where Jesus said, "My Father is greater than I." If the trinity doctrine is right he'd never have said that. If Jesus Christ had been a third part of deity from all time, and as trinity doctrine teaches, as much God as God is God, he'd never have uttered that statement because one-third of God would be as much as the other two-thirds of God. That's the teaching of the trinity doctrine and that's one of the main reasons it's not true. There is no such thing in the Bible, in God, or in any other place. This child was begotten and born and he grew in stature and knowledge. I'd like to ask Mr. Moore a question. Does Jesus know everything now? When you come back, please answer that one. Does he know everything now? I want to see what he does with it. Does he know everything now?

Then he turns to the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. and uses this argument. "Then cometh the end; when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father." Now in that Scripture there are many things to consider. First is that the church is his wife. Now in reasonable logic, would it seem reasonable that if you had a wife and about the time you met her you would turn around and give her away to someone else? Now that's the predicament that his theology places a man in unless he can explain this theology. I mean what the Bible teaches in the light it is. That's the position the Scriptures hold. Christ was born, finished his mission, he died, and the flesh suffered for sins. He was glorified by the eternal, invisible God and became the visible person of the invisible God which makes only one person. We are looking today for salvation through his suffering, through his death, through the cross of Calvary; but when that time is over and no longer we look back to Calvary, then we

Monday - Welch's First Negative

pass with him into the eternal everlasting Fatherhood and Father-ship of him.

Isaiah 9:6:

“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” Now if he’s going to present that church to the everlasting Father and he is the everlasting Father; then as he said in St. John 10:30 “I and my Father are one.” Eph. 5:25 the Bible said, “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; ... That he might present it to himself...” Well that’s understandable when God glorified him with himself. That’s understandable and there is no contradiction in that. Now I think I have covered part of his charts and referred to them here.

The Holy Spirit -- Sending

I asked Mr. Moore if the Holy Ghost was the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Well that was a tough one for him. He couldn’t get around it to well, bless his heart; it’s a real tough one for Trinitarians. Now if the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Jesus Christ, and I’m going to prove it is; then regardless of how ridiculous you may think it sounds you’ll have to say that the Spirit of Christ was the Father of the child Christ. There’s nothing else you can say. In 1Pet. 1:10-11 it speaks of the Old Testament prophets and said these words, “...the spirit of Christ that was in them”; that is the Old Testament “signified beforehand of his suffering...” And the Bible plainly tells us that the Spirit that moved the Old Testament prophets was the Spirit of Christ. And then in Second Peter, it tells us that it was the Holy Ghost, “...holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” First Peter one said it was the Spirit of Christ and this second epistle says it’s the Holy Ghost, and in Eph. 4:4 he said there’s one Spirit. Don’t forget that. All right! Now the same Spirit that was the Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, moved the Old Testament prophets, that same Spirit was

Monday - Welch's First Negative

the Father of the child, Christ. How do you know, preacher? Why, Mr. Moore introduces the Scripture and showed it to me. That's right. "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." If the Holy Ghost and God are not the same then Jesus was not the Son of God, he was the Son of a third person of the trinity. That I can not believe! That's right!

Ananias Lied To God:

Acts 5, Ananias lied to God, he lied to the Holy Ghost. Of course God is a Spirit, God is omnipresent, and he is everywhere. When he lied to the Holy Ghost he was lying to God, because it's God's Spirit. It fills all space. God's coverage is just like this light here. I can illustrate it like this. We could say that this bulb represented the son, the power in that light represented the Father, the rays from it represented the Holy Ghost; it fills all space, is God omnipresent, not three persons of him.

Isaiah Passages

Now, inasmuch as Mr. Moore introduced the Scriptures in Isaiah about the one God, I want to show you some of the contradictions of the trinity doctrine in the Scriptures that Mr. Moore introduced. Just as plain as can be! In Isaiah the 45th chapter and verse 20, and that's just another reason why I'm here tonight; "Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations: they have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Have not I the LORD? And there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me." Now if God told the truth that is just the way it is. And I believe that he did tell it. Jesus Christ told it. He had this same thing in mind when he said, "I and my Father are one." "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself". Don't you

Monday - Welch's First Negative

know that if there had been a trinity doctrine he would have sworn by one of the others? There was no such thing. Forty-five times God said he swore by himself. If there had been a committee of persons in God as Trinitarians teach there is, there is no doubt about it but what God would've sworn by one of the persons of deity as he talks about here tonight. But there was no such thing. God said, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me" the same God that said there's no God beside him. And I'm going to prove that's Jesus Christ. "Unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess." In Philippians the 2nd chapter we find the Scripture reads like this, speaking of this man Christ that God glorified with his own self he said these words about him, "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That unto the one man Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in earth, things in heaven, and things under the earth;" That's some of the reasons why this fellow Welch could never accept the theory of the Trinitarians the more I discuss it the further away from it I get.

Isaiah 46:9:

Now I call your attention to another direct contradiction of trinity theology. In Isaiah 46:9 "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me." Trinitarians teach the three are just alike, coequal in power from eternity to eternity. This is a direct contradiction of this theology. May I read it again, "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me." Just before my time is up I want to refer to this chart here again, and the word another. God didn't leave us in the dark about his truth. The word "another" doesn't always mean another person. It can mean the same one. In I Sam. 10:6, when Saul was going to become the king of Israel, and Samuel was talking to him, Samuel said these words, "And the Spirit of the LORD will come

Monday - Welch's First Negative

upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man." But he was the same man, that's right. It meant a manifestation. When God spoke here of another Comforter, Jesus Christ proved beyond reasonable doubt, in the 14th chapter of St. John in his speaking now of the Comforter, the Greek word *paraclete*, that is was going to be him when he came; for he said these words, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you". I'll go over that again. First, in the days of his flesh he prayed. He was our example. And in the 10th chapter of St. John he said, "There came a voice", and he said, "My prayers are always heard." He knew that! Mind you my friends and listen. When he said, "I'll pray the Father", when as in his mediator-ship, in the days of his flesh, as in the man Christ Jesus he prayed. Then when he was glorified by the eternal, invisible God, he became the incorporated headquarters of the God of person. Then he could say I'll send and I'll come. That's why he did do it, my friends, we find in this chapter that when he speaks of the Comforter, as I've already said, it was actually him coming.

And now I think that I'll have time to introduce a Scripture to confirm that. In Colossians he said, "The mystery that has been hid from ages, but is now made manifest, which is Christ in you." Not the trinity, ten thousand times NO! Well how do we know that Christ lives in us? How do we know that Christ is dwelling in us? 1John 4:13, "Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." That's how we know it. That Spirit is Christ in you, the mystery that's been hid before the world was but is now made manifest in these times to mankind. And I contend that there is a Bible way to explain and to show the connection between that child, the Son of God, and the eternal, invisible God that made that Son, that child, his permanent, visible person for all time and eternally.

The End of Speech

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

Godhead Debate: Part Two-A

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen both here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. It is a genuine pleasure to be able to come back and respond to the things that Mr. Welch has said. I'll take up my questions in the process of my speech, but there is something on my mind that I want to get off right now. When I get there I'll probably talk about it again.

Questions Four and Five Not Answered

Mr. Welch said that he could hardly get me around his question four and he never did get around to my questions four and five. He never did give me an answer to them. I did make an attempt, Mr. Welch, you didn't even get around to my questions four and five. We'll have more to say about that when we get there. I want now to take up Mr. Welch's speech, item by item, and statement by statement, passage by passage, the best I can. Some of the things that he said I believe was double-talk. It was not possible to understand what he was talking about. But so far as I was able to understand what he was talking about, I want to consider the statements and every passage that he presented. He said of course that this was the greatest subject that we could discuss because it had to do with God himself; and he freely admitted his inability to explain all about God and of course I agree with that 100 per cent. He cited 1Tim. 3:16, that God was manifest in the flesh and there is no issue here at all. The Bible certainly teaches and I affirmed in my first speech that Jesus Christ was divine, God made manifest in the flesh, and he wants to make an argument on that. If he contends that because God was manifest in the flesh, that makes the Father the Son, I seem to remember in John 1:31 that John the Baptist also came and manifested the Lord. Does that make John the Baptist the Lord? He said that he could face all that I presented. He could do it but you know that he didn't do it. I wonder why he didn't. And incidentally he said that the person definition that I had on the chart was a definition of trinity. I deny that, Mr. Welch, that isn't so. I had a chart over there, Heb. 1:3, taken from Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, but because I didn't have room to put it up, I didn't, but you

Godhead Debate

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

challenge it and I will put it up. Where he gives the same definition of the word person in Heb. 1:3.

One Person of God

Then he talks about there was only one person of God, that the first commandment affirmed this, Deut. 6:4 says, "There's one God." I cited this and I believe it. There's no issue there, he constantly and continually uses the term Trinitarian. I didn't use that term. I have no particular objection to it, and yet I didn't use it. He constantly used it there. He admitted in the Answer of my question that words convey ideas; and ladies and gentlemen, there are different kinds of words. There are words that instruct and direct; and there are words that prejudice and create emotions, and this is one of them. Mr. Welch could just leave it off and do just as well. It's meaningless. I haven't used the term. I didn't use it. He, of course, advanced what he called Trinitarian argument and endeavored to answer those arguments and left mine alone. I think you're aware of that. That's a word that's presented for no purpose other than to stir emotions and to create prejudice.

God Sent Forth His Son

In Gal. 4:4 the passage says, "That God sent forth his son." I want you to note that that passage is against him not for him. That passage says that God sent forth his Son and Mr. Welch says that words convey ideas. Tell us Mr. Welch, when you get up here, what idea is conveyed by the word "sent"? Would you do that for us? We shall see. God is invisible, of course, there's no issue there; (Col. 1:15, John 4:24) affirms that God is a Spirit. He made a play on the fact that we can not liken God to everything about a man and his son. Then when he went over and was talking about Christ and the church, he tried to do that very thing. We'll cover that when we get to it. But you admit that the term Father and Son admits of two don't you, Mr. Welch? Why he said I agree that if you are talking about a man and his son there'd be the idea of two. Was the Lord trying to deceive man when he talked about the Father and Son relationship? In John 17:5, he cited this, whenever the Son said, "Glorify

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

thou me," Let's read it, "And now, Father glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was begun." Tell us what's the meaning of with, Mr. Welch. You say words convey ideas, now tell us what idea the word with means. Will you do that? What does the word with mean Mr. Welch? Now, ladies and gentlemen, you know that the word with means in the company of. Let him tell us when he gets up here. Every passage that he introduced is against him.

Job 13:8

He cites this passage and indicts me as violating what the passage says. Because Job said, "Will you accept his person? Will you contend for God? Is it good that he should search you out? Or as one man mocketh another, do you also mock him? He will surely reprove you, if you do secretly accept persons." Now, Mr. Welch, I want to know about this because I may get you another debate with one of your brethren before this is over with. Do you believe that there was a person in the Godhead before Bethlehem? Come on and tell us, will you? You cited this passage. Is that what Job was talking about? Was he talking about persons in the Godhead? Now you tell us when you get up here! Was there a person in the Godhead before Bethlehem? Note if you will. In the first place he assumes that it's all right to accept person (singular) but it's wrong to accept persons (plural) in the Godhead. Now, Mr. Welch, let's try your logic. In James 2:1, James says, "My brethren, hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." Now there's the plural word persons. Watch it. James urges that we have not respect of persons (plural). According to Mr. Welch's concept of the word it would be all right to manifest a respect of persons so long as there was only one person! However, if there were two or more persons it would be wrong. Job 13:8,10 doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of this question. You know, these fellows will cite a passage without any consideration as to context. Let's take a look. In verse 7 Job shows that in using false arguments these men were pretending to defend God and his procedure; in verse 8 in giving partial judgment for God and presuming to make

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

themselves his protectors. Then in verses 9 and 11 in condemning what they secretly believed to be right or maintaining with their lips what they did not believe in their hearts. Verses 9 and 11 doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of this issue.

Mediatorship of Christ

Then of course, about my chart on the mediator-ship of Christ, and I'll have more to say about this in a moment. He said he asked me if Jesus was still praying to the Father. You asked me a question concerning that matter of Jesus' intercession, and right at this point I want to observe. His question was this. He says, "The Bible says that the man Christ Jesus is the mediator between God and man. Did he finish his work at Calvary or is he still interceding God the Father on behalf of man?" And he got up and just emphatically denied that it was. And in doing this, he denied the statement in Hebrews 7:25. Why didn't you take up the passage, Mr. Welch and consider it? I want to read the passage again but I want to show you how he perverted Hebrews 10. Hebrews 7:25 says, "Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Mr. Welch says that he's not doing it. Paul says he is doing it, and that isn't nearly right, that is right. In the 10th chapter of the book of Hebrews he cites verses 8 and 9 where it talks about the Lord sat down. I want to show you what he does in connection with this. "Then sayeth he, Lo, I come to do thy will O God. Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure in them which were offered by the law, then hath he said, Lo, I come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Now he talks about that when this was offered that he sat down. Mr. Welch, are you not aware of the fact that in this section of the Hebrew letter the apostle is contrasting the priesthood of Christ with the priesthood of Aaron? If he would of taken the time to have read the 11th verse he would have noticed what the sat down was contrasted to. One of the things that he

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

makes, shows the superiority of Christ's priesthood over the priesthood of Aaron is, "And every priest indeed standeth day be day." So that's the only significance of the words "sat down". And he made a play on that and emphatically denied Hebrews 7:25 that says, "he ever liveth to make intercession for us" and Mr. Welch says that he doesn't do it. He said he was going to stay with me on this mediator. We'll see.

The Trinity Doctrine

He talks about when the trinity doctrine started and what the encyclopedia says. You know, I looked at several of them to find several things about the United Pentecostal Church. Now, you want to take these encyclopedias as your authority, Mr. Welch? Is that what you want to do? I'm not concerned about the encyclopedia, he talks about the teaching of the Trinitarians, (that's real funny, you know any time that you feel Mr. Welch is losing, you laugh and demonstrate like that.) He cites Genesis 1:26 that I didn't even mention. I could have but I didn't. He talks about what the Trinitarians believe. He refers to passages I didn't cite and ignored those that I did cite. I didn't introduce Genesis 1:26, Mr. Welch. I didn't say a word about it but it might be well that you introduced it. Tell us do you agree, Mr. Welch, that a plural pronoun must have a plural antecedent?

Isaiah 44:24

Then he cites Isaiah 44:24 about the Lord alone. He has several references in Isaiah and I'll take care of those in a moment where I have them all collected together. He cites Mal. 2:10 where Malachi says, "We have one God, we have one Father, hath not one God created us all?" there is no issue there. I used that passage in my first speech and affirmed the fact that there is but one God, one deity. But you know something? He didn't say a word about this idea of one humanity. And the fact that there's one humanity and yet more than one person. He didn't say a word about that did he? All the passages that I cited and freely admitted that I believed that there was one God. He said, "I'm going to stay with him on the mediator-ship." Why didn't you do that, Mr.

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

Welch? Why didn't you do that? He's going to. He promised me that he would! He cited John 11:12 which is the wrong passage. Mr. Welch, I'm not going to look the passages up for you in this debate. You give the right passages! He talks about something about the Lord's praying and that's not the passage. Give the right one and I'll consider it.

Second Corinthians 5:19.

That God was manifest in the flesh (I know where the passage is! I listened to a debate last week with him where about half the passages he gave were the wrong passages and I'm not going to look them up for him. I'll let his moderator do that.). 2 Cor., 5:19, God was manifest in the flesh. There's no issue here. I believe that. Paul says, in this respect, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. That affirms the deity of Christ, I believe that with all of my heart.

You See Me, You See The Father, John 14:9

Then he cites John 14:9 where Jesus said, "If you have seen me you've seen the Father." Mr. Welch, that was the reason I asked you a question, to get you to let us know something about your vocabulary. I want to know what you mean by these expressions. That's why I asked him, "was the Father the Spirit and the Son the flesh?" and I never made heads nor tails out of what he was talking about. He never did tell us. I know what he thinks about it and I think you do too. That so far as Mr. Welch is concerned the Father is the Spirit and the Son is the Flesh. I know that's what he believes. Now I want you to tell us something, Mr. Welch. Would you tell us when John said, "If you've seen me you've seen the Father", did you mean that they had seen the Father in exactly the same way they saw the Son? Would you tell us that? Is he simply saying in this instance, now, that when you've seen me in the flesh you've seen the Spirit? Is that what he said? Is that what he means by that passage? Let's take a look at John 14:9. This passage is where Jesus said, "If you've seen me you've seen the Father." Mr. Welch has advanced the idea that this necessarily means that they must be one and

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

the same person. I want to know, Mr. Welch, and I wish you'd jot this down and tell us. Do you think that the word "see" in these passages means visible? Is that what you mean? Just think about this, ladies and gentlemen, you hear this passage cited all the time without any consideration of what it teaches. Jesus said, "If you've seen me you've seen the Father." Did that mean that he had SEEN the Father exactly the same way that he saw the Son? Does he mean by this that they visibly saw the Father? "Oh no" Mr. Welch says, "that can't be so because the Father is invisible." It can't mean that they visibly saw the Father when they saw the Son so it doesn't mean that, does it? Because he said, "He's invisible." Note if you will. The word "see" does not necessarily mean that a thing is visible. Do you know that? Jesus says in Matt. 13:13, "Seeing they see not, hearing they hear not." Now the word "see" when it's used in the Bible does not necessarily mean that a thing is visible, no more than the word "hear" means that it is audible. Observe if you will. The word in John 14:9 that's translated "see", is a term, according to Thayer, that means to see with the mind and not with the eye. (Page 451). Whenever the Apostle Paul said to the Ephesians, Mr. Welch, that he prayed that the eyes of their understanding might be opened, what was he talking about? What did Paul mean, Mr. Welch, when he said in Acts 26:18 that he was sent to open the eyes of the Gentiles? Was he talking about the visible eye? This passage is cited as if Jesus had said, "When you visibly see me you visibly see the Father." And since the Father is the Spirit and the Son is the flesh, when you've seen the flesh you've seen the Spirit." Is that right? Now what does the passage really say? Note if you will in Acts 8:23 and there are other passages on this, I just want to consider it while we are here. In Acts 8:23 whenever the Apostle Peter said to Simon the sorcerer, "I see that thou art in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." Did the word see there have to do with vision, Mr. Welch? Would you tell us that when you come up here? Jesus is simply saying in John 14, that you can see how and what the Father would do by observing what I've done and not the idea of visibly seeing him. Note if you will, when John said they saw

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

the Father, it was either actually or representatively, wasn't it? Was it actually? I don't think he will take that position. I hope he does. I don't think that he will take a position that Jesus means when you see me you see the Father actually. All right, observe that it is representatively, it couldn't be actually. In John 6:46 the record says, "No man has seen the Father." Obviously they saw the Father represented in the Son. Note in Job 42:5, Job said of these things that had been told him, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: " Now watch his next statement, "but now mine eye seeth thee." but did that mean Job actually saw the Lord visibly. Tell us about it, Mr. Welch. Friends, don't you see that that has to do with the understanding, and not the visible eye? Of all things! He talks about this part of God. This is a misunderstanding. Mr. Welch, are you part of humanity? I didn't ask if you are a human. Tell us! (Now friends, this isn't funny at all. Every time you think he is losing you do that.) The word humanity means a state of being human, just like the word God means the state of being God. It's easier to laugh it off than it is to deal with it. And the folks in the radio audience are hearing this as well. So, he talks about a part of God. That's a misunderstanding altogether, on his part.

In The Days of His Flesh

He prayed in the days of his flesh. I'd like to know a little more about that. Is he now in the days of his flesh? Tell us, Mr. Welch, is Jesus NOW in the days of his flesh? There are some of your brethren that think that it takes a fleshly human being to be a person. That's why I say I may get you a debate with them before I leave here. And they know they believe that too! Now tell us, is he now in the days of his flesh? We'll be waiting to see.

Ephesians 4:6, "One God and Father"

Tell me how many units there are in Eph. 4:4? Paul talks about there being one Lord, one Spirit, one God and Father, one hope, one faith, and one baptism. Doesn't he, Mr. Welch? Tell us how many units are in this passage. I've taken his speech up and I'm following him. Now, he may

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

not do me that way, but if he doesn't it's because he can't do it. He talks about one Spirit.

First Corinthians 12:13

In I Cor. 12:13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." The Apostle Paul is simply showing why the Corinthians ought to recognize that these spiritual gifts were for everyone and not for just one. Look at verse 7 where it says, "to one is given by the Spirit to the profit of all." That doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of the question under consideration.

Question #1

Then we deal with my questions. I want to take a look at them. I asked him in question number one, "Do you agree that God uses the 'word method' of revelation?" And right here I want a piece of chalk if you can find me one. There's one over there on the table somewhere. I want to put some words on the board; and I want Mr. Welch to accommodate us in connection with this. Mr. Welch says, "Yes, I agree, I agree that the Bible uses the word method of revelation; and I agree that words convey ideas. Now when you get up here, Mr. Welch, will you please tell us the meaning or what idea is conveyed in the word "both"? And while you are at it, will you give us a little dissertation on the word "with"? What idea is conveyed in the word "with" and the word "also"? Would you tell us? Now he's going to tell us when he gets up here. He says that words are vehicles of thought, or that they convey ideas. What idea is conveyed by the word "both"? The Bible says both the Father and the Son, 2John 9. Tell us what idea is conveyed in the word both.

Question #2

Then my question number 2 where I asked him, "Is it possible for two or more things to be one in one sense, and yet more than one in another sense?" he admits that they may. That's right. So, don't you see, ladies and gentlemen, he recognizes that there may be one God and yet it's possible for there to be more than one person. He admits that in answer to the question. That's why I say he needs to come to grips with the

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

arguments that have been presented. He realizes that a thing may be one in one sense yet more than one in another sense. So, he recognizes that God may be one in one sense and yet more than one in another sense, don't you Mr. Welch? That's what you said in answer to the question.

Question #3

Then that's when I asked him question number three. "Is the Father the Spirit, and the Son the flesh?" and like I say, I don't know what he's talking about. He talks about; he became the express image of the invisible God. He said that's what that passage says and I DENY it! That passage doesn't say any such thing. Now I want to show you. He doesn't have the right to just make up passages. He says, "the express image of the invisible God" and that is not what the passage says. I want to turn and read it. Observe if you will. The passage says, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation." In Hebrews the first chapter where it talks about the express image of his person, it doesn't say that he's the express image and the person of God or that he is the person of God, as you say the passage says. It says that he's the express image OF the person of God, not and the person of God. That is your interpretation of it. (Moderator: 10 Minutes)-all right. He said the idea that my Father is greater would never have been uttered if the Trinitarian theory was right, because one-third of God. Once again that's a misunderstanding of the word God and deity as Mr. Welch manifested by these expressions. I never affirmed any such thing in my life! I don't believe it now. I don't believe that Jesus was one-third God. I believe that he was all God. I believe that you are all humanity. Do you, Mr. Welch? Do you believe that you are all humanity? He's going to follow me on the mediator chart. I intend to see that you do it, Mr. Welch. Tell us now! Do you possess all of the essence of humanity? He doesn't recognize the fact that by appointment and on behalf of the redemption of mankind, Jesus could willingly subject himself as Phi. 1 says. Just because God knows all or can know all do you think that means that he does know all? Because he's all-powerful do you think that that means he does Godhead Debate

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

everything he is able to do? Now you think about that. God is all powerful, omnipotent. Tell us, Mr. Welch, is he doing everything that he is able to do? And while you are at it you might tell us what was meant by the expression when he said to Abraham, "Now I know."

As I said a moment ago, I'm surprised that he expresses a very elementary knowledge of what the book teaches about God.

Questions 4 and 5

Then of course my questions four and five that he completely overlooked. I'm not saying it was deliberate, he may have forgotten to do so. But whenever he chided me about not answering his question four and never even looked at my questions four and five; I think he needs to be reprimanded, don't you? Was there a person in the Godhead before the Word became flesh? That was important. I wanted to know that, Mr. Welch, that's why I asked it. And I asked him "How many humanities are there?" that was important also. And he didn't answer that. All right. Does Jesus know everything now? I think he could. Just like I think God could do anything. But I don't think that he's doing everything he's capable of doing. Now you deal with it. Let me stop for a moment and let me emphasize once again what I said. Mr. Welch, you tell us when you get up here. Because the Bible teaches that God is omnipotent do you believe that he's doing everything that he's able to do? You mean to tell me that you would question the power of God and think that God couldn't limit his knowledge? Is that what you're going to affirm? That's what seems to be implied by the laughs. That God isn't omnipotent. He's omniscient but he's not omnipotent. That he knows all but he's not all-powerful, and he can't limit his knowledge. You come to grips with that and see.

Husband and Wife

Then this is the way he talks; the church is his wife, the husband of the wife, and then turns around and gives her away. You see, when we were talking about the Father and the Son he said, "you need to recognize that

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

everything that's true about the Father and Son relationship in the flesh is not necessarily true about the Father and Son relationship with respect to God. Then he comes over to the church and everything that is true about a wife and husband he wants to make it true about Christ and the church. You see, Mr. Welch, it just depends on which foot the shoe is on.

Father and Son

I didn't make any particular argument about the Father and the Son relationship. I could have. Isaiah 9:6 says, "A Son is given." You tell us who gave him. Every passage he cites backfires on him. That passage says, "a Son is given." Now you tell us who gave him, Mr. Welch. We'll have more to say about that. We'll have more to say about this when we talk about Isa. 9:6. He wants to know if he is going to give that church to the Father. He cited Eph. 5:21, 24 and he says that the passage says that the Lord is going to present the church to himself and he thinks that's a tremendously strong argument that he can't present the church to himself and can't give it to the Father. That's no problem at all. I could walk over and present you with this Testament. Could you give it to your moderator? Could you, Mr. Welch?

He cites First Peter and second Peter regarding the Spirit of Christ that moved the Old Testament prophets. There's no issue here. It affirms the pre-existence of Christ. He implies several arguments with respect to the sending of the Comforter and the birth of Christ. Mr. Welch, I wish you would make your arguments plain. The implication was this; that because the Father sent the Comforter and because the Son sent the Comforter; that makes the Father and the Son one and the same thing. And because the Holy Spirit is said to be the one who is responsible for the birth of Christ, yet he's the Son of the Father; that makes the Father and the Son one and the same thing. You see his implication is this; if a thing is attributed to two or more individuals, they obviously must be the same. If that's not his argument, he doesn't have one. Mr. Welch, are you not aware of the fact that the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is our

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

Savior in 2 Tim. 2:10? Yet in Acts 2:40, Peter said, "save yourselves." Did that make them Jesus? Did it, Mr. Welch? Because man is said to save himself and because Jesus saves man, does that make them the same?

Acts 13

And while you are at it you might tell us about Acts the 13th chapter. In Acts 13 the record says that there were, in the church at Antioch, prophets and teachers and as they ministered to the Lord, the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereto I have called them." The record said that these men prayed and laid hands on them and sent them away." Are you going to answer my argument on this one? Let's see if you do. Acts 13:1-4, Mr. Welch's argument is because the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are said to do the same thing, that makes them one and the same. That's your argument! Now deal with this one. In Acts 13 the record said that Paul and Barnabas were sent out by the prophets and teachers, and the very next verse said, "so they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit." I want to know, were the prophets and teachers at Antioch the Holy Spirit? That passage said Paul and Barnabas were sent by the Holy Spirit. It also said the prophets and teachers sent them. Were the prophets and teachers the Holy Spirit? Just because two or more people are said to do the same thing that doesn't argue for their identity, none whatsoever.

Isaiah Passages

I want now to take up these Isaiah passages that he introduced. Mr. Welch turns to the book of Isaiah and he reads passages where the Lord said that he's alone, that there's none beside him, and all this. There's no issue there. But he completely ignored the setting of the book of Isaiah and the purpose for which it was written. He doesn't recognize the fact that Isaiah is contrasting the true Jehovah with idols. Observe in Isaiah 40:19-22 where he makes a comparison between idolatry and Jehovah. In 40:25 as well as verse 28 where he's making a contrast between Jehovah and idols. And over in 43:10-11 where he makes a contrast. In

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

Isaiah 44:10 and the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." In the very same CONTEXT! Where Isaiah is contrasting Jehovah with Idolatry! The one true God being contrasted with idolatry and he completely ignores the context.

Philippians 2 "Name above Every Name"

Then he cites Phi. 2:6, 10 wherein this passage affirms that a name given above every name. I will let him make the argument that he wants to in regard to the name. We'll cover that at the proper time. This passage simply affirms the deity as well as the humanity of Jesus Christ and that fits right in with the argument that I've made concerning the mediator-ship of Christ. He says the more he discusses this subject the farther away he gets from it and I believe that.

Then 1 Sam. 10:6 and there's no issue here. He talks about Christ in you (1 John 4:13). The very next verse in 1John 4:14 ; that's why I said every passage he cites, instead of it being something for his cause, is actually against him. Listen to verse 14 where the writer affirms, "And we have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son." You tell us what's the meaning of sent the Son. Rom. 8:14 tells us how that we are children of God when we are lead by the Spirit of God. And that deals with the gentlemen's speech item by item, statement by statement, and passage by passage. Now I want you to take a look at the argument that's presented on the chart.

reducto ad absurdem

Now, I want to go back to these reducto ad absurdem arguments. How much time do I have, Brother Bruce? (Moderator: nearly 2 Minutes). All right. In connection with this there are two or three of them. He left these alone. He mentioned briefly something about the birth of Christ and about the sending of the Comforter; and I dealt with those in this joint action argument, and I think that Mr. Welch knows that I did. It simply refers to reducing a position to an absurdity, and I want you to observe this. In John 12:49, "For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent

Monday - Moore's Second Affirmative

me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." If the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying; I don't say what I want to say, I told myself what to say, whatever I told myself to say, that's what I say. Now if your position is right, Mr. Welch, that's what that passage would be teaching. In connection with Mark 13:32, "...of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only." Observe if you will. If the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying that here was something that he did not know but that he did know. And in connection with this, in regard to the argument that I made on the chart over here, I presented one, two, three, four, five passages, Mr. Welch, and if you mentioned them I didn't even detect it in your speech at all. I wish that you would come up and take up this speech that I've delivered and deal with it as I've dealt with yours. And I invite you to hear Mr. Welch.

The End of Speech

Godhead Debate: Part Two-B

I can speak this last 30 minutes just as quickly as anybody. It’s nice to be here tonight and to enjoy the discussion with Mr. Moore and to look further into this wonderful subject. I did not intentionally evade answering the questions Mr. Moore. The two that I didn’t answer I’ll take them up now.

Questions 4 and 5

(4) Was there a person in the Godhead before the word became flesh?

This is the position we hold, Mr. Moore, that God, whatever he was, no one had ever seen him, was incarnate in Christ. That is incarnation doctrine.

(5) How many humanities are there?

Just one. I’ll go along with you there on one, one humanity. I won’t fuss about that.

John 12:44-45 “God Sending His Son”

Now, I get to the thought, while its fresh on my mind, of God sending his Son. That is one I’d like to deal with. In the 12th chapter of St. John I’m going to call Jesus on the stand as my helper now in his teachings in St. John 12:44-45 and this is Christ talking: “Jesus cried and said, he that believeth on me, believeth not on me but on him that sent me.” Now to explain the setting. That’s why I asked Mr. Moore this question. God is omnipresent. Wasn’t it possible that God could send someone and go with that one he sent? Argument to explain that would go like this, a sail-ship. The wind sends the ship out but the wind goes with the ship. That’s exactly the way it was, because God was in him, in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself and there’s no detour from that, Mr. Moore. That passage is actually mine. That’s right. God sent his Son. That doesn’t necessarily mean that God is like a man sending his Son. I have five sons in Florida. Someone might ask Jimmy, “Jimmy, where is your father?” and Jimmy couldn’t truthfully say my father is right here with me. His father is in Orange, Texas tonight. But in the case of God and his Son, God filling all space, Christ could say these words, “He that sent me

Godhead Debate

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

is with me.” and He was, that’s right. Amen. So, that doesn’t help your trinity theology there, Mr. Moore, about the word sent.

Mediator-ship

Now, while he speaks about the mediator; “He ever liveth to make intercession”. That is, that Christ’s priesthood lives on. It isn’t changed. He’s a High Priest but his offering was offered. And the Bible said, “Once in the end of the world has he appeared to liberate away sin by the sacrifice of himself and by one offering has he perfected them that are sanctified.” I’ll stay with you on that mediator-ship and your chart until it’s rags, rags, rags.

Does God Know Everything?:

That’s right. I mean that. Now, the Scriptures that Mr. Moore tried to grapple with and he could not. It’s not because he’s not a nice man. It’s not because he’s not a good debater, he is. I concede that. Mr. Moore is an intelligent man. But the position he holds just can not be backed up by anybody. When it comes to the light of the Bible and God’s truth to us, the Trinitarian position cannot be upheld. I asked him this question. When he said that the Father knew more than the Son I presented an argument to show that if there were three distinct persons of God, one as much God as the other one is God, that would never have been in the Bible because one would have known as much as the other two knew. Could you imagine God not knowing anything? Why Mr. Moore asked the question does he know everything? Well, if he knows everything, he knows everything and if he doesn’t know everything how could he learn everything? That’s what I want him to answer when he comes back here. That’s right. And that’s not nearly right Mr. Moore that is right.

Malachi 2:10

Now I want to show you the position it places Mr. Moore in about the Fatherhood of God. Mal. 2:10 says, “Have we not one father?” Well now, Jesus Christ is the everlasting Father and the Bible says he is. If he is,

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

then he and God must be fused together. There’s no way around it. The eternal invisible God was incarnated to that born Son that grew and learned and yet was glorified by this invisible God and became the visible person of the invisible God. The Bible says he was the express image. Now I want to show you what Christ said when they asked him. In fact there is only one way to actually know God if Christ told the truth, and I believe that he did.

Matthew 11:27

In Mat. 11:27, Jesus said, “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” Now, if Jesus Christ told the truth, and I believe he did, there is no way on earth that you can depart from the revelation of Jesus Christ of the Father and ever find who the everlasting Father God is. Now he said that. I’m going to read it again. “No man can know the Father save the Son and he to whosoever the Son will reveal him.” And that’s what Christ said. Now I’m going to give you a revelation of the Father by the Son to a man. And if it isn’t what I’m teaching, then it—it is what I’m teaching.

There’s no if to it! (** 2 sentences left out**)

Christ said in Mat. 11th chapter that no man can know the Father except the Son reveals the Father to him. Why? Because Mr. Moore knows that nobody knows what God looks like, unless it’s Jesus Christ. Could you imagine, and I want to appeal to your reasonable thinking for a moment. Let’s say the trinity doctrine is right, which it isn’t. God knows it isn’t and I know it isn’t and you are going to know it isn’t before this debate is over if I have my way about it. Now suppose the trinity doctrine was right, that there are three separate distinct persons of God as Mr. Moore contends here and all other Trinitarians, whether he likes the word Trinitarian or not he’s in it. That’s right. He’s contending for their theology. I wouldn’t be ashamed of it, I’d accept it and all the rest that goes with it if I believed it and taught it like Mr. Moore teaches it. But mind you this, if

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

God and this man were not fused and became the same one, then suppose Mr. Moore went to heaven. Of course I don't mean he's headed that way; I'm not saying that through criticism, unless I baptize him right. He thinks the same thing about me. We're even-steven there. Now! But suppose he went to heaven with his concept of the Trinitarian theology and someone would ask him a million years from tonight. "Mr. Moore, do you have a heavenly Father?" "Yes, he's here somewhere but I can't see him." It doesn't make logical reasoning. But the way that I and my brethren teach this it can be Biblically explained and it is that we can see and know. Then Christ is the everlasting Father. Mal. 2:10 says "We have one Father." There is no getting around it. Christ and the invisible God were fused together in person and he became the visible person of invisible God. I was asked this question: "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way the truth and the life: No man can come unto the Father but by me. If you had known me..." That's Mr. Moore's trouble, he doesn't know Jesus. That's right. I don't say that through criticism. The Trinitarians do not know him in the full sense of his glory. I believe that! Jesus said these words: "If you had known me, you would have known the Father also: and from henceforth you know him, and have seen him." Now what plainer language could anybody want? That is a revelation of the Father by the Son to a man.

The Word "Both"

Now he hedges on that word both and I'll just add that one with this one right here. Comes in real nice. The word both he has on this blackboard over here, I'm going to give him a Biblical quotation on the Godhead. I find it right here in John 15:24. Jesus is talking again, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father." There's your both Mr. Moore wound up together in Biblical truth. That's right. Now, the truth of the matter remains and will be God's commandment from all time. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." They asked Jesus one time what was the greatest commandment of all. In Mark 12:29 he said these words: "...The first of all the commandments is,

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord.” The position that I and my brethren hold explains the begotten Son of God, how he was born. He did not have an earthly Father. His Father was invisible as a Spirit God presented the Son: “But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,” If the Trinitarian doctrine were right, which it isn’t, but if it were, (I’ll say this about the theology of all Trinitarian people, their theology takes Mary back further than the Catholic religion has taken her up. She would have to be back yonder before there was a world. And she wasn’t there.) Only in the mind of God! As Mr. Moore referred to Genesis, after I’d introduced it, (1:26), “let us make man.” And the Scripture says that he was: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” (Jn. 17:5). That’s not any credit to Trinitarianism. The Bible explains that. In Eph. Chapter 1 the Bible, speaking about the church said these words, “We were predestined in him before the foundation of the world.” That didn’t mean that the church was actually back there. Only in the mind and plan of God. The Bible said in Rom. 4:17 that God calleth those things that were not as though they were. And the Bible said that Jesus was the man, in the book of Revelation, slain before the foundation of the world. But actually we know that it was only in the mind of God. He died 2000 years ago. So that doesn’t help Mr. Moore’s cause any to present that. In fact, nothing will help him! That’s right. He’s not going to find anything to help him. No sir, not when it comes to teaching the Trinitarian theology. He’ll never find it. No!

Fused Together

I introduced a Scripture a while ago proving that we knew we were in Christ because he had given us of his Spirit. (1Jn 4:13) And then in Colossians it said that the mystery that has been hid from ages is now manifest, which is Christ in you. I’ve oft times wondered if Trinitarians could try to harmonize their teaching about individualities of God and beings and persons. I don’t think any man would say that his Spirit was a separate person from him. It’s part of him. Mr. Moore introduced the Godhead Debate

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

Scripture in John 1:1, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” I don’t believe that any man would believe that his word was a separate person from him. It just doesn’t work that way. And God’s Spirit is God’s Spirit, and Christ and God are one fused together. He became the person of the eternal God, and he is the everlasting Father. The Bible says he is. And when he gives us his Spirit, the Holy Spirit, it is Christ omnipresent. As Paul said in Colossians, “The mystery that has been hid from ages but is now made manifest which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.” Jesus said, “in that day you know I am in you”. The Trinitarians have another being separate and apart from Christ. They have another spirit in their theology and mythology, and that cannot be true. There is one Spirit. The Bible says that in Ephesians, and in the sense of Bible explanation, it proves beyond a shadow of doubt in the same 4th chapter of Ephesians that that one Spirit proves out to be the eternal Spirit of God which is the Spirit of Christ, and that his body or person is the headquarters and corporation of the person of that omnipresent God. That’s the language of this book I’m talking about here tonight. And every Trinitarian on earth stands indicted tonight in the courts of God’s eternal heavens with their theology of demoting Christ, taking from him the glory that the Bible gives him; such as, the husband of the church.

Husband and Wife Relationship

The husband of the church is always the Father of the children. The church, the church I belong to, is the wife of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostle Paul said in 2Cor 11:2, “... for I have espoused you to one husband...” If there was any trinity theology in the world in Paul’s day concerning the giving of the church to the Eternal God, Paul knew nothing of it. He said, “...for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.” The trinity doctrine takes that away from him. That’s why I am going to do my dead level best the nights I am here to show you from this book here the erroneous conception of trinity theology. It takes him from the children. Mr. Moore

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

made quite a play, bless his heart, about him giving me a Bible and me handing it to Brother Gamblin. There’s quite a bit of difference in him giving me a Bible and him giving me my wife and me turning around and giving her to Brother Gamblin. There’s quite a bit of difference in that, Mr. Moore. I said there’s quite a bit of difference in that. Yes, sir, quite a bit. This church I’m talking about is the wife of the Lord Jesus Christ.

First Corinthians 15

And then he misconstrued the 15th chapter of First Corinthians, “Then cometh the end.” And I stated aforetime we were looking now to the cross of Calvary for our salvation. When a man comes to God, he must come that way. He must be baptized into Christ, by water and Spirit of course, and then in Christ the atonement becomes his. What happened on Calvary? Then if he does sin the Bible plainly tells us that he is the propitiation for our sins and not for our sins only but for the sins of the whole world, through everlasting priesthood and his everlasting offering that lives on and never dies until the end of time or passes such time of operations. There’s nothing else he has to do. If he had to pray again, he’d have to die again. If he had to do something for you before another person of the Godhead, he’d have to bring some kind of offering. That’s why the Book said that by one offering had he perfected forever them that are sanctified. Amen.

Isaiah Passages On One God

Now, in the passages of Scripture that we went over in Isaiah, I was showing the contradiction of the trinity concept. Now Mr. Moore can grapple with these and if he lived long enough to make Methuselah look like a school boy he’d never change them. If he could live that long, bless his heart. But he won’t live that long. But could he do that? Now in the 45th chapter, and this is positive teaching by God himself that said these things, Isa. 45:21 “Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Am not I the LORD? And there is no God else

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me.” Now the only Biblical way that can harmonize with all the Bible is the position that my brethren and I take concerning God. That God is omnipresent from eternity to eternity. No one had ever looked upon him and could not see him. He became visible through birth, conception of the Son of God, and glorified that man, Christ Jesus, with his own self and made him the visible person of the invisible God. He asks a question: If there was a being of God before? He thinks me and my brethren are going to have a debate on it. I’m going to tell you one thing. When you talk about brethren debating, I can bring up some things about you and your brethren. I may not do it and I may. I might just do it Mr. Moore. I’m not going to do that right now. But I can do it all right. Yes sir. But nevertheless, God existed. I don’t know how God looked. No Jew could tell you. When Moses was at Mount Sinai, the passage of God, the mountain shook and smoke was there. They could not see him. The 11th chapter of Hebrews said, “Moses endured, as seeing him who is invisible.” But whatever and whoever God was, he was incarnated in that man that went to Calvary. And glorified that man that went to Calvary with his own self. And Jesus speaking of that in his own explainable terminology said, “He that has seen me hath hated me, has seen and hated my Father.” However that may be and I want to say this right here. There will never be anyone any place or anywhere that you can ever look to see God in person or deal with in person other than through the face of that man that went to Calvary, and was the express image of the invisible God. There may be many false gods, there may be many heathen deities or gods, but the Bible tells me without a shadow of doubt who the true God is: Jer 10:10, “But the LORD is the true God,…” Who is the Lord? When Saul was on his way to Damascus and God knocked him from his beast and he fell to the earth, looking towards heaven he said these words, “Lord, who art thou?” The answer came back, “I am Jesus”. The full reading of Jer 10:10, “But the LORD is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation.”

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

And I didn’t say awhile ago that I was getting further away from this, Mr. Moore. You either misunderstood me or kind of turned me a U-turn there. I meant that I was getting further away from what you preach. Yes sir. Even if I did say it, I meant that there. But my stand there was that I’m getting further away from the Trinitarian theory every time I debate. Yes, that’s what I meant, Mr. Moore. Now, Isa 45:22 “Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.” I said before and I say again, if existing there were a company of Gods or a committee of persons in God, do you believe that God would have said these words, “I swore by myself” 50 times in the Bible. I’ll produce it tomorrow night; I’ll refer to it tonight. But some 50 times in the Bible, God is referred to as the Holy One. Even the devils knew him. They lived up there with him at one time and he kicked them out of heaven. I say he kicked them out of there; they left. He said, “I beheld Satan as lightning falling”. And when Satan and his company met him on this earth they said these words about him, “we know thee, thou Holy One of God.” That’s it. They knew who he was. They’d been up there with him. That’s right, Holy One. Not trinity or three, Mr. Moore. All right. Now I must move along or my time will soon be gone for me tonight, but if the Lord is willing there will be more tomorrow night.

Isaiah 45:23

“I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.” I’ve proved conclusively, and Mr. Moore may hurl efforts to tear down that, but in Philippians the 2nd chapter, the revelation and fulfillment of this Scripture here pointed directly to Jesus Christ and him alone. And here’s the way it reads. The God that said there’s no God beside him, none with him said these words now, that he “swore by himself”. Of course there was nobody there for him to swear with, there was no one there with him so he had to swear by himself and he did. Between the time that God said this and the time that this takes

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

place God was manifest in the flesh. That’s right. He overshadowed a virgin woman. He begot a Son, his own begotten Son. He was incarnate God in Christ reconciling the world unto, not themselves, but himself. That’s right. Not imputing their trespasses. And then he saw a time coming after he became visible, as his children will be in the end, that one could enjoy, they could enjoy him and see him. The Bible said in the last book, the last chapter and the last verse, “They shall see his face and his name shall be in their foreheads.” He looked to that time when he would glorify this man with his own self. Then he said to him in the second chapter “God has highly exalted him” That is, he glorified him with his own self and made him the visible person of the invisible God; God was eternal Father, everlasting Father, all that as far as God in person would ever be concerned. “And given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow; of things in earth, of things in heaven, things under the earth.” Now I don’t know, Brother, Mr. Moore, I call him brother, of course if I didn’t hit him in Christ I’ll probably hit him in Adam, amen. To those other persons of God as the Trinitarians teach, and they had knees, of course there are no such thing. But if there was, they would have to bend their knees to God in Christ; Glorified Christ, bearing this name, the everlasting Father in a time to come. That proves that the same God of Isaiah that said there is no other God, proves to be Jesus Christ in the New Testament; and the name Jesus in the end that they’ll bow their knees to and confess to that name. I’m showing the contradiction to trinity theory.

Isaiah 46:9

In Isa. 46:9 “Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me,” I know what the trinity doctrine is. I know where it had its beginning. I’ll be telling you more about that tomorrow night when I have the affirmative. Mind you my friends, if the trinity doctrine was right; and there were three equal persons of God, the same to make the one God, God would’ve never put this verse in the Bible. It would’ve been missing. It wouldn’t have been

Monday – Welch’s Second Negative

there. “Declaring the end from the beginning.” Let us make man again. I want to throw this in, too; it’ll help that out. “Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying my council shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.”

Isaiah 43:12-13

You want to know if he’s going to do it all. He said here that he would. That’s right. He sure did. In Isaiah 43: 12,13 “I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed, when there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, that I am God. Yea, before the day was I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand: I will work, and who shall let it?” Jesus said in Jn. 8:24 “I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.” And Jesus said in Rev. 1:8, I am ... the almighty.” Isa 43:14 “Thus saith the LORD, your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships.” Holy one, not holy two, not holy three. Now he’s my Holy One. I don’t have but one. Now if he’d have been three he would have said to me, “Now Welch I’m your holy three.” If he’d of been two he’d of said, “Welch, I’m you holy two.” But he didn’t say that. He said “I’m your Holy One, the creator of Israel, your king. That’s exactly what he said in Jer. 10:10, “The Lord.” There may be many false gods, but “The Lord is a true God, he is an everlasting king; and at his wrath the earth shall tremble.” And so I see my time has slipped away; until tomorrow night, the Lord willing

The End of Speech

End of First Proposition

The Next proposition is as follows:

1. The Scriptures teach that there is only one person in the Godhead and that person is Jesus.

Mr. Welch Affirms

Godhead Debate: Part Three-A

Mr. Moderator, Mr. Moore, ladies and gentlemen. It is with a deep sense of reverence for Almighty God that I appear here again this evening to participate in this Bible discussion. I would like to say tonight at the very outset of my speech, that I appreciate the opportunity of coming to Orange; for the opportunity of meeting my brethren, so many of them and to be sponsored by this fine church, The First United Pentecostal Church, located on Border Street here in Orange Texas. And to have the opportunity of speaking to you here in this fine audience; and not only to you but to the radio audience. Now, I might say here in the very outset of tonight’s speech that should I in this debate refer to any religious people in reference to facts of religious things starting, such as the Protestants, Jews or Catholics, it does not specify that I personally have anything against you. I respect all mankind. In my heart tonight I have no grievance against any religion. So if I refer to any religious group in the debate, remember that it is in the interest of what I believe to be true, and from no personal criticism of my own about you.

Affirmative Proposition:

“One Person in the Godhead”

Now tonight, in as much as I am in the affirmative, it is my job to define my proposition. That is, that I teach and believe there is only one person in the Godhead. I believe that. When I say person, to define that in it’s complete sense, I mean the teachings of person that can appear bodily, that you can recognize there in person; I conclude that all of the Godhead, from the standpoint of body, centers in Christ Jesus. Thus, by that he is the only one, if there is a God, ever could be that could appear as a person to anyone. That’s a definition of my proposition tonight. And I’d like to liken that to a Scripture concerning man. The apostle said in 1Ths. 5:23, “And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Up until God took on him the form of man, no one knew what God looked like and would have never known

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

if God had not appeared in that form. Throughout all the ceaseless eternity, we could number it that way, no one could ever recognize God in person. They could recognize him in power, by his omnipresence; but to appear in person, that means you are personally there. I’m here tonight in person. You see me, you recognize that I am. My spirit, my soul, my body is all contained in my person here tonight.

Proof Argument

Now, in the explanation of this, I wish to bring forth Scripture to prove this. First, in as much as God was invisible and eternal, and the Son of God was born, there was a connecting together of the invisible to the visible. In Col. 1:15 the Bible said of Jesus Christ, that he’s the image of the invisible God. Now up until God was manifest in the flesh, as he said in 1Tim 3:16, God could not be seen. He could appear in his Spirit omnipresent but to appear with them in person as he could after he took upon him this bodily form, it did not happen until after that. And that’s what I want to emphasize tonight. Now, I’ve asked Mr. Moore some questions and he has asked me some. He ask me one about Heb,10:5.

Answers of Moore’s Questions

- (1) Who is the “thou” in Heb. 10:5?

Jesus is speaking there in his humility or his humanity; speaking of the sacrifice he would suffer; and said of the eternal Spirit, “A body has thou prepared me.” And that body was prepared for sacrifice. He said in Revelation the last chapter “I am the root and offspring of David. The root meant he was the creator. As for as invisible God was concerned, the root made David and brought him forth, and yet was the offspring after this body of humanity.

- (2) Do you agree that the word one denotes contrast opposed to another?

I don’t altogether know what Mr. Moore means by that. But in some cases it could.

- (3) Do you believe that Jesus is now the Son of God?

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

Yes.

- (4) Does God have the right and power to limit his knowledge?

Well, as far as limiting his knowledge, I don’t see why he ever would. Now of course, when you answer a question of what God can and can’t do that’s a big question. But since God is almighty and he’s omnipresent and God, I don’t see how that God could ever want to forget anything. In fact I don’t think he could.

- (5) Since you believe that words are signs of ideas, could you please explain the ideas conveyed in the word “both”?

I have some charts here, Jesus is both. We find the Scripture in St. John 15:24. Now, when it comes to speaking about the Godhead, I covered that last evening. Jesus said here, “You have seen and hated both me and my Father.” And also in the connection between, as I’ve proved in the fourteenth chapter of St. John, not another. The Holy Spirit, when Jesus prayed said, “I’ll pray the Father, and he’ll give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth.” Then further down, proving that it was the same one that was doing the praying that would be doing the coming, the latter verse before that said that I’ll not leave you comfortless; I will come to you. I covered that pretty well last evening but I’ll answer it again tonight.

Will Christ Appear in Bodily Form?

I’ll ask you some. Is Jesus the everlasting Father? When Jesus Christ appears will he appear in bodily form as in Titus 2:13? And the Scripture says this, “Looking for the glorious appearing Of the great God and our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.” Now when he appears in person, I asked him the question, will he appear in bodily form? Will he have a body? Now since the full sense Of person means to appear in bodily form, to be present; then when he appears he will come back in bodily form and as Paul said in Col. 2:8 and 9, “In Him dwelleth all the fullness Of the Godhead bodily.” Since to appear in the full sense is to be there in bodily form that can be recognized as a person, he will appear as he did at the resurrection in his bodily form. That’s why I teach that the Godhead

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

bodily, is in Christ personally and in person and not out of him. That’s right. Now, in the Bible we find that he did appear after he arose from the dead. In John 20:26 and 28 he appeared and Thomas said he would not believe it was he unless he could reach forth his hands and thrust them into the nail prints in his hands and the spear thrust in his side. And Jesus said to him, reach hither thy hand Thomas, and see it is I. He appeared there in person, in bodily form. We find again that he appears to them in Luke 24:34-41 and I will read that to you. He appeared here in bodily form after he arose from the dead. He had a body and he appeared in Luke the 24th chapter, 37th verse: “But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, why are ye troubled and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” Now, since he does have a spirit can he have a body? The fact that he was conveying to them was that he was not some spirit. He presented himself in person. He was there in person, there in body. That’s right.

Now, I’d like to ask this question since it seems that Mr. Moore has put this chart up over here; “Place, Spirit, Title, Name”. Last evening he made some remarks about some of the things that we taught; Jesus praying to himself, and such and sending himself, and things like that. I’d like to ask him a question. Which would be the hardest to do; pray to yourself, send yourself, or raise your self from the dead?

Now in John 2:19 Jesus said these words, “Destroy this temple”; that is, the body, the body that he was going to live in throughout eternity, was going to be God’s body. “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.” Now, if Jesus Christ was not God in the full sense, and he was, it was the eternal invisible Spirit, because Paul said in the 8th chapter of Romans, “If the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you.” And Jesus Christ actually raised himself from the dead, if the Bible’s true. That fuses again the eternal, invisible and the

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

visible to present and produce a body of God that he can appear in, in person, and be seen and looked upon. And that’s all in Jesus Christ.

Godhead Bodily

Now, in Colossians 2:8 and 9 we find all the Godhead bodily, that is the body part of it. No one can appear in a body but Christ because he’s the only one that has one and he’s the only one that ever will. He’s God’s body - I SAY HE’S GOD’S BODY! In Isa. 26:19 God speaking through prophecy said these words, “Thy dead men shall live, with my dead body.” God has a body. That man Christ is his body. It’s the body of the Godhead and the person. Now, he said in Isaiah 26:19, “Thy dead men shall live with my dead body.” All right. Then in Matthew 27:25 when Christ rose from the dead many of the dead saints arose and appeared to many; showing that that body that God spoke of was his body. Now, in the sense of person, to appear bodily in person, to be recognized, then Jesus Christ, the man Christ, the Son of God, was the body of the invisible God that lived in him and resurrected that body from the dead; it’s all Jesus; Jesus the Spirit; Jesus the man. We find in 1Cor. the 15th chapter and the 3rd verse, God speaking there of the resurrection. The Apostle Paul was anointed by the Spirit of Almighty God and said on the resurrection or the resurrected ones that God giveth it a body as it pleased him, and to every seed his own body, or likeness of this body. Now since Christ became the first fruits of those that slept and he did, then we’re to be resurrected like him, and we will. Then in Phil. 3:20 and 21 said these words that he’d fashion our vile body like unto his glorious body. Now, David said these words in Psalms 17:15, “I’ll be satisfied, I’ll wake in his likeness.”

It was the purpose of God from back before there was a world that he’d beget a Son, a material being. That Son would be his body; and through that man Christ, God would manifest himself to the world in person or to his people in person for all time and eternity and become visible to man.

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

Now, in 1John 3:1 and 2, “Now are we the sons of God, and it doeth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him.” Now, from back yonder when God said, “let us make man in our likeness,” I challenge Mr. Moore here, every bit of him, every ounce he weighs, I say this through courtesy to him, to show anybody or anything, this is in the Bible or anyone that the saints of almighty God are going to be like when this Christian journey is over, other than the Lord Jesus Christ. He is that likeness. He is that person. He is that likeness and he is that person. All right. In as much as he is the likeness, then we’ll be like him when he comes back again. It was God’s purpose in the beginning when he said, “Let us make man in our likeness.” Now, when man’s journey is completed and he’s a finished product, and there’s nothing else to do to him, and he stands in the likeness of his creator; who and what is that likeness that he’ll stand in the likeness of? It’s Jesus Christ. Now, if’ God had not taken on him a body as he said here, “a body thou hast prepared”, then no one, as I said last evening, could ever have looked upon anything in person or seen anything in person that they could’ve called their God - looked at and worshipped as God if God had not taken on him this form of man.

I know tonight, as I stand before you, that I am battling almost 2000 years of man-made erroneous philosophy and theology. I realize that but I know another thing, that the Godhead is so mystical in its setting in the Bible there’s no easy task of explaining this. The Bible said, “Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness.” But you take the point to come back to, every time it brings you to this God-man Jesus Christ. If you want to see the Father you go to him. John 14:9 said, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.” He simply meant by that, that I’m God’s person. He said, in John 10:30, “I and my Father are one.” It was the eternal Spirit causing him to utter these words. He said that the Father, eternal, invisible, that is incarnated in me; he’s doing the works, and bringing to you through me the express image of the invisible God. And he has now and will now show you the invisible things of him from the

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

creation of the world looking upon me, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Romans 1:20:

In the 1st chapter of Romans the Bible said, “The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are now clearly seen.” Well, there’s only one place that it can be seen. That’s looking through the body of Jesus Christ. Every man no doubt longed to look at the God who made him and to see him. I said last evening Moses endured as seeing him that’s invisible. But now Paul said, “The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, even his eternal power and Godhead.” Now, if the body part of the Godhead is ALL in Christ and to be present bodily or to be present in person, the full coverage would mean the bodily presence. Then to see God in, or to have him in person with you and to see who or what he is, it’s impossible to even think of that other than through this man Christ Jesus that became the glorified body of God Almighty.

Some Historical Facts

Now, I’m going to present a few facts tonight and I trust that none will take any offense out in radio land. That is, I have some historical facts. There’s a tract there. See if you can find it. That’s right. No, that’s not it. Yes, that’s the one. Now these historical facts present without any ill feeling towards any religious group about the establishment of the trinity doctrine. Now since I can’t find the word trinity in the Bible and since my opponent doesn’t even like for me to refer to him as a Trinitarian, I’ll say with due respect to him and no ill feeling or criticism of him, that he is a Trinitarian in philosophy and theology whether he wants to accept that or not. Now the first establishment of the church there is no history that goes back to the Trinitarian doctrine in hours and times of the establishment of the church. Every authentic book that you can find about where the trinity doctrine came from, carries you back some hundreds of years this side of Christ, and it was established, I’m firmly convinced tonight, by the minds of men. I believe that. I believe it was a concept of the ancient mythologies, of ancient worlds that was gleaned

Godhead Debate

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

by theologians at the time that this came up. You can recall that there had to be such a doctrine as three separate persons of God taught in their theology. It’s not taught in the Bible.

The Trinity Doctrine

The following information is offered as proof in church history as well as the Scriptures, proving water baptism in Jesus’ name was practiced for 300 years after Christ and was changed by the Roman Catholic Church. I say this without any disrespect to Catholic people. I love the Catholic people just as I do the Methodists, or the Baptists, or the so-called Church of Christ, or anybody. I do not indict them. I am simply quoting historical facts about the establishment of the trinity doctrine- - a dictionary of the Bible, Schribers, page 241, Vol. 1. There is a form of words into the name of Jesus, the Lord Jesus. Baptism into the trinity was a latter development. All right.

And I quote Canney’s Encyclopedia, page 53. The early church always baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus until the development of the trinity; afterward they were baptized in the name of Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The new International Encyclopedia, Vol.22, page 476 – trinity doctrine in the Catholic faith is this.

Catholic Faith on Trinity

I’m going to indict Mr. Moore tonight, a true indictment that his theology is in perfect harmony with the conception of trinity. The Catholic faith is this: We worship one God in trinity. That there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost; the glory is equal, the majesty is co-eternal. The doctrine is not found in its full development from the Scriptures. Modern theology does not seek to find it in the Old Testament. At the time of the reformation the protestant church took over the doctrine of the trinity without serious examination. I believe that tonight with all my heart. And the reason why I’m here is for the defense of Jesus Christ as the everlasting Father; the fusing together of the man Godhead Debate

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

Christ Jesus and the God eternal that made him the visible person of the invisible God, and thus that all the body of the Godhead is in Christ. And to appear personally as he did in his body and the Bible said, in Acts 1:3, that he was seen of them after his resurrection forty days, in his person, His resurrected body. He was seen of them. And he went back to heaven and the Bible said, “This same Jesus that is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you’ve seen him go into heaven.” The Bible says, “He’s the everlasting Father.” Isaiah 9:6. Everlasting means no end; and the only Biblical and truthful way that that could be is the exact position that I and my brethren hold the opposite to the trinity theology. I am not a Trinitarian, I do not believe in the trinity doctrine. It has no place in the Bible. God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself: and since all the Godhead bodily is in Christ, then the name of the Godhead is Jesus.

Jesus the Almighty

And now, in the last book in the Bible, Rev. 1:8, speaking of Jesus Christ it says, “I am the Almighty.” So I must take my stand. I can take no other in the face of these facts that there is nothing but one person of God. That person is centered in the resurrected body of the Lord Jesus Christ. He’s coming back from heaven in that same body. We’re going to be changed to be like him and there’s not anyone else we’re going to be like. Mr. Moore has at least three more nights to disprove that. When the Christian journey is ended; God said, “Let us make man in our likeness” and I’m contending that this resurrected Christ is that likeness. If there is anyone else that Mr. Moore can find, he’ll have three nights to do it. That we’re going to be in the image of when this journey is over. I’m here to hear him produce that. And since I’m more than sure that Mr. Moore can’t, I’m going to hold my position as I’ve held it for some 40 years. Jesus Christ is the Almighty God. The only Godhead bodily centers in him. He’s the everlasting Father and his Spirit is the Holy Ghost.

Tuesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

The Mystery Hidden

Paul said in Colossians the first chapter, “now the mystery that has been hid for ages...” and I’d like to deal with that if I have time. The Spirit of this person is not the person. The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the person. That’s right. The only part of Christ we could’ve seen is his Spirit. That’s the part that’s omnipresent. But as far as the person of Jesus Christ that person is in heaven, a glorified body, and he’s going to stay there until he comes back in person. And we’re going to be like that person when these bodies of ours are changed and we’re in his likeness in the resurrection. Thus, by that then we conclude there is one person of God and that person is the Lord Jesus Christ.

The End of Speech

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

Godhead Debate: Part Three-B

Gentlemen Moderators, ladies and gentlemen of the audience here, and those in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'm happy that through the providence of the Lord I'm privileged to be back this evening to continue our investigation into these matters. I want to join with the statements that have been made, prior to my coming to the stand, about the appreciation of your interest in a discussion of this kind, and the efforts that have been put forth by so many people to make it possible. I'm certainly happy to be here to engage in this dispute with Mr. Welch.

Double Talk

I now want to refer to a few matters that were brought up last evening in the last speech - since we are continuing the same subject. You know I have, in the few disputes that I've had, endeavored to be just as nice and courteous to a man as he is to me. And I've always endeavored to keep before the audience at all times, not only the fallacy of a man's reasoning, but also the fallacy of his tactics. Mr. Welch last night, throughout the discussion, engaged in tremendous DOUBLE-TALK, that just simply means that you say a lot of words, a lot of sayings, but they have no particular meaning. Double-talk of course, is a means of saying something and yet saying nothing. I want to read you a sample of what I'm talking about when I say double-talk. The following statement wasn't made last night, it was made in a debate that he had with brother Belue, and I took it from the tape. Now you listen to this. He was asked the question "Who is the thou in Hebrews 10:5?" I want you to note what Mr. Welch said, "Eternal Spirit was the Father of that man Christ, the man Christ had a body he died. It was humanity talking of the eternal Spirit that over-shadowed Mary that brought the body that the humanity of Christ died that thou has given me a body. This me here, became the entirety of the thou yonder." That's what I'm talking about. It's not a thing on earth but double-talking, and he engaged in that tremendously. I want you to know that to make a lot of statements doesn't prove anything.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

The Law of Rationality

And the second thing I want to call to your attention is his evasion of the LAW of RATIONALITY. He has this evening, as well as last evening, made an appeal to emotion. The introduction of the terms Trinity, Trinitarians, Catholicism, things of this kind serves not to teach a thing on earth but rather to create emotions; to try to prejudice the minds of the people. That's one thing he's engaged in. And that's an evasion of the Law of Rationality. I brought along with me a book that has to do with the matter of logic and reason. I want to turn and read you some of it. On page 131, Mr. Ruby talks about the evasion of the LAW of RATIONALITY. One of the evasions is the appeal to emotion, not only from the standpoint of trying to stir the emotions by terms such as have been used, but also a appeal to laughter. On page 131 Mr. Ruby says, "Finally, we note the appeal to laughter. This means that we meet an opponent's arguments, not by evidence, but by a joke which arouses laughter at the expense of the other person, to divert the attention of the hearers from the issue. But laughter like loud talking is never a substitute for evidence." I want to give you a sample of this. I asked him last night several times, I asked him again this evening in a written question and I had it on the board to please tell us what the word B-O-T-H means, he has not yet told us. I don't know whether he ever will or not. There is not a fourth grader in this building that doesn't know what the word "both" means. But Mr. Welch is afraid to tell us. So he cited Jno. 15 last night, "They have both seen and hated both me and my Father." And he got a big laugh by stating that passage. But now what did that prove, ladies and gentlemen? Did that define the word both? Mr. Welch, you still haven't told this audience what the word BOTH means. Do you think they don't know? Don't you know that they know that the word BOTH means TWO? He cites Jno. 15:24, "they've both seen and hated both me and my Father" and he gets a laugh and laughs about the passage; but he hasn't answered the argument. You know that.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

Absurdities of the Oneness Doctrine

At this time I want to consider with you some absurdities my good friend made last evening, in the process of his speech. (Mr. Gamlin will you hand Mr. Welch a copy of this please sir?) That he might be able to follow me as I read them. These are some of the positions that he finds himself in from the statements that he makes:

- (1) Mr. Welch has argued in such a way as to deny that Jesus is NOW our mediator. Observe if you will. He denied that Jesus is now interceding for us. Then argued that intercession, mediation, and power amounted to the same thing. So, if Christ is not now interceding for us and if, as Mr. Welch teaches, that intercession and mediation is the same thing then Christ is not mediating for us now. I knew that his doctrine denied the mediator-ship of Christ but I never thought that he would advance the thought.
- (2) He emphatically denied last night that Jesus is now interceding for us even though the Bible affirms it, Heb. 7:15, "he ever liveth to make intercession for us." This is just simply a case of Welch verses the Bible.
- (3) He admitted that two or more things may be one in a sense and still be more than one in another; yet, his entire rebuttal consisted of arguing that God is one. Yet, by his own admission this does not necessarily mean one person. It may mean two or more. He admitted that and yet this was the minor premise of his arguing last night.
- (4) In answer to my question four, he denied that there was a person before the Word became flesh. (And you did that again this evening too, as we shall note.) Yet, Mr. Welch, in answer to this question in a debate with Mr. Belue, you said that there was a person. Observe he said an invisible person. Now, Mr. Welch, which time were you right? Then or now?
- (5) You agreed that the essential idea involved in the terms father and son was that of two persons, but denied that such was the case when it referred to Jesus and his Father. Now tell us, Mr.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

Welch, what idea did the Lord intend to convey by the terms Father and Son?

- (6) He implied that Jesus was hypocritical when he prayed; his prayers were only to impress the audience that heard. Now if that isn't what you meant on John 10, you tell us what you did mean.
- (7) He argued that the Father sending the Son was like the wind blowing the ship, and now let's take a look at his illustration. He advanced the argument that when you literally saw the Son you literally saw the Father. If that isn't what he meant let him tell us. I asked him six important questions in my speech last night and he ignored them. He also argued that the Father and the Son are one and the same thing; hence the ship and the wind are the same thing.
- (8) He made the statement that Jesus became the express image and person of the invisible God. But the Bible states, "He became the express image of God's person. Just another case of Welch manufacturing Scripture. He argued that my doctrine would not allow me to recognize the invisible God, yet in the same context affirmed the devil recognized God because he'd been in heaven with God.
- (9) He cited the passage in Hebrews where Jesus is being contrasted with the priest under Moses and where he is said to have sat down. And he concluded that he's no longer doing anything, not interceding, not mediating. Is he acting as our advocate, Mr. Welch?

Questions Mr. Welch Has Asked

- (1) "Is Jesus Christ the everlasting Father?"
Isa 9:6 says that he is. Yes!
- (2) "When Jesus Christ appears will he appear in a bodily form as mentioned in Titus 2:13?"

Well in the first place, Mr. Welch, I don't believe that you've properly

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

analyzed Titus 2:13. I want to take a look at the verse for a moment. This verse doesn't tell us how the Lord will appear. This verse is simply encouraging Christians to live righteously while they are looking for the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ. It doesn't tell us how he's going to appear. Now observe if you will. He said in verse 12, "Instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world, looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." Now that verse is telling New Testament Christians to act in a certain way while they're looking forward to the time that he does come. So, that verse doesn't say what you think it says. But as I suggested to you last night, I Jno. 3:1 tells us that we don't know what he's like. I answered this question last night. I called your attention to Acts the First Chapter. That the passage there affirmed, "that as they saw him ascend they would likewise see him when he returns again." There's no issue on that at all.

- (3) "For one to appear in person, does it mean they appear in bodily form?"

No it does not. When you met Mr. Belue you admitted this, but tonight you deny it. OH, YES YOU DID! You said an invisible person.

- (4) "Is the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ?"

He asked me this question last night. I answered it then. He said he didn't understand what I said. I've written out a statement for Mr. Welch and I want to read it carefully so that you can understand what I've said. I said this, "Jesus had a Spirit and the Spirit that he had was holy. He didn't have an evil Spirit." That's what I said last night. That's what I say again tonight.

- (5) "Is Jesus Christ the Almighty God?"

I affirmed last evening that the Bible teaches that Jesus is God. He's omnipotent, he's therefore Almighty. Certainly so. All right I want to take up his speech.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

Admonishing The Audience To Be Courteous

I want you to be courteous when Mr. Welch is speaking. I believe that it's in order that I expect the same from you. I think Mr. Gamlin and Mr. Welch both agree with me on that. I appreciate their fine statements. We want to have a good discussion and I intend to press Mr. Welch. He intends to do me the same way. But laughing is not the answer to an argument. It may help your feelings but it doesn't answer an argument. He says that if he mentions any religious group he doesn't do this with any purpose of demeaning them; and of course I feel the same way. If I mention the name of some religious group it's not for the purpose of trying to intimidate anybody whatsoever.

Definition of Person

And then his definition of person. Now, Mr. Welch I have jotted down from the tape verbatim, your definition of person when you met brother Belue. It is not the same as you gave tonight. It's not the same, Mr. Welch. Here's what Mr. Welch said about person when he debated Mr. Belue, "When I say person I mean what it takes to make a being in full, an intelligent being." Of course that's my definition of person that I gave last night. He further says, "That is, with body or without body." Now tonight he said no, and you know that he did. Observe further, I have those tapes laying right over there on the table if you want to deny that, Mr. Welch. "With body or without body." That's right he says. "But in the Godhead teachings of the Bible there was a time when the person of God did not have a body. Invisible. Later God begot a Son of a woman and this Son became the visible person of the invisible God. That's my contention." Now there was a person you said then but tonight you said, "By person I mean that which appears in a bodily form." Now you said back then, "By person I mean with body or without body." Now, which time did you mean what you said? I suggest to you that you were closer to the truth then than you are now.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

I want to show you that actually his proposition and his definition of person put him in a ridiculous position. Now observe ladies and gentlemen. He says, and his proposition affirms that there is one person in the Godhead and the Godhead means deity and person means bodily. So you have something bodily in deity. Now think about it for a moment. He has something bodily IN DEITY. That's like saying you have water in a rock isn't it? Look at it now. He has the thing in reverse. He talks about there being a person in deity and he's talking about there being deity in a person. That's the way you've been talking isn't it, Mr. Welch. Now you straighten that out when you get up here. You talk about a person in the Godhead and the word person, he says, is bodily, and Godhead is deity. So he has something bodily in deity.

And then he said, "No one could have recognized him in person until he was manifested in the body of Jesus Christ and that God was personally there in the body of Jesus Christ." Now I want to know something, Mr. Welch. Would you tell us, in Mat 27:46, when Jesus said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" I want to know, did he cease to be divine? Now you ignored what I asked you last night. Are you going to ignore that tonight? Let's see. These folks are listening to that. "God was invisible", well, was he a person? His definition of person tonight argues there was no person until Christ came in Bethlehem. And you know that. He says that it demands a bodily thing, something bodily. Well now, was there a bodily being before Bethlehem? He argued there wasn't. Therefore, no person before Bethlehem then. Every passage that he has introduced, or that he will introduce in the Old Testament is completely impertinent because Mr. Welch doesn't believe there was a person back there. Do you Mr. Welch? Or do you? One time he does and another time he doesn't.

Answers To Moore's Questions

- (1) "Who is the thou in Hebrews 10:5?"

And from what he said I gathered that he meant the "Thou" was the eternal Spirit.

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

And like I say it was one of those statements that had a lot of double-talk and I wasn't able to determine what was meant. But if he didn't mean that "thou" was the eternal Spirit, then he can correct it when he gets up here and I'll apologize. But that's what I understood him to say that the thou was the eternal Spirit. And he called attention to the fact that he was the root and offspring of David, which is no issue whatever. But I want you folks to observe the chart up here. This is Mr. Welch's VOCABULARY. I don't believe that I've misrepresented him. I told him before the debate if I had misrepresented him, to tell me wherein I had misrepresented his vocabulary and I'd come over here and cover it up. By listening to him in the speech I believe this is what he means by these terms. Now, when Mr. Welch talks about the Father he's talking about the Spirit. When he talks about the Son he's talking about the flesh. That's right. All right now, observe if you will the chart that I have up here. In Heb. 10:5, that passage says, "a body." Now that's the Son according to the definition. Observe. A body, (the Son) didst thou, (that's the eternal Spirit) prepare me. Now you tell us who the ME is, Mr. Welch, when you get up here. Who is the ME in that passage? The body is the Son. The thou is the eternal Spirit. This debate will close and he'll never tell us who the me is will he? Who is the ME in that passage, Mr. Welch?

- (2) "Do you agree that the word one may mean in contrast opposed to another?"

Mr. Welch said, that is one of the definitions of one.

Now, he said very little about that tonight: but, last night he talked about the matter of these being the Holy One, not two, nor three. As if the term one was denoting number (Moderator: 15 minutes) and the definition of the word denotes "contrast opposed to another." And I pointed out last night repeatedly that the setting of the book of Isaiah was Isaiah's teaching against idolatry and the one true God being contrasted to idols.

- (3) "Do you believe that Jesus is now the Son of God?"

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

Well last night I asked this question and I didn't get a definite answer but I do now have a definite answer. Jesus Christ is the Son of God. That's the flesh therefore he has a flesh body NOW. That's his contention. Now, watch it if you will. He says that Jesus is the only person, that's bodily, has to be. Now he says he believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Son is the flesh. Therefore, he believes that Jesus has a fleshly body now.

- (4) "Does God have the power and right to limit his knowledge?"

He talked about this a little bit and then implied that he did not think that he did. Yet I cited a passage last night and I call his attention to it again. Genesis 22:12. We'll wait for further development along that line.

- (5) "Since you believe that words are signs of ideas would you please explain the idea conveyed in the words BOTH and ALSO?"

And this is what he did. Now, has he explained the idea conveyed in the word both? Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to think. Words are vehicles of ideas. They convey an idea. When I say a word immediately I convey an idea to you. And when I say the word both what do I convey to you? Two! Of course I do. That's all I asked him to do with that. Now I want you to look at this. There is a sense then in which the Father and Son are two. Now, Mr. Welch I believe they're one. I told you last night how they were one. Would you tell us tonight how they're TWO? Tell us how the Father and Son are two. The passage that you have on your chart said both. Now tell us how they're two. In Acts 8, the record said, "They went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch." How many went down into the water? TWO? Tell me HOW the Father and Son are TWO would you, Mr. Welch?

Colossians 2:8-9

Let me just suggest to you briefly till he makes further argument on this. He cited Col. 2:8-9 that the fullness of the Godhead bodily dwelt in Jesus and he concluded from this that all there is to deity is that which is in the body of Jesus. Is that what you mean by that? Now, Mr. Welch, I'm

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

perfectly willing to come to grips with you on this or any passage. I challenge you on your interpretation of the passage. The word fullness in that passage doesn't have reference to the amount or the non-amount of deity that's in Jesus Christ. The word fullness relates to the blessings that the Colossians could receive through Jesus Christ. It doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of what you and your brethren have said about it. Now come up and CHALLENGE that and let's deal with the passage. It deals with the fullness of the blessings that they need not to go to the vain philosophy of men, because all the blessings that they needed could be obtained through Jesus Christ.

John 20:26,28

"In Jno. 20:26,28 he appeared in body form." There's no issue there. He also appeared in Lk. 24:37. What issue is there to that fact? Have I ever even implied that I didn't believe Jesus appeared while here on earth; or that he didn't appear after his resurrection? I've never denied any such. What does that have to do with there being one person in the Godhead? Not a single solitary thing, there's no issue there whatsoever.

He asked me a question. "Which is the hardest to do, pray to yourself, raise self or send self?" Well, Mr. Welch, I suppose that one would be just as hard as the other. But I want you to tell me, that when the Lord spoke these words was he intending to convey an idea or did he intend to be deceptive in this? You see, that is his idea; that the word send, that the word also, and the word both, has no meaning. And if time will permit I just want to take time to do it on this word both and also (Moderator: 10 minutes)

The Words Both and Also

I've already made an argument on the word both. It means TWO, the one and the other. Now observe 2Jno. 9 on the word both, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the doctrine, hath BOTH" (That means TWO!) "the Father and the Son." Now in Hebrews 2:11 the Bible affirms that "he that sanctifieth

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

and they that are sanctified are all one." Talking about Christ and Christians. In Eph. 2:16 where the passage said both Jew and Gentile are one. BOTH is that talking about TWO? Is it talking about two in all these passages, Mr. Welch? Then tell us how God is two and on the word also. The word also means "in addition, as well, besides, too." He won't define the word, even though I've asked him three times and did it once in writing and he didn't even attempt to do it. Now observe, in Jno. 8:19, "If you'd known me, you should have known my Father ALSO." Observe Jno. 14:7. "You'd known me, you should have known the Father also."; A repetition of the same passage. Then in Jno. 14:1, "Ye believe in God, believe ALSO in me." And the word also suggest an idea, ladies and gentlemen, that idea is: in addition, as well, besides, and too. That's why he won't define these words. He cited Isa. 26:19, "Men shall live with his dead body." How would this prove there's one person in the Godhead? Now what does that prove? Even if I accept your concept of what that passage teaches, what does that prove about there being one person in the Godhead? Not a thing on earth.

First Corinthians 15:38

This passage talks about the resurrection of the body. And that still has nothing to do with the Godhead. Now I recognize that the New Testament teaches that we'll not be raised in the same kind of a body that we have now. That's what Paul is talking about in 1Cor. 15:38. The fact of the matter is, that verse talks about the seed that was planted in the preceding verse and God giving these seeds a body of its own. That's what that verse is talking about which you cited.

In Phil. 3:20-21 and Psa. 17:50 is what I understood him to say and there's only 15 verses in Psa. 17. I may have failed to understand you.

The United Pentecostal Manual

I want to read to you tonight from the United Pentecostal Manual. And in the opening of the book they make this affirmation, "During the last 21 Godhead Debate

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

days of the 19th century, a band of early hungry-hearted ministers of Christian workers in Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas called a fast, praying earnestly for a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Which with joyful surprise came upon them in the early hours of the morning on January 13, 1900." He goes ahead and talks about that. Then on the next page he affirmed , "that with the coming of the Holy Spirit the word of the Lord became a new book. Truths which had been hidden for many years were made clear. And then in the year 1914 (14 years later now) in the year 1914 came the revelation of the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the pivotal doctrine of the absolute deity of Jesus Christ and baptism in his name became tenants of faith." You see, they weren't tenants of faith before that. Tell us, Mr. Welch, did you and your brethren practice Catholicism for fourteen years? Is that what they were doing when they were doing that? He said a moment ago that because there's some things that I teach that the Catholics teach, that means then that I'm in the same category with them. Of course that doesn't follow. But I want to show you something. Observe now, I haven't cited a Catholic scholar in proof of anything that I've said. I've been reading from the New Testament. But if you want to take a look at a comparison between Catholicism and Pentecostalism observe if you will.

Catholics catechism vs. the Pentecostals Manual

Catholics have a catechism and the Pentecostals have a manual. The Catholics have a priest; they call him Father: Pentecostal preachers are called Reverend. Catholics say Mary has a human body in heaven today and Mr. Welch affirms that Jesus has a human body, a fleshly body, in heaven today. The Catholics claim to do miracles, so do the Pentecostals. The Pope claims inspiration and preachers of Pentecostalism claim to be Spirit filled and some of them claim inspiration. The Catholic Church uses mechanical instruments of music; so do the Pentecostals. The priests (Now watch this very closely. You talk about something coming from Catholicism. Observe if you will.) The priests must bear ceremony over the subject for forgiveness. And

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

tomorrow night Mr. Welch is to affirm that same thing. That the preacher must say a ceremony over the subject for forgiveness. And in the eighth place, there is the holy father, the pope, a man, and the Pentecostals have a general superintendent, a man. I'll tell you about this, Mr. Welch. Every last one of these things are complete. All Right.

Demonstrations Explained to Radio Audience

I'm going to make an explanation to the radio audience that these demonstrations do not reflect the majority of the Pentecostal people. There are hundreds of Pentecostal people here tonight that are being courteous. And there are just a few that are acting rude, so it doesn't reflect on the majority of them. And in favor of those of you who are listening courteously to my speech, I wanted to make that statement.

Alright, observe now if you will, each of these things that occur on the chart are outside of the realm of the authorized. Not a one of them authorized in the Scriptures. All right now back to my notes.

"Let Us Make Man"

First John 3:2, "We shall be like him." There's no issue there. Amen. "Make man in our likeness." I didn't cite Gen. 1:26-27, he talked all around that. He talked about a prophetic perfect and about what God meant when he said, "let us make man in our image." Well now, Mr. Welch, you stop and think what you actually said by your interpretation of that passage. Your interpretation of that passage has it in reverse. Instead of you having it as God said, "Let us make man in our image." you've turned the passage around and you say, "We're going to make ourselves in the image of man." That's what you argued on the passage. You have it in reverse. God said, "Let us make man in our image." You said, "No, let US be made in man's image." That's the thing you've been arguing, you have it in reverse. And you didn't tell me last night, will you tell me tonight, Mr. Welch, does a plural pronoun have a plural antecedent? Does it, Mr. Welch? What is the antecedent of US?

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

John 14:8-9

Now observe if you will, I want you to see this. "If you've seen me you've seen the Father." Now Look, when he says the Father, he's talking about the Spirit. When he says the Son, he's talking about the flesh. Now watch it. In Jno. 14:8-9 when you've seen me (the Son) you see the Father. I asked him last night, I'll ask him again. Mr. Welch, did that passage mean that when they saw the flesh they saw the Spirit? Is that what that meant? I made a lengthy argument last night on that passage to show you that the word see in the passage did not have to do with seeing with the eye but had to do with the matter of mental perception. And he didn't touch top, side, nor bottom; he hasn't even referred to it. Not a word!

John 10:30

I believe that the Father and the Son are one, but I believe they are two. The Bible says so in 2Jno. 9. Now I'll tell you how they are one in Jno. 10:30. You tell me how they are two in 2Jno. 9, Mr. Welch. In Jno. 10:30, verses 27-29, I noted, they are one in protection. Now like I say, you know, Mr. Welch will deal with this when he comes to the stand I'm sure.

John 8:16-17

"Yea and if I judge, my judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me." I and the Father that sent me. Now watch it. "Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true." Jesus said your law demands the witness of two men. I've satisfied the law." Now listen to the next verse "Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true. I am that witness of myself" (there is #1) "and the Father that sent me bear witness of me." (there is #2). That passage says there are two. I believe they are one, you tell US how they are two.

Romans 1:20

Paul talks about the invisible things of God are clearly seen by the things that are made. And he said that had reference to the body of Christ and I

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

DENY ANY SUCH. That passage is simply talking about Gentiles being without excuse in denying the existence of God. Because he said they could look at the things that were made and be led to believe on the existence of a Supreme Being. It doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of what he had to say. Then of course, that's when he introduced the encyclopedias. We've dealt with that.

Second Corinthians 5:17-19 " God was in Christ"

There's no issue there. Rev. 1:8, says he's Almighty. He said you might have many mighties but not many Almighties. DON'T YOU SEE, now you just think about that. You mean, Mr. Welch, that there can't be two beings that posses all power. You see the idea is this: If one was Almighty then the other couldn't be Almighty because the first has ALL of it. That's right. In other words there couldn't be two beings that were omnipotent. Do you have any powers at all? According to your argument you couldn't. And that deals with the gentleman's speech item by item, statement by statement, passage by passage. How much time do I have? (Moderator: 2 minutes). All right.

I want to take time now to introduce my argument that I introduced last night, and that he still hasn't dealt with and that is on the mediator-ship of Christ. I insist, ladies and gentlemen, that this destroys his contention. That you cannot have a mediator without there being three parties. Now you folks in this area are familiar with the problems that labor and management have, and a man is brought in as a mediator. Is he taken from labor? Oh no, management wouldn't stand for that. Is he taken from management? No, labor wouldn't stand for that. He must sustain the same relationship to both parties; labor and management. That's why a third party is brought in. I made this argument last night. He's left it alone, left it alone completely. That the Bible teaches that there's one God and I cited numerous passages to affirm that; but it also affirms that there's one man or humanity and there's one mediator. The Bible teaches that a mediator is not of one party but of two. That's why the Bible teaches, Godhead Debate

Tuesday-Moore's First Negative

ladies and gentlemen, that Jesus Christ was divine. That's why the Bible also teaches that he was a man that he became a part of humanity that he might occupy the right relationship to be a mediator between us and God. Note if you will. A mediator is defined to mean "one who interposes between two parties." And I suggested last night and I do again; and I plead with Mr. Welch to come to grips with the argument that where you have a mediator you must have three parties. God is the first party, humanity is the second party, and Jesus Christ the third. I thank you very kindly.

The End of Speech

Godhead Debate: Part Four-A

Now we come back again to take up the affirmative of my proposition; that is, there is only one person of Almighty God. I still contend the Biblical proof that there is one. I think Mr. Moore has practically given me the debate in his acknowledgement of the questions that I asked him. I asked him the question if Jesus was the everlasting Father and he said, “yes.”

Both and Also

He’s been trying to get me to tell him how that the Father and Son could be in the sense of’ both and also; and last evening and also this evening, I have repeatedly shown how that that could be. God is a spirit, John 4:24 he begot a son - was born; Gal. 4:4, when the fullness of time came God sent forth a son made of a woman, and when he referred to both me and my Father, in this sense of Godhead teaching, the both there referred to the eternal deity, that is the invisible God that was incarnated in this man. That was the both in one. Peter said on the day of Pentecost, “God has made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ.”

Two Witnesses

Then he brings up the Scripture about two men, the witness of two men. But in the Godhead, Mr. Moore, there is only one man. There aren’t two men. That’s the difference, that’s what you can’t see. He can’t understand that in the Godhead, God and this man Christ, there was an invisible, eternal God. No one had ever seen him. He keeps bringing up the Mr. Belue debate. He surely must have been checking on me. Yes, sir! I think I made it clear this evening, what I believe about God. I made it clear last evening, I made it clear this evening. But I do not believe that anyone has ever seen God, eternal, invisible. You cannot see him, only through the face of’ Jesus Christ. I believe that. I repeatedly contended for that. As far as the word both, the terminology of it, it explains itself in Godhead teaching. It doesn’t mean it’s two separate persons because one of these was humanity fused with divinity. And this humanity that was the visible, the first son was born, was the temple of the invisible

Godhead Debate

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

spirit that glorified this body with himself. Thine own self and made him a Lord in Christ.

Everlasting Father

Now, he admitted that Jesus is the everlasting Father. Well, then to confirm my proposition, the Bible says in Malachi 2:10, “Have we not all one Father?” Now, if the Bible is true and it is, then that true is. Christ is the everlasting Father, then in all duty to truth and obligation to truth, could we say then that we had just one father when Jesus taught us to pray, “Our Father who art in heaven.” How many Fathers do we have?

Husband Of The Church

I introduced the argument, last evening, that Jesus was the husband of the church. The church is the mother of the children, and since He is the husband of the church he is the Father of the children. And we have one Father and he is the everlasting Father, and Mr. Moore said he was. He’s given up this debate in answering my questions. He admits that Jesus Christ is the everlasting Father. I knew he had to do that. If he is, how long is everlasting?

“Is The Holy Ghost The Spirit Of Christ?”

Then, his analysis of my question: “Is the Holy Ghost the Spirit of Christ?” He sure tried to dodge that one. That’s a hard one for him, real hard. He tried to dodge it and I don’t blame him. If I believed what he does, I would wiggle like he did too on that one. That’s right. The Holy Ghost is the spirit of Christ. I produced Scripture last- evening and I’ll do it again this evening, in 1Peter 1:10-11, that speaks of the Old Testament prophets, and said, “the spirit of Christ that was in them.” It signified when it testified beforehand of the symbol that should follow. The Holy Spirit that was in the Old Testament prophets was spoken of and proved of the Scriptures to be the spirit of Christ. Note just the same, Mr. Moore, I asked you if the Holy Ghost is His spirit? That’s what I asked you. And you certainly did a good job dodging it. All right.

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

Then, in Colossians, the Scripture that I introduced proving the omnipresence of Christ, that Christ in you, the hope of glory, proves the Holy Ghost is Christ in spirit. There’s no question about that.

Ephesians 4:4

Then Eph. 4:4, “there is one Spirit.” There can’t be three or two, there’s only one. And God is a spirit, that omnipresent, universal spirit and the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the Holy Ghost, is the same spirit, and it’s Christ in spirit. And that being true, the scripture that I introduced in John 2:19, and that was speaking of God in the full sense of his power. Christ as God said destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up again. And that speaking there was God speaking in Christ which was Christ’s eternal spirit that brought that body from the land of death and glorified that body and made that body his visible person for all time and eternity. And Mr. Moore won’t live long enough to tear that down. He can’t live long enough. Now, since that is true, then when you see Christ; as for as God, the only God, the only Father, that you will ever see will be when you look upon Jesus Christ because he was a visible body; a visible person since God took on the form of man and became visible through the resurrection and the glorification of that man Jesus Christ.

Mediator-ship

Now to the mediator-ship. He thinks that I’m afraid of his chart. I’m not afraid of anything he’s got. He cannot produce anything. The Bible said there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, the man part, the part that could suffer. I’d like to ask him a question. He keeps talking about the humanity and the flesh, and I want you to remember this and set it down to answer when you come back. When Christ died, did deity die? I want to ask you that. Did God die? One of his brethren said He did, but I see Mr. Moore shaking his head. That’s right. The Bible said being put to death in the flesh, and talks about the flesh. Well, what was it that died? It was the Christ Jesus, the body, the Sacrifice. That’s what it said in Hebrews speaking of the

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

sacrifice and offerings that a body sacrifice and offerings thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me to eternal spirit of — the Bible says - of that himself to the eternal spirit and that body was the sacrifice. He asks the question, “Who prepared it?” Well, it was in God’s plan that the man Christ Jesus should die, and he did, shed his blood. And then he speaks about my denying the teaching on the mediator-ship of Christ, that he ever liveth to make intercession for us. I asked him last evening if Christ is up in heaven praying, one person to God, another person for our sins. The untruthful thing of it would be this: that if that doctrine were true, which it isn’t. he prayed in the days of his flesh, Hebrews the 5th chapter says he did. But mind you if he was up there as Trinitarians teach he is; praying to God, asking God to have mercy on unsaved or apostate brethren even; well, we would have to say one of two things: That he either didn’t pray for everybody, or God didn’t hear him, because everybody doesn’t get saved. Now, when he raised Lazarus from the dead, the 11th chapter of Luke he said his prayers are always heard. He said “I know that thou hearest me”, but for the sake of these that stand by he said it. I didn’t say he acted hypocritically last evening. You said that I said that. I didn’t say that. I said he wasn’t acting hypocritical when he did that and was not. It was in his plan and in the days of his flesh he prayed; he was high priest and his body was a sacrifice to be offered — the humanity of God — and God prepared that body on the human side of the woman and made that son of that woman. Now, I think that I clearly brought that out last evening.

Then he says that I’m afraid of this chart. That chart doesn’t bother me. Ten thousand times no. That chart doesn’t teach trinity - nothing about it. The mediator-ship of Christ that’s spoken of there meant his suffering, his blood, the Bible said if we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us and to cleanse us of all unrighteousness the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us. He doesn’t have to pray any more. He doesn’t have to die any more. As far as the sacrifice, and I said it last evening and I say it this evening, by one offering hath he perfected forever them that

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

are sanctified. I’ll stay with him on that mediator-ship, right on through it, the whole week if he wants to.

Psalms 17:15 “In His Likeness”

Now, in Psa. 17:15, I quoted; and it is Psalms 17:15, and I’ll make you dislike this. You’ll find 15 verses in that 17th Psalm, Mr. Moore, if you’ve got the right kind of Bible. That’s right. Psalms 17:15, “When I awake in his likeness.” That’s right. Back in Genesis when God spoke of the likeness, that’s who he had in mind. That’s right, be in that likeness when I awake. Well now, who’s likeness is David going to wake in? Who is he going to be like? He talks about Titus 2:13 where it said the great God and our Savior Lord Jesus Christ, and he tries to make like that doesn’t mean the personal appearing of the Lord. I introduced another Scripture in John, 1John the 3rd chapter, and he might not have read it and passed it. Sometimes you don’t have but 30 minutes up here and you just can’t get to everything, I know that. But in 1John the 3rd chapter and verse 2, I introduced that showing the likeness we’d be in and John said, “now are we the sons of God, but it doeth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him.” Like who? And in whose likeness? And I introduced a Scripture in Philippians the 3rd chapter where it said that he would fashion our vile bodies like unto his glorious body -- that body he lived in on earth was glorified by God and that body will be forever. And it can be recognized, looked upon and seen. And that’s why I made the statement that the son of God is still existing. The eyes, teeth, hair, hands, scars will live throughout eternity and that was the glorified man that was, that came from the woman, which was and ever will be that one that was designed to become the visible body of the invisible person; the invisible God. Thus, that makes him the everlasting Father and that’s been my contention and will be.

The Holy One

Now, I want to introduce some more Scripture here that speak of the Holy One. Where in the Bible can you find the saying of holy two or holy

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

three? It’s always Holy One. Now since it is, and since the first commandment of Mrk. 12:29 is, “Hear, O Israel: The Lord your God is one Lord.” Then I want you to note the passages of Scriptures that speaks of God as the Holy One of God:

2Kg29:22	Job 6:10	Ps. 71:22	Ps. 78:41	Ps.89:18	Isa. 1:4
Isa. 5:24	Isa.10:17	Isa.10:20	Isa. 12: 6	Isa. 17:7	Isa.29:19
Isa 29:23	Isa. 30:12	Isa30:15	Isa. 31:1	Isa37:23	Isa.40:25
Isa.41:14	Isa.41:16	Isa.41:20	Isa. 43:3	Isa.43:14	Isa.43.15
Isa.43:11	Isa.48:17	Isa. 49:7	Isa. 44:5	Isa. 55:5	Isa.60:19
Isa.60:14	Jer.20:29	Jer. 51:5	Ezk. 39:7	Hos. 11:9	Hab. 1:2
Hab. 3:3	Mrk 1:24	Lk 4:34	Acts 3:14	1Jn 2:20	Acts 2:27 Acts14:5.

All these passages refer to God as the Holy One of Israel, of the Holy One. Never anywhere in the Bible does it refer to God as holy two or holy three. That’s right. That is another reason why we take the position that God is one and only one as far as his person is concerned. It’s revealed and proven out that way. Now, I’m going to introduce some Scripture again tonight that I introduced last night. And Mr. Moore didn’t have a chance to refer to it in the last speech and I’m sure he can do it tonight, because I’ll introduce it before his last speech.

Matthew 11:27

In the 11th chapter of Matthew, speaking of the Father and the Son and the 27th verse of the 11th chapter of Matthew, Jesus speaking there tells us that we only know God the Father as revealed to us by the Son. I believe that. I don’t think that human reason even can explain all about the Godhead. I don’t believe that. I think that it’s a mystery. I know it is and it comes by revelation, by God’s revelation of how it is. In the 11th chapter of Matthew and verse 27 Jesus said these words, “All things are delivered of me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and to Godhead Debate

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” As I stated before and will again, you cannot explain God, the mystery of it as you would know two and two makes four. There is a mystery, either way you take it. You take the Trinitarians side of it that my opponent holds. Trinitarians teach that there were three persons of God in the beginning of time and equal in majesty and power. They teach the second person Jesus came and was fused into humanity, one of the three. They teach of two natures of Christ: nature of God and humanity. The oneness people or Jesus only people as we call them, that hold the position there is only one person of God teach there was only one to be fused. That the invisible God was incarnated in Christ and it was God himself in there instead of one of the Gods. That’s the difference of the theology. That’s right. Now, Jesus said here that you couldn’t know the Father except the Son reveal him. I believe that.

St. John 14:6-9

I’m going to produce evidence to show a revelation of the Father by the Son to a man; just as clear as can be. St. John the 14th chapter and this is what they were talking about. Jesus said in the 6th verse, “I am the way, the truth and the life: no man can come unto the Father, but by me. If you had known me, you should have known the Father also.” That’s what he’s talking about. That is to know him means to know the Father. That’s exactly what he means. That’s what he’s talking about. That’s a revelation of the Father to a man by the Son. Now Mr. Moore said that Jesus is everlasting Father. He said that and how right he is. Here is a revelation and he goes on down and he said these words, show us the Father and it’ll satisfy us. “Philip saith unto him, lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.” Now what’s he asking there? What are they talking about? What is a revelation? What is going on there? He asked him this question; I want to know who the Father is. And since Christ said no one could know unless he revealed that, here is a clear cut revelation by Christ of the Father to a man. And here’s what he said, “Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?” He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

then, shew us the Father?” Now there stood the Father in front of him. Whether you like it or not, whether you believe it or not, whether you accept it or not, there he stood. Now, when you teach the trinity theology through the Trinitarian theology you rob him of the glory and the majesty, and the power, Fatherhood, eternal Godhead, cheating him of everything that the Bible gives him. And you make him, through the trinity theology, a second person and not the first. And he said, “I am the first and the last.”

One God, Isaiah 45:21

I want to go a little further to some other Scriptures here on the one God and none besides him. You take in the book of Isaiah, God speaking, he tells that it proves to be Christ, that beside him there is no other, there’s none with him, there’s none beside him, there’s none like him. Now, I introduce these passages to prove my position: when I take the position that there’s only one person of God. Isaiah 45:21, “Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together who hath declared this from ancient time? Have not I the Lord? And there is no God else besides me.” Now, the both here was united together as far as God the Godhead is concerned. It is revealed and that’s the way it is. Jesus said, “Ye have seen and hated both.” Now you can’t use that Scripture about two men because there’s only one man here. When they looked here there was only one man, this both here. There aren’t two men. There’s divinity and humanity. They are fused together and there’s two natures that’s in him until he was glorified. In his humanity and Son-ship he grew in stature, he learned, and when he was glorified with eternal divinity he became the fullness of all the knowledge, invisible God, and hence humanity blended into divinity and now he knows everything. I asked Mr. Moore last evening when he produced such Scripture as some things he didn’t know. I asked him if Christ knew everything now and he didn’t say to much about that. I don’t think he will, not in opposition to it.

“Look to me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else.” Now the way that I and my brethren teach that it

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

harmonizes. There’s no contradiction the way we teach it to all these passages that says the Holy One. And he said here, “A just God and a Savior; there is none besides me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God and there is none else.” Now when God said none else, he meant that. “I have sworn by myself the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow.” Now this God that said that says there is none besides him. And I’ll produce Scripture now to show that God is revealed to be Jesus Christ.

Philippians 2:8-9 “Highly Exalted”

Phil. the 2nd chapter 8th and 9th verses say these words. God has highly exalted him; that is, this man Christ. He made him the visible person when he glorified him with himself. With thine Own self he said in the 17th chapter of St. John, and made this that went to Calvary his visible person for all time and eternity. And hence, Phil. 2:8 and 9 said these words, “God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.” I said it last evening and I’ll say it again. If there was another person of God that had knees besides Jesus Christ, or two, they would have to bow their knees to this great name. But there’s no such thing because there is no other besides him. In him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. The body part of it. Thus by that you can see him. When he appears the Bible says we will be like him. You can see him. He’s the express image of the invisible God. Now his blood, his suffering on Calvary was the go between. There he hung his head, in his work as mediator, the man did, and suffered and died, bowed his head and said, “It’s finished.” He’s not praying for anybody. His priesthood lives. His sacrifice lives. But as far as his praying or interceding in the sense of prayer any more than his plan was made that they could have a propitiation, a sacrifice for their sins, it’s all settled forever. And the man Christ Jesus paid it on Calvary and was glorified by the God. Christ Jesus and the two were fused, that is the eternal and the begotten were

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

blended together and made that one divine person of the eternal God. That’s the Lord Jesus Christ. Jeremiah 10:10 said these words, “But the Lord is the true God, he is an everlasting king: and at his wrath the earth shall tremble” Revelation the 19th chapter and about the 16th verse, when Christ comes back from heaven, they’re going to look at him, and he’s going to have this title upon his breast and upon his thigh, “KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.” And that is conclusive proof again that he is the everlasting God, the only God, and the only God that will ever be seen. He is an everlasting king. Jeremiah 10:10 says that. 2 Sam. 22:13 says who is God save the king. And Eph. 4:4 says there is one Lord. And Paul said in Acts 9:5, Who art thou Lord?: And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.” That’s him tonight.

As far as what’s coming up tomorrow night on his name I have no fear, no dread of that whatever. As far as the mediator-ship of him, I know what it is, explained what it was; there’s no dodging of that. As far as his eternal Godhead, I explained that: there’s no dodging of that. And he is like he said in John 10:30, “I and my Father are one.” And Mr. Moore if he could produce where it says holy three or holy two. How many did I produce here — the Holy One speaking of God. He believes there’s three. He believes there’s three like the Catholic Church believes. I don’t say that through criticism of the Catholic Church. They’re Trinitarian and he’s a Trinitarian, that’s right, they are. I introduced that evidence awhile ago. I don’t say that to criticize him or the Catholic people either because I have no ill feeling towards any of them. But the facts are facts.

The Pentecostal Manual

He said something about the manual. How much time do I have? I have two minutes. He said something about the manual, about the Pentecostal manual. I’ll take the Pentecostal manual. I’m not afraid of it. I’ll debate him some other time about the latter reign of the Holy Ghost, that’s right, about 1906. And I could have a lot to say about the establishment of his church. I could say our church was established on

Tuesday – Welch’s Second affirmative

the day of Pentecost, like a grain of corn, or ear of corn. If you found it a thousand years later and planted the same seed, it'd come up and produce the same thing. So time wouldn't mean too much because there's a lapse of time about his religion too. There's time when it didn't exist. Of course if he wants to go into that in any other debate, I'll debate him on that. I'll take the establishment of my church versus the establishment of his — on the time limit. That's right. That's exactly what I'll do. And that doesn't get him anything to produce the manual here. Of course I know that he calls it a creed book and the man that started his religion called it a creed book too. That's right. I know that. Yes sir. But however that maybe, I'm not ashamed of the manual and I won't back off it.

The End of Speech

Godhead Debate: Part Four-B

I want to, later on in my notes this will come up, refer to these passages that he mentioned concerning the Holy One. I jotted them down. I had them before he stood to speak. I found them also in the Old Testament. And of course he made no argument on them. He just lumped all of them together. I’m obligated to spend no more time on the passages than he did. I have a formulated argument on this idea of Holy One. We’ll take a look at it in a moment, but I want to mention these passages because I have endeavored in this discussion to refer to everything that the gentleman has said and I think you know that. So he cited:

II Ki. 19:22 ; Job. 6:10 ; Psa. 71:22 ; 78:41 ; 89:14 ; Isa. 1:4 ; 5:24. I had Isa. 5:19 there that you didn’t have, Mr. Welch. Isa. 10:17 10:20, 12:6, 17:7, 29:19, 29:23, 30:11, 30:15, 31:1, 37:23, 40:25, 41:15-16, 41,20, 43:3, 43:14, 43:15, 43:11, I believe that’s 45:11 but we’ll take yours for it, Isa.47:4, (I had that and you didn’t have it.) You had Isa. 48:17 so we’ll just swap. He cited Jer. 50 and there were a few passages I didn’t get. I’d like to get them when this is over with. Hosea and Habakkuk then in Mark and Acts 3, Acts. 2, and Acts 13.

All these passages he used to made an argument on the Holy One, not two, not three.

No Person In Old Testament?

I asked him a question and there was a purpose for that, but incidentally, Mr. Welch, in your definition of person tonight, I think you know that you are denying there was a person in the Old Testament. You said that a person “necessitates a body,” and the body didn’t come till Bethlehem. So there was no person back there anyhow. All these Old Testament references he cites are not even germane because, he doesn’t think there was a person back there. He cited all these passages and yet he says that a person demands a body. So there wasn’t even a body back there.

The Word “One”

The word one, ladies and gentlemen, is defined: “denotes contrast
Godhead Debate

opposed to another.” This was the point that I had in the question. He agreed that that’s right. There are some four other definitions here and I’m not going to read them, I’m going to take the one that he agreed to. The idea is that the word one “denotes contrast opposed to another. Now he says, “Mr. Moore, I found a passage that talks about the Holy One.” Now he said, “You find the one that talks about the holy two or three.” Well, Mr. Welch, in Dan. 4:17, the record says, “This matter is by the decree of the watchers and the demand by my word of the HOLY ONES” or the holy ones to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men.” The HOLY ONES. Observe further in connection with this, Mr. Welch, in Genesis 3:22, the passage says, “Behold; man has become, as one of us.” And then in Gen. 11:6-7, observe: “Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language.” And then in the next verse, “Go to, let us go down there and confound their language.” Here you have humanity described as one and a plural pronoun used in referring to God. Now I want you to note, Mr. Welch cites all these passages that affirm God is the Holy One, and concludes that there is but one person. This is an unwarranted conclusion. Now let’s look at his argument in logical fashion. This is what Mr. Welch does on these passages. He affirms, for instance that the Bible teaches that God is one. And I believe that and have affirmed it all through the debate. He further affirms then if God is one: therefore, there must be one person. This is an assumption. He doesn’t prove this. He assumes his minor premise; and yet, he admitted last night to me that one does not necessarily mean one. It may mean more than one. So he assumes his minor premise and then DRAWS the erroneous conclusion that because God is one he’s therefore one person. Now, Mr. Welch, it doesn’t take a logician to know that you have assumed your minor premise throughout this whole debate. Now observe if you will. Christians are said to be holy as the Father is holy 1Pet. 1:15-16. Observe further, Christians are also said to be one as the Father and Son are one, Jno. 17:22. So, according to Mr. Welch, Christians are not two persons, not three persons, but one. One with reference to God does

not mean one person. This is Mr. Welch’s assumption. So all that he had to say about the Holy One, and you know, this afternoon when I was talking about this I turned back in my notes and observed that I had said, God is one. And those of you who are present tonight who were here last night are aware of that fact. In the first five minutes (And this debate supposedly will be put in print and it will be in the book where you can see that I admitted this in the first five minutes of my speech.) I admitted it, that God is one, and that the adjective holy is a term that’s used to describe each and every person in the Godhead. Therefore, the Holy One. All of that was a waste of your time, Mr. Welch. All right. Now, he says, he still contends that there’s only one. I do too. I still contend that there’s only one. I believe there’s one God, but there’s not just one person. That’s what he assumes.

Both and Also

Then he considered his questions. He said that I’d been trying to get him to tell us how that the Father and the Son were both and also. I did no such thing! I never did ask you that, Mr. Welch. That isn’t what I asked you, Mr. Welch, is it? That isn’t what your question read. I asked you to please define the term both. That’s all I asked you to do and you haven’t done it yet. You haven’t done it through this whole debate. I didn’t ask him to tell me about how the Father and the Son were both and also. The question is and of course if there’s any doubt in your mind let me turn and read the question to you. “Since you believe words are signs of ideas, would you please explain the ideas conveyed in the words both and also?” Now that’s what I asked him. I wanted him to tell you what the word both meant. He hasn’t done it yet.

John 4:24 and Galatians 4:4

Where God is a Spirit and the fact that God was manifest in the flesh. Gal. 4:4, “...at the proper time God sent forth his son, born of a woman, born under the law.” and so on. This has to do with deity and flesh. And of course I take no issue with that. I have affirmed that all the way

Tuesday – Moore’s Second Negative

through. I affirmed all the Way through that Jesus Christ is God and man. I’ve never denied that. There is no issue there whatsoever.

John 8:16-17

He said, “in the Godhead there is only one man.” In answer I used Jesus’ argument in Jno. 8:16-17. Now, Mr. Welch, you ignored my argument. Why do you suppose Jesus introduced it? In Jno. 8:16-17, Jesus simply says to them, “In your law it’s written.” Now listen at the reason. I didn’t say that the Father and the Son were two men, and John doesn’t say that, Mr. Welch. I don’t think you missed my argument, did you? You didn’t miss my argument did you, Mr. Welch? Listen now if you will once again. “Yea and if I judge, my judgment is true for I am not ALONE, but I and the Father that sent me. Yea and in your law it is written.” And he cites a passage over in Deuteronomy where the Jews’ law demanded that for a thing to be true, there necessitated the witness of two men. Now Jesus said,³ “I have satisfied the demands of that law in that I have TWO so far as my witness is concerned. Now that was my argument of the passage and that’s what Jesus said. Jesus made the argument. He said Jesus will reveal himself and here he’s revealing himself, “Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true. I am he that beareth witness of myself” and that’s ONE witness, “and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.” and that’s TWO witnesses. And there’s the TWO I introduced. He still didn’t touch it, he ignored my argument.

Two Definitions On Person

Then he said, “I keep bringing up Mr. Belue’s debate, that I was checking up on him.” And of course that’s right, I was. And you noticed he didn’t deny that did he? He didn’t deny it. You didn’t deny that you took one position with brother Belue and another one here tonight, Mr. Welch. All he said was, “I was checking up on him.” He got a laugh out of that but he didn’t deny his contradiction in the matter. He affirmed that God did exist as an invisible person back then. And tonight, he says that you can’t have a person without there being bodily form. “Never seen God

only through Jesus Christ.” I had a chart up here last night and pointed out then that I never did believe that more than one human being ever manifested deity. I’ve never affirmed any such thing. I recognize that only one human being manifested deity or became God in the Flesh. I’ve never denied that. There’s no issue at all here.

The Husband Of The Church

Then he talks about Jesus the husband of the church is the Father of the children and then everlasting Father. He cited this last night in his last speech and I asked him a question to draw him out on it. I asked him about the passage, “Unto us a son is given.” and here you have the gift and the giver. And I asked him who gave the Son? And then he had the audacity to stand up here tonight and tell you that I missed 1Jno. 3:1, when he’s ignored about 80% of my speech. Mr. Welch the book will show that, it’ll show that!

Everlasting Father

Now observe if you will. His argument in substance is, “since the Bible affirms that Jesus is our everlasting Father, Isa. 9:6, and that the Bible affirms that Jehovah is our everlasting Father, it follows therefore that Jesus and Jehovah were the same” He never stopped to consider the fact that the Bible also affirms that Abraham is our Father, Rom. 4:11. Now if your argument proves anything at all, it proves that Abraham is Jehovah. Now watch, Mr. Welch says, you see he can’t, he just can’t reason that Jesus can be our everlasting Father and have a Father. He just can’t see that at all. But observe if you will. The Bible affirms that Jesus is our Father. The Bible affirms that Jehovah is our Father. Mr. Welch says that proves Jesus is Jehovah. Watch. Jesus is our Father, Rom. 4:11, the Bible affirms that Abraham is our Father. Does that prove that Abraham is Jehovah? He’s said to be our Father? Ladies and gentlemen, the word Father is used in the Bible many times in the figurative sense. It’s used in the sense of a spiritual ancestor; sometimes good, sometimes bad. Good in the case of Abraham, Rom. 4:11. Bad in respect to our Father the Devil, Jno. 8:44, “Ye are of your father the

devil,” It’s good in the sense of a source, as the Father of glory, Eph. 1:17. As the creator, Jas. 1:17 and in many other ways in which the term Father is used in the Bible. And because Jesus is Father and Jehovah is Father he assumes they are one and the same thing. And I think you see it isn’t so. Then Mal. 2:10 where the passage says we have one Father, “Hath not one God created us all?” Don’t you see how the term Father is used in that sense? The term Father is used in the sense of creation as the passage indicates. Now I want you to look at this further. With respect to the Corinthians the apostle Paul affirmed that God was their Father, 1Cor. 1:3. Then Paul said in 1Cor. 4:15 that he was their Father, does that make Paul GOD?

Question 4

And then in regard to question four and he said that I wiggled and that got him a laugh. Like I told you at the outset of the debate, Mr. Welch is evading the law of rationality. He’s appealing to emotion. He said I wiggled and I very carefully read the answer to you. I didn’t wiggle. I answered the question. And you ignored my answer. You said I wiggled and you got a laugh and you think that’s answering an argument. All right.

Spirit Of Christ

1Peter 2 talks about the Spirit of Christ. He introduced this last night and I pointed out that all on earth this affirms is that these men spoke by inspiration and it affirms the preexistence of Christ. I answered that last night. Then he cited Eph. 4:4 where there’s one Spirit and you know I went over that last night and I said, Mr. Welch, you cited that passage where there’s one Spirit. It says also there’s “one Father”, it says also there’s “one Lord”, it says that there’s “one baptism”, there’s “one Spirit”, There’s “one faith”, and “one hope.” And I asked you how many units there were in that passage and you haven’t said a word about that. And then he talks about me forgetting 1John 3:2. I think these folks know I’m following your speech, Mr. Welch. They know that.

The Resurrection of Jesus

The resurrection of Jesus, I pointed this out last night to you in my argument on Joint action. Don’t you remember that, Mr. Welch? When I went over and asked you very kindly to deal with Acts 13. Asked you if you would, and you didn’t deal with it. And yet he brings it up again tonight. He made the same speech tonight that he made last night. Now observe if you will. In connection with this I pointed out last night that because the Bible teaches, for instance, that Jesus raised himself up and the Bible affirms the Holy Spirit raised up Jesus he says that proves Jesus and the Holy Spirit are one and the same thing. Just like he said, “If the Father sent the Comforter and Jesus sent the Comforter that means Jesus and the Father are one and the same thing. (Moderator: 15 minutes) All right. Now observe. I pointed this out to you last night and I asked him to deal with it so we could debate the situation. I asked him to come to grips with it. I pointed out that in Acts 2:40 the apostle Peter said, “Save yourselves from this crooked generation.” That passage says that man saves himself. I cited Lk. 19:10 where the record says, “For the Son of man came to seek and save that which is lost.” Now the Bible attributes salvation to man and it attribute it to Christ. And because the same thing is attributed to two individualities, that makes them one and the same thing, he says. Now that’s your argument if you have one. And yet salvation is attributed to man, it’s also attributed to Christ. Does that make man Christ?

Joint Action

And I also cited Acts 13. Now this has to do with joint action. You see he thinks that if you have an act out here that’s being performed by more than one person, they must be the same. Now if that isn’t his argument he doesn’t HAVE one! And ladies and gentlemen, you know THAT, just as well as I do. Now that is the man’s argument, I answered it last night and I answered it again tonight. In Acts the 13th chapter observe if you will. The record tells us that in the church in Antioch there were prophets and teachers. These men are named and the record says that as they prayed “the Holy Spirit said Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work

whereunto I have called them.” Then in verse three we have, “Then when they had fasted” (that is, the prophets and teachers) “whenever they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.” Now that passage says the prophets and teachers sent Paul and Barnabas away. Now the very next verse, ladies and gentlemen says, “So they, being sent forth by the Holy Spirit.” And I want you to observe this. The passage says the prophets and teachers sent Paul and Barnabas and the very next verse says that they were sent by the Holy Spirit. Now Mr. Welch says, “because the Father sent the Comforter and Jesus sent the Comforter that makes them one and the same.” But in this passage the prophets and teachers sent Paul and Barnabas. The Holy Spirit sent them, and according to his argument that makes the prophets and teachers the Holy Spirit. He doesn’t recognize this joint action at all. And when I presented the argument, instead of him coming up here and dealing with the argument, he just read his argument through again. Instead of trying to come up to the issue. All right.

The Mediator-Ship

He said, “I’m not AFRAID of the mediator-ship of Christ.” But I still say, and he admitted in no uncertain terms, that he doesn’t believe that Christ is our mediator today That ended with his death on the cross. That is his whole argument. As I suggested to you in my first speech and of course it isn’t an easy matter for some of you folks tonight but I know that you don’t believe that. I don’t believe that you folks believe that, but that’s what he’s affirmed in this debate. He has made the idea of mediator-ship, praying and intercessions mean the same thing. He juggled the texts, he used them interchangeably, he thinks they are all the same thing. He said, “you think the Son is up there praying to the Father now. So, the idea of intercession as far as he’s concerned must mean praying. This is what he introduced in answer to my charges. Now he says, “Christ prays for everybody and so if that’s the case everybody would be saved.” You mean to tell me that in Christ’s praying for everybody; he’s praying to the Father and that he would pray to the Father that the Father *Godhead Debate*

would save a man contrary to his WILL? The Bible still teaches that “CHRIST EVER LIVETH TO MAKE INTERCESSION FOR US” and the passage that he cited in Hebrews 10 I went to last night and I want to go to the passage again. I say this kindly - without disrespect to Mr. Welch, that he doesn’t have an inkling of an idea of what the book of Hebrews is about especially the 10th chapter. And his inability to explain the passage shows that.

Contrast Between Priesthood of Christ And Aaron

[Now in the Hebrew letter, let me just take a minute. Now laughing is not going to help the matter any.) Now observe if you will. (Just hold my time for a minute while they do that. Now, Mr. Gamblin asked you not to do that.) Mr. Welch asked you not to do that. I did and so did my moderator. Now I don’t know why you keep it up. Once again I want to apologize to the radio audience for the interruption.]

Now let me continue. In the book of Hebrews where the writer is making a contrast –

(Mr. Moore to the audience: what has and is happening is no reflection on Mr. Welch and Mr. Gamblin. We’ve had a good debate from that standpoint and I appreciate their actions and I want you gentlemen to know that. And the demonstrations that takes place is NOT because they want it.)

Observe now in the Hebrew letter, the writer is making a contrast between the priesthood of Aaron under the Law of Moses and the priesthood of Christ. He makes several arguments there, and one of them is the sinless offering that Christ offered. They offered the sacrifices of animals but Christ offered himself without sin. These priests were guilty of sin. He was sinless. They stood daily, but when he made his sacrifice he sat down. Now, Mr. Welch, observe. The Bible teaches that in the mediatorial work of Christ, so far as provision was concerned, providing for man’s salvation, that was done when he died on the cross.

Tuesday – Moore’s Second Negative

But sir, do you really believe that the mediator-ship of Christ is no LONGER? Now watch it if you will. He came up here and advanced the idea that in the mediator-ship of Christ that, that involved the humanity of Christ. But you could see on the chart that it isn't so. The Bible says that a mediator is not of ONE but of TWO. You see the idea? Now, I say once again, this was a matter of a few words thrown out in connection with this. I know that this is the argument that he has advanced because I've heard him make this argument. That is, the man part of Christ was mediating between the deity and humanity. That's why I made a chart to show you that that cannot be so. And that's why I used the illustration of labor and management. You wouldn't just take someone out of labor (those who are in labor would like that) but that's not a mediator because a mediator must sustain the same relationship to both parties. And I've pointed that out to you and yet, you'll come up and take the position of the man part. You see, as far as he's concerned, here's the mediator right here (pointing to the human part of the chart) but that isn't what the Bible teaches. The Bible affirms that Jesus, as mediator, is in fact both divine and human (Moderato: 10 Minutes) both of these things are necessary.

Did Deity Die When Christ Died?

When Christ died did deity die? No sir, I've never believed any such thing. I can't imagine my brethren taking such a position. I do not believe any such thing any more than I believe that your Spirit will die. But, Mr. Welch, while you were dealing with that, why didn't you deal with the argument on the passage that I introduced about Matthew 27, "My God, My God, why has thou forsaken me?" Just an oversight wasn't it? Now you see, it was an easy matter to introduce that and tell about what somebody else believes, but I'm dealing with my argument that I had introduced. Then the matter of praying for all, and I've already dealt with that.

Matter Of Implication

He still denies that Christ is interceding for us today. And yet the passage says so. He says, "I didn't say that Christ was hypocritical." I

Tuesday – Moore’s Second Negative

didn’t say you said that. I said you implied that. I wrote that as your blunder. I believe that’s what I said, Mr. Welch. I’ll let you argue if that’s right. Let me see if I did, I don’t intend to; “He IMPLIED that Jesus was hypocritical. I wouldn’t misrepresent you for anything on earth. I don’t think that I have to do that to defend my position. Your implication was in the passage that you cited last night; that the praying that the Lord did there was for the benefit of the people around him. That’s why I say, what he actually said was not for his benefit; yet, he prayed like it was; and therefore, he implies that he was hypocritical, that’s what I said, And then about Psa. 17:15. I said I might have misunderstood you. I thought you said 15 and I admitted there is 15 verses in the passage. There was no argument made on the passage. None whatsoever. He said Christ died once. I recognize that. I know that Christ died once, no doubt about that. And he provided for man’s salvation. But that doesn’t mean that because he died once he ceases to be our intercessor or that he ceased to be our mediator. It doesn’t prove that at all. When he died he provided for our eternal salvation. We have to appropriate that to ourselves.

Titus 2:13, 1John 3:1, Philippians 3:20-22.

And I did refer to these passages. The book will show that I did. I simply pointed out that there is no issue here whatsoever about the fact of a glorified body. What on earth does that have to do and to prove about the idea of one person in the Godhead? Nothing whatever!

Jesus now bodily in heaven. Is he omnipresent? Is he Omnipresent, Mr. Welch? He is now bodily in heaven and he’s all that there is. But is he omnipresent? Then that’s when he introduced the idea of Holy One and we’ve dealt with that.

The Son Reveals The Father

Then Matt. 11:27 where he said, “the Son reveals the Father.” That’s right. And I want to cite two or three passages that I introduced last night as to how he did reveal the Father. He said the only way you can know about the Father is to let the Son reveal him. I introduced these

passages last night. I call your attention to them again. In Jno. 12:49 is one of the ways in which the Son revealed the Father. And if he revealed the idea of one person it would be completely ridiculous. Listen now Jno. 12:49, “For I spake not for myself but the Father that sent me, he has given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.” Now if Mr. Welch’s contention is true on this, if the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus would be saying, “I don’t say what I want to say. I told myself what to say. Whatever I told myself to say, that’s what I say.” And the Son’s revealing himself now. In Lk. 12:46. “And Jesus crying with a loud voice said Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit.” If the Father and the Son are one and the same person, Jesus is saying, “I commend self into the hands of self.” Jno. 6:38, “For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” Jesus is revealing the Father. Now watch. If the Father and the Son are one and the same persons, Jesus is saying; “I did not come to do my will, I just came down to do my will.” Mr. Welch said he revealed the Father to you and that’s the way that he does it. All right, how much time do I have? (Moderator: 5 minutes) All right, thank you.

And this idea that it’s a mystery and I admitted to you in the very beginning there are a lot of things about God that I don’t know and don’t claim to know. But friends I admit to you that anytime I take a position that will cause me to deny that Christ is now interceding for us, and cause me to argue in the fashion that Mr. Welch has, you can rest assured that I’ve taken a position that’s contrary to that which has been revealed. I can at least read and understand that which has been revealed.

Two Natures Of Christ

He said the Trinitarian idea (I think I took this down verbatim, Mr. Welch, and I’m interested in knowing what you mean about this.) He said the Trinitarians believe two natures of Christ, nature of God and humanity. Don’t you believe that? Do you deny that, Mr. Welch? Do you deny that,

Tuesday – Moore’s Second Negative

Mr. Welch? Do you deny that Jesus was human and God, that he was man and God?

John 14:6-9

Then he cited Jno. 14:6-9 and I've gone over this passage numerous times and will do it again. But I just want to turn and read. I've asked him to give us a definition of the word also, and of course he didn't do it. I've defined it for you. It means in addition to. And every passage that he cites backfires on him. Now observe this passage for instance. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life and no one cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also." And the word also means in addition. The words don't mean a thing on earth to him. I want once again to go back to my notes, as I did last night, and to show you what the teaching of Jno. 14:9 is. I called your attention to the fact last night that the word see does not necessarily mean that a thing is visible. No more than hear means it is audible. Jesus said, "seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not," Matt. 13:13. And the word in Jno. 14:9 means to see with the mind and not with the eye. J. Henry Thayer on this word see, p. 451 - He didn't even pay any attention to these arguments that I advanced. Note this is contrasted with - or rather he goes further and says, "From the intercourse and influence of Christ to have come to see, that is known, God's majesty, saving purpose, and will."

You remember I asked him about the eyes of one's heart being enlightened, if that had to do with vision. You see he cites this passage as if that's talking about that which was visible. And I came over and asked you, Mr. Welch, "Whenever you see the Son you see the Father. Does that mean that whenever you see the flesh you see the Spirit?" Now you folks know that I dealt with his argument, just as well as I do. And I called your attention to the fact that in the passage Jesus is simply saying, (and the very passage makes a contrast between know and see) "have I been with you so long and you've not known me?" He says, "If you've seen me you've seen the Father." The passage shows that the

idea of knowing is that which is under consideration. I asked you last night, “Did they see him actually or representatively?” And pointed out that in Jno. 6:46 no man had seen the Father actually and therefore, they saw the Father represented in the Son. What they saw the Son do actually they’d know what the Father would’ve done in the same circumstances. For Jesus said, “I came not to do my will, but the will of my Father.” I cited Job. 42:5 where Job said, “I’ve heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye seeth thee.” That Job had been told things about God but now he says I can understand the truth about God. Now that’s what the passage teaches, and that’s what I presented last night, and he hasn’t said anything about it.

The First And The Last

This is an expression that simply ascribes not only deity but the eternity of the Lord Jesus Christ. I don’t believe that Jesus Christ just began. I don’t believe that for a moment. I believe that he is eternal, for in John 1 this is affirmed. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.” When the Bible talks about the first and the last that simply is what it’s talking about. In Isaiah, “None besides me, “Alone by myself.” But yet, Mr. Welch, there’s no person there. You’ve already said there wasn’t by your definition of person. It necessitated a form, there was no body back then, there was no person there according to YOU. Why do you cite these passages? I have pointed out and he’s yet to even make any reference to it, that Isaiah’s setting is that of idolatry. And he’s making a contrast between the one true God and idolatry, and he’s ignored it all the way.

Humanity Blended With Divinity

Then he talks about humanity blended in with divinity. Is humanity become deity? Is that what you were saying? Are you saying that humanity became deity? Now when you say humanity blended into divinity is that what you mean?

Tuesday – Moore’s Second Negative

Philippians 2:8-9.

There’s no issue here. Jesus Christ has subjected himself, “He counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but he emptied himself, taking upon himself the form of a servant, that he might be made like unto his brethren.” That affirms the humanity of the Lord, that he was willing to do it for man’s redemption. Jeremiah 10:10.

There was no person back there, YOU said, Mr. Welch. It necessitated a body. There couldn’t have been one there. 2Sam. 18 ; Rev. 19:15, “That he’s King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” And there’s no argument there. Then Acts 9 in regard to Lord. I have never taken the position, nor do I believe now that Jesus Christ was not Lord. The Bible affirms that he was. And the apostle Paul knew that some heavenly being had appeared to him, and therefore, he said, “Who art thou Lord?” In Jno. 10:30, “I and the Father are one.” And I pointed out that not only does the Bible teach they’re one, I believe they’re one, but the Bible teaches they’re two. I told you how the Father and Son were one. I asked you to tell me how they are two. He hasn’t done it. The Father and Son are one just like these are one. Jno. 17:20-21. (Moderator: Time) That deals with his speech.

The End of Speech

This ends the debate on the Godhead. The next debate is concerned with proper baptism and whether or not a formula must be said when baptizing a convert. The two propositions are as follows:

1. The Scriptures teach that a baptismal formula must be said when one is baptized and the only name to use in the formula is the name of Jesus.

Mr. Welch Affirms

2. The Scriptures do not teach that a baptismal formula must be said; and we are at liberty to use the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in scriptural statements when one is baptized.

Mr. Moore Affirms

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part One-A

Mr. Moderators, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Moore. It’s good to be back again this evening to follow this Bible debate and investigation of the truth we’re contending for in this discussion. I’d like to say again, as I start my first speech this evening that in case I refer to historical facts, to the audience out in radio land and I mention some religious group, remember, I have no ill feeling towards you, neither Catholics, Protestants, or Jews. And when I refer to historical facts, it is simply to seek for the facts that we are finding, or trying to find. Also, I want to thank the fine people of this United Pentecostal Church here in Orange, their fine pastor, my longtime friend, Mr. Gamblin, for the privilege of being here in this discussion, and all my fine brethren that are attending this debate from their churches and their people, and also Mr. Moore and the people of his faith. I have no ill feeling whatever toward you; in fact I have discussed so many years with you. I really do respect these men, because they will stand up for what they believe. Last evening, a young man came to me here of their group. Bill Crews. I’ve known Bill all his life nearly; in fact I and his father had a debate in Pensacola. So I assure you that there will be no ill feeling in my heart toward anyone when this discussion is over, and I hope that I can handle myself in such a way that not only will my brethren say of me, “We appreciate brother Welch”, but even the members of the other congregation and their ministers will at least appreciate me as a gentleman. I hope I can act that way.

Proposition Defined

Now tonight, this proposition that I am affirming is that in baptizing anyone, the only formula or name to be used is the name Jesus. I believe that. I believe that Jesus is God’s name in this age, his outstanding name. Since I do believe that, and since I believe that Jesus is the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, I firmly believe in order to be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost mentioned in Matthew 28:19, the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit must be called or spoken upon you at the time

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

you’re baptized and that the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is JESUS. I believe that! I don’t think the Bible crossed itself up. I don’t believe that. I think when it’s all put together right, it reveals its truth to men.

God’s Name Is Reverend

I’d like to show in the first part of my speech what God himself thinks of his name. In Psalms 111:9 God speaks of his name as being reverend. Now, there was something said about “reverend” last evening. I’ll not go into that because last night has passed; but in the Bible we find that God’s name is spoken of as being reverend. Now, in Isaiah 52:6, the Lord speaking of the time to come said, “My people shall know my name.” In other words, God is going to reveal to his people what his name is, and he said that means, “They shall know it is I.” Now, when Jesus came walking on the water in the 14th chapter of Matthew, verse 27, he said, “Be not afraid; it is I.” That proves from Isaiah 52:6 to Matthew 14:27, that the name was to be revealed, and he revealed it to us, that name is Jesus. Now God said in Ezekiel 39:25 he was jealous of his name, and in Isaiah 63:16, he said his name is from everlasting. Now since God’s name is from everlasting, it will be owned everlastingly. In Micah 5:2, speaking in prophecy of the coming of the Son of God, are these words, “He that shall come forth unto me whose goings forth” (as far as God’s plan of him was concerned) “hath been from old from everlasting.” Now that is back behind us. We know who it was that came from Bethlehem; it was Jesus Christ. Now in Ephesians the first chapter and verse 21, speaking of the name Jesus, said of this name Jesus, that not only was it the highest name in this world, but in that world to come. That is eternity in front of us. Now, Psalms 22:2 speaks of glory to his name. The name of Jesus is declared in Psalms 22:22, and in John 17:6 Jesus said, “I have manifested thy name”, and then he said in St. John 5:43, “I am come in my Father’s name.” I’ve asked Mr. Moore some questions that I’ll read to you now:

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Questions For Mr. Moore

- (1) Is it scriptural to use the words, “I baptize you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ”?
- (2) Is it scriptural to use the words “I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost”?
- (3) Is it scriptural to baptize a convert and not say anything?
- (4) When you were baptized in water, did the one who baptized you say anything?
- (5) Is Jesus the name of the everlasting Father?

Jesus, The Everlasting Father

Now last evening Mr. Moore made the statement that Jesus was the everlasting Father; he said that last evening, and tried to compare it with Abraham and Paul. Of course, I don’t think he’d say Abraham and Paul were everlasting or that the name Paul and Abraham were everlasting. But he did say that Jesus was the everlasting Father; he said that last evening. Now if Jesus is the everlasting Father, then the name of the everlasting Father is Jesus, and that’s easy to understand. Now the argument that people present to try to detour around baptism in Jesus’ name is to try to use the word authority – by the authority.

Questions For Mr. Welch

Now the questions that Mr. Moore has asked me deals almost entirely with authority. The first one is this:

- (1) When one is told to halt in the name of the law, must some name be called; if so, which?

Now in the name of the law or halt in the name of the law, if it was the name of the king, I guess King James of old England, you could say, “stop in the name of the law of King James of England”, but that all depends on what you said. But this doesn’t deal with authority in water baptism. You cannot do away with the name in baptism by the word authority. In the first place, the Hebrew word “name” and authority never come from the same word. That’s right.

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Now, I notice Mr. Moore’s got some words on his chart here. But the Hebrew word “name”, I mean the name from the original Hebrew and Greek never comes from the same words; it’s different. I want to state that here. I have the words to produce that they come from if it becomes a question. The next one

- (2) Is not the expression “in the name” sometimes used to mean to do a thing by one’s command and authority, acting on one’s behalf, promoting his cause?

Not water baptism, no. I’ll answer that emphatically

- (3) In order to do a thing in the name of Jesus, must the name of Jesus be called or mentioned in some kind of formula or ceremony?

In water baptism, yes.

- (4) Since affirming that a formula must be said, please tell us what the exact statement is that the administrator must say in order for baptism to be valid.

All right, he must baptize his convert, if he baptizes him Biblically, into Jesus Christ; that’s the entrance into Christ. I shall show that tonight and you could not baptize anybody into Christ without telling them who it is that you baptize them into. That’s right, so YOU must use the name of the one you baptize them into to convey and show that’s who they’ve been baptized into and not into trinity. I want to tell you that. We’re baptized into one.

- (5) May titles be used in the baptismal formula?

No, titles should not be used in the baptismal formula, that is, the title is not the name. The name must be used, and the name is Jesus. Now if you say “Lord Jesus Christ”, the name is Jesus. You could say that the name is the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost”; then you’re telling what the name is. But just to use names as titles, no. And I trust that you can understand what I’ve said about these questions. And I’ve tried to hit every one of them tonight, Mr. Moore.

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Proverbs 30:4: “What Is His Name”

Now I'll go back to my scriptural affirmation. In Proverbs 30:4 “What is his name, and what is his son’s name.” That question is asked. Now since the Lord told his followers to go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, then what is a name of the Father and the Son, the question is asked here. The name of the Father in Isaiah 9:6, and Mr. Moore said so last night, I've got him on my side; in fact he almost gave me this debate last night on the Godhead; Now listen, the Father’s name, Isaiah 9:6, “He is the everlasting Father.” Jesus is. And just as long as everlasting can be, if Jesus Christ is the everlasting Father, the name Jesus will be the name of the everlasting Father. That’s right.

Matthew 1:21 “Sons Name Is Jesus”

“She shall bring forth a son, thou shall call his name Jesus,” Of course, I don't think I'll get too much argument against that because I think that Mr. Moore would accept the fact that the name of the Son is Jesus; and that's what they called him, that's what his name is. I see he's got a lot of other names up here, but this is the one I'm talking about, this highest name. The Holy Ghost, the Father sent in my name. In St. John 14:26, Christ in you the hope of glory. We find in Colossians 1:26 that the mystery that's been hid for ages is now revealed which is Christ in you. Christ only comes (question Mr. Moore asked last night) if Christ is omnipresent, Christ is omnipresent, Christ is everywhere. The only thing you receive of Christ is his spirit, like I illustrated here on the Godhead argument, like this light here. We'd say this bulb represented the Son, that power inside represented the Father, and the rays from them represented the Holy Ghost; which makes Father, Son and Holy Ghost in one person, and the Holy Ghost is Christ in you. Now to prove that further, in 1John 4:13, “Hereby we know that he dwells in us and we in him because he hath given us of his spirit.” Now God had many names. God's first name was Elohim, Hebrew. Then his name was Elshaddai, God Almighty. His name was Jehovah, and his name was Yaweh. His

Wednesday – Welch’s First Affirmative

name was “I Am”, when he sent Moses into Egypt. And the Greek word for God is Theos.

The Highest Name

I’m talking about tonight the highest name that God has, and that’s the only name, that there’s any salvation in. I’m going to prove that tonight. Acts 4:12, “Neither is there salvation in any other.” That’s right. Acts 4:12, and there’s no other name given that there is salvation in, other than this name Jesus. That’s right. And when Peter said this, he had just healed a sick man. That’s right. And he caught this sick man by the hand. He didn’t say this, “In the authority of Jesus Christ. I command you in the name of the holy trinity to walk”, he didn’t say that. He said, “In the name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk.” That’s right. Then he followed that and says, “neither is there salvation in any other, for there’s no other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved.” Now, there is remission of sins in no other name. That’s why that I’m pressing the point that you must call the name Jesus in baptism to show and know that you’ve been baptized into him because there is remission of sin in no other name. In Acts 10:43, all the prophets gave him witness that through his name, that is the name Jesus, whoever believed in him should receive remission of sins. Now if Christ is the door, and you’re baptized into Christ, spirit and water of course; I believe in calling it one baptism; of course when they get on that, Mr. Moore’s two will be one. It’s been two before that, but it’ll be one then; I’m no prophet neither the son of a prophet but I make that prediction. However, there’s no other name that remission of sins can be given through, preached in, other than the name of Jesus, according to this scripture here, and confirmed by Christ in Luke 24:45 and on down. And here’s what he said “And then opened he their understanding that they might understand the scriptures.” Luke 24:45, “That repentance and remission of Sins should be preached”, not in their names, I want to emphasize that, “but in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.” And ladies and gentlemen, that’s exactly what happened, and we find that the remission of sins should be preached to all nations.

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Matthew 12:21 ”Include Gentiles”

“In his name shall the Gentiles trust.” And John 1 and 12 said, “became the sons of God that believe on his name.” Acts 15:17 said, “And all the Gentiles UPON WHOM MY NAME IS CALLED.” That’s right. All the Gentiles UPON WHOM MY NAME IS CALLED. And it’s called when I baptize somebody; yes sir . I tell him he knows who I baptize him into; I don’t leave him with any trinity riddle or anything to guess about that; that’s right. Acts 15:14-18, “Upon whom my name is called.”

Baptism Argument

Now we move from that to present other arguments, this baptism carried out by the apostles. Now in Luke 24:47 Christ has said that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And now we go to Jerusalem, the second chapter of Acts, and we find what happened there; but first, note the commissions, Matthew 28:19, I didn’t say great commission. I’m not going to say that; I think one’s as great as another —Mark 16:16, Luke 24:47. I think all three of those places where he’s talking about baptism are just equal; I don’t think there’s any such thing as one of them being a great commission; I don’t teach that nor believe that. They’re all great.

The Day Of Pentecost, Acts Chapter 2

In Acts 2:38 as these men carried out being sent of Christ, here’s where it started. On the day of Pentecost, when the Lord set this Jesus name church up, that is the one he set up, you won’t find anything like a Trinitarian group there; I’ll guarantee you that. The trinity was missing there. In Acts 2:38, and they said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, “Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said to them repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” Now if I were going to baptize somebody just like he told me there or commanded. I’d take him out and say “I’ll baptize you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins.” And I’ll guarantee I could lay down and draw my last breath and face God

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Almighty and the judgment and everything else upon it. There wouldn't be any question in my mind when I did that; that's right.

The Samaritans , Acts Chapter 8

In the 8th chapter of Acts, as we come on down, we find the door is opened unto the Samaritans. Acts 8:12, "When they heard Philip preaching the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women." Now, it goes on down and says "When the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." Don't you know that Christ had told these ten that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem? There's no mention of a trinity there, nor authority either; that's right. Baptize them into somebody that they're baptized into, and we're not baptized into them; we're baptized into him, HIM.

Cornelius' Conversion, Acts 10

All right now as you come on down, in the tenth chapter of Acts, we find the door of faith opened unto the Gentle. Jesus had said, "I am the door" in John 10:9. Galatians 3:27 said, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ" not into a trinity there, no mention of the trinity, in fact there is nothing about it until years after that. "As many of you as have been baptized into" somebody, "into Christ have put on Christ," That's right. Now since Christ is the door, and the time had come for the Gentiles to enter the kingdom of God, we find that Peter goes down in Acts 10:44 and 33, as I have previously read, all the prophets said that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And now we find the Gentiles beginning to come in, another nation. Of course, they received the Holy Ghost baptism before they received the water. There's two elements to

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

that birth, never did come at the same time; we’ll be on that the last two nights of this debate. But in this particular place, I want to show you how that the Gentiles were baptized into Christ and not into a trinity. In Acts 10, after the Holy Ghost had fallen upon them, and after they had spoken in tongues and received the gift of the Holy Ghost, Peter said, “Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized.”; “Which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized IN THE NAME OF THE LORD.” He didn’t say YOU can do it if you want to; you can give them a silent ducking, he told him how to do it. That’s right, “...and commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” Now what is the name of the Lord? And I take Saul’s conversion to confirm that.

Saul’s Conversion, Acts 9

Acts the 9th chapter — and Saul was knocked down and a voice said to him,” Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said Lord, Who art thou? And he said I am Jesus whom thou persecutest”; he told him what his name was. No argument about that, no question about that. He said, I am Jesus whom you persecutest.”

Husband And Wife Relationship

Now the argument that I bring in is the relationship of the church and Christ, like a man and his wife. The Bible speaks that. Every man that marries a woman, that I know anything about, that woman takes a man’s name. She isn’t ashamed of it; she doesn’t try to hide it; and she doesn’t try to put it aside. She takes the name of her husband and it’s always that way ever since God made the first man. Baptism is the entrance into Christ; it’s how you come in union with him, water and spirit, and now we find in Romans the 7th chapter and verse 4 that Paul said, speaking of us, that we should be married to another, even to him, not them, there’s one husband and one wife, there’s no trinity of wives and there’s no trinity. There’s one husband and one wife, and the church is his wife; that’s right. Now, married to him, Romans 7:4, one husband, thy husband, thy maker, Isaiah 54:5, only one husband. 2Cor. 11:2, Paul

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

says, “I’ve espoused you to one husband.”; not a trinity of them; just one, that’s all. Not three, not two, just one. “I’ve espoused you to one husband.” Now, the church is the bride of Christ. Revelation 19:7 says, “Let us be glad and rejoice and give honor to him”, not to them, it’s always him. “...For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.” Now, he’s taken out of the Gentiles a people for his name; in his name shall the Gentiles trust, and his wife has made herself ready. Now in Ephesians 5:25, “Husbands, love your wives even as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify it with the washing of water by the word.” It goes on down and says, “ought men to love their wives as Christ the church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.” Mind you, when God took that woman out of Adam’s side, made him a wife, Adam said, “This is now flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone.” And I want to call your attention; to the fact that that woman took his name. Genesis 5:1, and quote saying, “This is the generation of man. In the day that God created man, male and female created he them; and blessed them and CALLED THEIR NAME ADAM.” Now, in the 15th chapter of 1Corinthians and verse 7, the Bible said that the second man Adam is the Lord from heaven, and it’s Jesus Christ, the Lord.

This wife, the church is his wife, and this church that belongs to him is not ashamed of his name. They’re proud to take his name and be called the Jesus’ Name people, the Jesus only people, and tell the world that they’ve been baptized in the name of the Lord, and that name is Jesus; that’s right. I’d just like to say this tonight, what about any woman here tonight that had a husband, she wanted everything else about him, his money and everything, but she didn’t want to take his name. Any people that will not take his name and become a part of his New Testament church through that is headed for trouble in the Day of Judgment. And that’s exactly why tonight that I take my position against the trinity doctrine. The trinity doctrine tries to detour you away, and their argument is so weak they’ll jump on the word “authority” and everything else trying

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

to get around the name, when it’s just as plain as can be, right there before them, and there’s no way around it.

Three Witness

Now, in I John 5:8 it says “...three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.” And when they stuck that spear in Christ’s side in St. John 19:34, there came out there to make him a wife, his bride, and we’re going to accept it in his wife. In Ephesians 1:6, “We shall be accepted in the beloved.” What is the beloved? It’s his wife. It’s the mother of his children; well who is the husband, who is the father of them? Her husband. That’s easy to understand. That’s one of the easiest things that anybody can see. The husband of the wife is the father of the children, that’s right. There’s one, I said there’s one husband; I proved that, there’s no trinity of husbands, and there’s no trinity of wives. In Song of Solomon 2:10, prophecy speaking here, the Lord speaking to his church, “Rise up, my love, my fair one.” Now she’s only got one husband, and he only has one wife, and that forever does away with the trinity theory of two husbands or three husbands, and she only has one husband, and that husband only has one wife and that wife is his church. Revelation 3:8, the Lord speaking said these words, that they had not denied his name. Now the only people that I know today that exalted the name of Jesus Christ and preach it in the fullness of it’s power and glory is what you call the Jesus’ Name people or the Jesus only people. It’s certainly is not Trinitarians. The Trinitarians try to hide it. They try to get around it. They try to say it’s not essential. They try to make like there’s no meaning to it, some secondary name. I want to thank God again tonight that I am not a Trinitarian. I want to say that again and again and again. I do not believe in the Trinitarian theory; I want you to know that over and over again.

Hated For My Names Sake

In the book of Matthew the 24th chapter and verse 9, Jesus said, and also in Mark 13:13, that you’d be “hated of all men for my name’s sake.”

Wednesday –Welch’s First Affirmative

Not because you have a church, not because you have a meeting house and assemble together, but for that great name JESUS. He said you'd be "hated of all men for my name's sake." How much time do I have? In other words, that's it. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part One-B

Gentlemen Moderators, ladies and gentlemen both here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'll assure you that I am grateful that through the providence of God we're privileged to be together again this evening, that I am allowed an opportunity to stand before you to reply to the speech to which you've just listened. I'd like, before entering into the proper polemics of the night, to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks that Mr. Welch made concerning no ill feeling toward anyone. I've known Mr. Welch, by reputation at least, for quite some time, and I'll assure you that I don't dislike him, and don't dislike you. And so I share his views on this, and I want to just go a step further and express my personal appreciation for Mr. Gamlin and the very fine spirit that he's manifested throughout this discussion. So we're having a good debate, we're not mad at anybody; we press the things that we believe to be so, and I shall do so this evening, but I do it because I believe that they are the truth and not because I'm mad at anybody.

Proposition Not Properly Defined

I would like to suggest to you this evening that from the speech that has just been made, I'd never get the idea that Mr. Welch was affirming that in water baptism a formula must be said. He never got around to defining the terms of his proposition. Now, one of the things that's absolutely essential for the matter of honorable controversy is that the points at issue are to be so clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding. And yet, in Mr. Welch's proposition, there were some terms that were very vital to this discussion this evening, and most of everything that he's had to say has been completely beside the point. He signed to affirm that there must be a formula said when someone is baptized and that that formula must include the name of Jesus; Now Mr. Welch, that's what you signed to affirm, and the only thing that you said that was anyway close to that; you said formula or name. Mr. Welch, you didn't define those terms at all, did you? And yet it's what you signed to affirm.

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

“Still Discussing Godhead”

Now you'd think that we were still discussing the Godhead, and I don't blame him for going back to what we discussed the first two nights. I don't blame him for going back and since he brought the matter up, I want to show you some of the reasons why Mr. Welch has seen fit to go back and discuss the Godhead question. I don't blame him for going back.

Blunders And Absurdities

Observe if you will. These are some of the blunders and absurdities and the contradictions of Mr. Welch. And I have a copy of these for him, would you hand them to him, Mr. Gamlin, please sir, so that he might follow along as we read. Now, if you have been here the first two nights of the debate, you'll understand then why it is that Mr. Welch didn't even attempt to define his proposition much less affirm it this evening and why he went back to the discussion of last night. I intend this evening to discuss the formula idea of water baptism; he's not getting away from it. That's the proposition that he signed to affirm, and that's the proposition that I intend to see that he comes up to. So you just as well get ready, Mr. Welch. Now observe if you will:

First, in regard to the first two nights of this debate, Mr. Welch took the position that “person” necessitated a bodily form. He then said he believed Jesus is now the Son of God and that “son” necessitated flesh. Therefore, according to Mr. Welch, a person is a fleshly, bodily form.

Secondly, since Mr. Welch was affirming that there's one person in deity he was actually affirming that there's a fleshly, bodily form in deity. Such is like saying that you have liquid in a solid.

In the third place, since it takes a fleshly body to have a person, according to Mr. Welch, and that there was no fleshly body until Bethlehem, according to Mr. Welch, hence there was no person until Bethlehem, according to Mr. Welch. So you wonder why that he went

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

back to last night?

In the fourth place, since Jesus is not now in the days of his flesh, Hebrews 5 and verse 7, Welch's logical conclusion is that there is not now a person in deity.

In the fifth place, he argued that Jesus was a priest in the flesh, yet Jesus was not a priest on earth and could not have been.

In the sixth place, he affirmed that the Father and the Son, being one, must be one person, yet John 17 and verse 20 affirms that the Father and Son are one as Christians are one. If Mr. Welch is right, then all Christians are one person. Do you wonder why he went back to last night?

In the seventh place, he has argued to the effect that there was no person in the Godhead before Bethlehem, yet in the Belue-Welch Debate he said there was.

Welch vs. Welch

This is a case of Welch versus Welch, and he hasn't as yet told us which time he was right. So if you wonder why he went back to last night, that ought to help you understand why that he did.

Welch's Questions

I want now to take up his questions before I get any further in my speech, and answer question number one:

- (1) Is it scriptural to use the words, "I baptize you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ?"

I am not denying the right, Mr. Welch, to do this; you are affirming that you must say them. Why certainly it's Scriptural to use these words.

- (2) Is it scriptural to use the words, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit?"

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

Yes. Tomorrow night, that's my proposition; I don't know why he asks the question; he could have turned over and read the fourth proposition. That is what I'm affirming, the right to do it.

(3) Is it scriptural to baptize a convert and not say anything?

Yes.

(4) When you were baptized in water did the one that baptized you say anything? Yes.

(5) Is Jesus the name of the everlasting Father?

Everlasting Father is his name also, Mr. Welch. And I'll come to that in a moment when I get to my chart.

Formula Not Defined

I want to call your attention to some things that Mr. Welch ought to have done. As I suggested a moment ago, Mr. Welch should have defined the terms of his proposition. Now the first night of the debate I asked Mr. Welch if he agreed that words conveyed ideas, and he said, "yes I agree with that." Well now, there was a term in his proposition, and that's the word "formula". Now he didn't take the time to define it and I think you can see why that he didn't do that. Now Mr. Welch, why didn't you do that?

Hodge's Rules of Controversy

I want to call your attention to something. Mr. Welch signed some rules, he agreed to be ruled by Hodge's Rules of Controversy, and one of the rules of Hodge's is that the terms in discussion are to be so clearly defined that there can be no point of misunderstanding. And "formula" is defined: to mean a prescribed form; a rule or model. It has to be the same every time. Now that, Mr. Welch, is what you are affirming. You are affirming that there is something that's prescribed, a form that does not vary, that it must be the same thing every time and that it must be said. You needed to deal with the word "must" - that it was absolutely necessary, that here is a certain formula that must be said and not the matter of doing, but that it must be said. I have a chart in front of the stand that I want you to observe.

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

Chart On Formula

"we know what they did!
Tell us what they SAID!"

There's no question about what they did; we all know what they did. We wanted you to tell us what they said, Mr. Welch. You haven't done that yet.

Proposition: "A Formula Must Be Said"

Your proposition says that a formula **MUST BE SAID**. You didn't even define "formula". Now, formula is a prescribed form. If you don't believe that a formula has to be said, say so. But a formula is a prescribed form, a rule; it cannot vary; it must be the same every time. That's what would have to be done. The question at point is not, ladies and gentlemen "Is baptism in the name of Jesus?" I believe this with all of my heart; that's not at issue. It's not the issue of whether baptism is in the name of Jesus; it's not the issue whether we're baptized into Jesus Christ; it's not whether or not remission of sins is in the name of Christ. But the issue is this: Is it absolutely necessary for the administrator to say a formula for baptism to be valid; that's what you're affirming, and you didn't touch top, side, nor bottom of the issue at hand; you didn't even define your proposition.

Matthew 28:29: Name Of The Father

Then he cites Matthew 28 and verse 19, Baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. I'd like to know something, Mr. Welch, would it be all right for me to say what I'm doing then? Would it be all right for me to say that? You say now Jesus said, "Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." I want to

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

know if that's what I'm doing, would it be all right to tell them what I'm doing? Would you jot that down and tell us when you get up here? See if he tells us if it would be all right for me to tell them what I was doing .

Name Is Reverent

Then he cites Psalms 111:9, "Holy and reverend is his name", and there's no issue here. Isaiah 52 and verse 6, Matthew 13 and verse 27 says that we'd know his name, and there is no issue there. And now you know what he did? And this is not even worthy of a reply, much less a man of Mr. Welch's caliber. Because the word "I" was over in Isaiah, and because the word "I" was in Matthew and verse 27, he made a play on that. Now you just think about such shallow reasoning. Then in Ezekiel 39 and verse 25, holy name, and there's no issue here. And then he cites Isaiah 63 and verse 16. Now, Mr. Welch, why didn't you read that verse and tell us what the verse really said?

Everlasting Name:

(Ezekiel 39:25 ; Micah 5:2 ; Isaiah 53:15)

May I have my Old Testament, Brother Bruce? He connected Ezekiel 39 and verse 25, Micah 5 and 2, Isaiah 53 and verse 15 together here in regard to the everlasting name of the Father. I want to call your attention to what the verse actually says. Mr. Welch didn't turn and read the verse. Not only does the verse tell you that the Lord will have an everlasting name, but that verse tells you how that he would obtain that everlasting name. Isaiah's talking about the time when the Israelites, now watch this, he's talking about the time when the Israelites were led out of the land of Egypt; how that the Lord destroyed the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. Now I want to read the verse. See if he just cites the verse, takes two words out it, and ignores the complete context. Now observe if you will, "That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm dividing the waters before them, to make himself an everlasting name." That passage says that the Lord made himself an everlasting name by leading the Israelites out of Egypt, Mr. Welch. That's what he says. In connection

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

with this, since he's brought it up, let me call your attention to the fact that in Exodus 9 and verses 11 through 16, as well as Romans 9 and verse 17, we are told that Pharaoh was raised up to publish abroad the name of the Lord. Then in Exodus 15, verses 11 through 16, in the song of Miriam, we're told how that the Lord's name was published abroad; in, "that fear and dread shall fall upon them." This is an instance when the Lord, in delivering the Israelites out of Egypt and that which was accomplished, caused men to fear his name. And that brings me to a point right here that I want to call to your attention. And that is the meaning of the word "name".

The Word "Name"

Now ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Welch would have you to believe that the word "name," every time he sees it, that it just means a designation. He doesn't make any distinction whatsoever. I call your attention to the fact that in the Bible the word "name" is used in these four different ways:

(1) The word name is used to mean reputation. In Proverbs 22 and verse 1, where it says, "... a good name." Now Mr. Welch, I want to know, when it says "a good name" is it talking about the way the name was spelled? Do you think he's going to answer my speech? He's not even taking it down, is he? He'll not answer the questions I'm asking. Not even taking down a thing that I am saying; that of course has been the process throughout the debate.

But when he sees the word "name" it means to say it because he wants it to mean saying it. Now you tell us how you know that that didn't mean that he came saying the Father's name? Mr. Welch, would you tell us that when you get up here?

Names Of The Son Of God

Then, of course, he introduced last evening, and I've already talked about that, the matter of everlasting Father. I want to introduce this chart at this time; that is the names of the Son of God. He gets up here and he

Baptismal Formula Debate

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

talks about the one name. I deny that; that isn't so. That is assumption of Mr. Welch. Observe if you will: the names of the Son of God: in Isaiah 9 and verse 6, the passage says that his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. In Luke 2 and verse 21, "His name was called Jesus. In Matthew 1 and verse 23,"...called his name Emmanuel." Revelation 19, verses 13-16, "His name will be called the Word of God, King of Kings, Lord of Lords." Yes, and Hebrews 1 and verses 4 and 5, "...a more excellent name, my Son." Now all of these are names of the Son of God. Mr. Welch says they're not; Jesus is the only name. And yet the Bible says that all of these are the names of the Son of God. That's when he mentioned authority. And once again I suggest to you that he was supposed to have been affirming that water baptism, to be valid, you must say a formula when you baptize someone. Did you not know that's what the proposition said, Mr. Welch? You couldn't tell it by your speech, sir. Then he talks about authority and name not from the same words but what does that prove? Not a thing on earth. (Fifteen minutes)-All right.

Answers to Moore's Questions

Then this is when he came to my questions, and I want to take a look at the questions that I asked Mr. Welch, and his answers. Actually, he didn't answer question number one. I asked him, "When one is told halt in the name of the law, must some name be called? If so, which name?" He said, "Well, you know that actually it might involve the name of the king", or something. Do you mean to say by that, Mr. Welch, that an actual designation must be stated, is that what you meant by that? Then question number two: "Is not the expression, 'In the name', sometimes used to mean to do a thing by one's command and authority, acting on his behalf, promoting his cause?" He said, "No, not when it has to do with baptism." Now that's an exact quotation that I took out of Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon when he was defining the word "name". But now Mr. Welch said that isn't what it means when it has to do with baptism. I want to get question three in connection with this: "In order to do a thing

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

in the name of Jesus, must the name of Jesus be called or mentioned in some kind of formula or ceremony?" And then he says, "Yes, if it has to do with baptism." Now, Mr. Welch, you've been debating thirty-five years I understand. Do you know what equivocation is? Do you know what begging the question is? It doesn't take a logician to know that you begged the question there. Begging the question simply means assuming what one's under obligation to prove. And he's engaged in it; he begged the question. "Oh", he says, "yes it means that when it has to do with baptism, but it doesn't mean it when it has to do with something else." Now you give us the rule to determine when it doesn't, Mr. Welch. When doesn't it mean it? Tell us why it doesn't. Oh, he says the expression "in the name" when it's connected with baptism, it means you have to say something, but when it's connected with something else, you don't have to say anything.

(4) "Since you affirm that a formula must be said, please tell us what the exact statement is that the administrator must say in order for baptism to valid."

Now, he didn't answer the question; he didn't really answer the question. He didn't tell us what has to be said. I want to know Mr. Welch, you tell us that we're going to go to hell, but you won't tell us what to say. And the reason why we're going to hell is for not saying the right thing but you won't tell us what to say. The reason we are going to hell, according to your proposition, tonight, is because we don't say the right thing, and you won't tell us what to say. Why won't you tell us what to say, Mr. Welch? Come on up and tell us what to say. Tell us the "prescribed form" the exact formula. We're going to get in trouble for not saying the right thing. Then he said, "No, titles cannot be used". Now this is his vocabulary. (Pointing to the chart on opponent's voc.) Observe if you will, so far as he's concerned, the term "Father", the term "Son", the term "Lord", and the term "Christ" are all titles. Now, this was up last night, and I asked Mr. Welch personally, to tell me, in regard to this chart, that if I didn't have him represented properly, to let me know. And he hasn't said a

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

word about it, so I have him represented properly.

No Titles Allowed In Formula

Now watch it. The passages that he cited tonight, in an effort to prove what has to be said, I want you to note. According to Mr. Welch the words "Lord" and "Christ" are both titles. And Mr. Welch says they cannot be used in a baptismal formula; he Cites Acts 2:38, Acts 8:16, 19 and 5, and Acts 10:48, and these supposedly establish the formula, but watch it if you will. Acts 2:38 says, "Jesus Christ"; there's the word "Christ", it's a title'; you can't use that one. That's not your passage, so out that one goes. Acts 8:16, Acts 19:5 says "...in the name of the of Lord Jesus", so there's the word "Lord" that's a title so you can't use it, and out goes that one, according to Mr. Welch. Acts 10 and verse 48: "...in the name of the Lord"; there's the word "Lord", and it's a title, Mr. Welch says, and you can't use titles, so out goes that, Mr. Welch.

Names

Now, back to the notes proper. Proverbs 30 and verse 4, his name and the Father's name, and there's no issue here. Isaiah 9 and verse 6, the Father's name, and I've already dealt with that. Matthew 1 and verse 21, the Son's name, and there's no issue here. He cites Colossians 1 and verse 27, "Christ in you...the hope of glory." What does that have to do with water baptism and a formula being said? Not a thing on earth. I John 5 and verse 14, God had many names; he had many names. 1John 5 and verse 14 says, "... according to his will", Mr. Welch. Was that the passage you intended to cite? I don't know whether it was the one you intended or not; I'm reading from the American Standard; I checked the King James, and I don't believe that said what you said it said. "And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." I agree it has to do with his name, but you don't; that one slipped in accidentally, didn't it, Acts 4 verse 12, where there's none other name. Now, you see Mr. Welch thinks that whenever that expression none other name occurs, it means

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

designation. That's what he thinks about it. But to the text of Acts 4. (How much time do I have -- 10 minutes).

Acts Chapter 4

Let's just take a look at Acts the 4th chapter. Like I say, Mr. Welch will just cite a verse, take it out of it's setting; he doesn't read the verse, makes an argument when he finds the word "name", and that's a designation. He thinks that means the name of a person, place, or thing and that it can't be reputation, character, or authority, it doesn't mean that. It has to mean person, place, or thing, and it means to say it unless he wants someone to wear it, and then it means that you're wearing it, just however he wants to use it. But in Acts the 4th chapter, observe if you will at the setting of this verse; in the third chapter and the first 6 verses, this man was said to have been healed in the name of Jesus. I want to know what does that have to do with water baptism? That's a case of healing. In the second place in Acts 3 verses 11 through 26, Peter was preaching, as a result of this; people came together, and he took advantage of it, and he preached. Now, in the very context, when Peter was preaching about what he had done, he had this to say: 'Moses indeed said', and I'm reading verses 22 and 23, "Moses indeed said; 'A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people.'" That was the conclusion that Peter was reaching on this matter, and observe further in connection with this. In the fourth chapter and the first seven verses they were challenged by what they were doing, and observe if you will, in connection with this; in the fourth chapter these men came and, verse 7, said, "By what power, or in what name did you do this?" Now watch it, "Then Peter, filled with Holy Ghost, said unto them, 'Ye rulers of the people and elders, if we this day are examined concerning a good deed done to an impotent man, by what means this man was made whole...'; "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in him doeth this man stand, here before you whole." Then he cited the statement that Mr. Welch did in Acts 4 and verse 12, observe if you will. The idea of "name" means "power", or "means" and hearing what he speaks; these are all used interchangeably in the context. And not only that, James 4 and verse 12, Ephesians 1 and verse 19 affirms that there is no authority except that which the Lord Jesus Christ has.

No Issue

He begins to talk about Acts 10 and verse 43, that baptism is through his name, remission of sins is through his name; there's no issue here. Luke 24 and verse 47, not in their name, he said, and then this is where he begins to talk about the great commission.

Parallel Passages; Luke 24; Matthew 28; Mark 16

I want to know, Mr. Welch, are you taking the position that Luke 24, Matthew 28, and Mark 16 are not parallel accounts? You mean you don't know that those are three men's account of the same thing? Let's hear you on that, Mr. Welch. He cites Luke 24, and yet a parallel to that of Matthew 28, where Jesus said, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And certainly Luke 24 and verse 45 affirms that this is to be in the name of the Lord, because he has all authority. He cites Mt. 12:21; John 1:12; Acts 15:14 - 18 and just because the passages uses the word "name", he links these together, and in verse 17 where the record says that the name of the Lord was called upon them; he thinks that means that it was spoken, that there is a personal name that was spoken and that that is what this expression means. Observe if you will, "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles on whom my name is called." And since you cited that verse, tell us what the residue of men means Mr. Welch. Will you do that? Observe, if you will, Thayer, on page 239, says that the word "called" here means "the name of one whose

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

name was called upon someone, that is, he's called by his name or declared to be dedicated unto him."

Now the context will explain this verse, verse 7 through 11, Peter rehearsed his efforts in the conversion of the Gentiles. Verses 13 and 14 affirm that Peter had witnessed that God had visited the Gentiles to take a people out for his name. Verses 15 and 18 states that this agrees with the prophecy of Amos that he referred to. Now, watch if you will, what happened to the Gentiles was the equivalent of having the name of the Lord called upon them, they had been allowed to hear the gospel and obey it, and the Gentiles were identified as being dedicated to the Lord, and that's what the passage teaches and doesn't touch top, side or bottom of what this man says about it.

Liberties Taken On Text In Paul's Conversion

Baptized into Christ, not into the trinity, this is not the issue; I believe that they were baptized into Christ. In Acts 9, he says "Saul knocked down". Now, several Times, this really doesn't make a lot of difference, but several times Mr. Welch just takes the liberty of saying things, he talks about when Paul was knocked off his horse or mule or when he was knocked down. Where'd you get such an idea? You never read such a thing like that in your life; he just takes the liberty of making it anything that he wants to. Saul knocked down, told him what his name is. Christ the husband of the church, should take his name.

Wearing the Name Of Christ

Now he has continually brought this idea up that the church is married to Christ and that the church has one husband and that we ought to wear the name of Christ. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, they don't do that; they don't wear the name of Christ. Now, where do you get the name of Christ in the United Pentecostal Church? Where do you get that? He talks about the church is the bride of Christ, and the church ought to wear the name of Christ, and yet he says, "I'm a member of The United

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

Pentecostal Church". Like I say, that doesn't prove a thing on earth for water baptism.

None Applicable

Ephesians 5:25-31, Genesis 5, "Christ loved the church" - what does that have to do with saying a formula when someone is baptized? 1Corinthians 15 verse 47,"... not ashamed to take his name". I'm not ashamed to take his name, but you are, United Pentecostal Church. Just on the word "authority", he says, John 19, verse 34, Ephesians 1 and verse 6, accepted in the beloved; what does that prove, Mr. Welch? What does that prove about having to say a formula when one is baptized? That's what you obligated yourself to deal with. Then the Song of Solomon 2 and 10, one husband, and this does away with the trinity theory, and I told you why that he wanted to talk about the trinity. If you want some more on the Godhead, I expect it can be arranged, Mr. Welch. Then in Revelation 3, verses 7 and 9 about denying the name, and I don't deny the name of the Lord. And that deals with the gentleman's speech item by item, statement by statement, passage by passage. How much time do I have left? (About three and a half minutes)

What Is The Formula?

Now, I want to call your attention to something, ladies and gentlemen, in regard to this idea of a formula. I want him to tell us which one of these is the formula. Mr. Welch, you tell us that what we're teaching is error and that we're sending folks to torment by teaching it and practicing it. And yet, you haven't told us what the formula is. We want to know what it is. And while you're at it, I want to know, would it be all right if I said, "In the name of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit"? I want to know, would that be all right? Now, the word formula means a prescribed form, if he didn't intend to affirm that, he shouldn't have signed a proposition; that's what he signed to affirm, and that's what I intend to see that he does; But now, a formula is a prescribed form or rule. Now, observe these passages that have to do with water baptism in the name of Jesus: Acts 2 and verse 38, "in the

Wednesday - Moore's First Negative

name of Jesus Christ.” And Acts 8:16, Acts 19:5, “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ”. In Acts 10 and verse 48, “in the name of the Lord.” I want you to note that in these four passages, you have three different arrangements of name, and yet he says there is a prescribed form, and he cited all four of these passages to give a prescribed form, and yet there is no prescribed form in them. Words have no meaning to Mr. Welch. He says they do, and yet he doesn't pay any attention to the words, does he? Now, that's what a formula means.

Three different Propositions

Now, watch this if you will. There are three different prepositions that occur in these passages. Not only are there three different prepositions, but there are three different arrangements of the name. Observe also, in connection with this, what these passages and these expressions mean. Baptism in the name of Jesus, in Acts 2 and verse 38: “in” or “epi”, upon the name; J. Henry Thayer, on page 232 says that this expression means, “relying upon the name, that is the authority.” Now, Mr. Welch laughs at that, laughs at scholarship. Thayer was to the Greek language what Webster is to the English language. Like I say, Mr. Welch has no care or concern for language apparently. Observe if you will, in Acts 10 and verse 48: In, or by the name, “by one's command and authority” Thayer, page 447. In Acts 8:16; 19:5, “in”, it's the proposition “eis”, “into the name, that is to profess the name of one whose followers we become”, Thayer, page 94.

And I trust that Mr. Welch will come back to the stand and endeavor to affirm the proposition that he signed to affirm; that water baptism, to be valid, necessitates a certain formula that must be said.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Two-A

Now, we come back again in the affirmative of my proposition so plain as it is. I am affirming that the only name to use in water baptism is the name Jesus.

I clearly stated that. You folks know I did; that the only name to use in water baptism, and further said in reference to titles and the question of titles, that if titles were used, you have to recognize Jesus was the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, if you use titles in that effect. I said that. I defined my proposition. Here's what I believe and what I'm affirming tonight, that the name Jesus is the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Baptize anybody, anytime, anywhere in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, you must utter the name Jesus because that is the name that God had in mind when he told them to baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost.

Names Of God

Now, in Colossians 2:8,9, in reference to the names that Mr. Moore referred to, like Everlasting Father; Mr. Moore is just trying to dodge, but he's got one hard time doing it, I'll guarantee you that, he's got one hard time doing it. And I've watched his brethren try this, and I don't say this through criticism; Mr. Moore is a good debater. I'm not going to criticize him there, he is, but he's run into something here he just can't get around. He can't get around it, and he tries to, bless his heart; he tries to find some detour, but there isn't any. I teach that when you baptize anyone, that the name Jesus is the name that must be used. If any titles are used, titles could not be the name. The name that is here, that's Lord Jesus Christ or the Lord Jesus or the Lord, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is Jesus; the name of the Lord is Jesus; the name of Jesus Christ is Jesus. Jesus, the name Jesus, must be said. That is what I am affirming, and that is what I believe, and I defined that before when I got up here. Now, if Mr. Moore doesn't understand that, I can't help it. That's right, but I know what I did.

Colossians 2:8-9

Now, getting back to the names of God, I'd like to call your attention to Colossians 2:8,9. God had many names, God has had many names down through time. He appeared to Moses in the burning bush by the name "I Am". God made the world, the Hebrew word Elohim, and then as I quoted, the word Elshaddai or God Almighty. God has had many names, but there's one name that's above all the others, and that is the most precious name, and that's the name that all the apostles used in baptizing their converts, because they were baptizing them into the one that owned this name. That's right. I think that you folks can see that; I believe the people in Mr. Moore's congregation can see that. I believe that. Now in Colossians 2:8 and 9, the Bible said these words that, speaking of Jesus, God had given him a name. I mean Philipians instead of Colossians, Mr. Moore, and wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and we're speaking of this risen Christ Jesus that became his visible body and person, and given him a name which is above every name. Not just half of them or two thirds of them. It's above Elohim, it's above God Almighty, it's above anything else; and it doesn't leave us in the dark as to what the name is. It doesn't leave us in the dark. It tells in verse 10 what that name is, that at the name of JESUS; that's the name I'm affirming tonight, that's my proposition; that's what I'm affirming tonight, every knee should bow, of things in earth, things in heaven and things under the earth and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, and he is, because God glorified him with his own self and made him both Lord and Christ. I've been arguing that the previous nights. Now Mr. Moore must be worried about last night, and tomorrow night he'll probably be worried about tonight. What he's got to do is do something about tonight. And this argument that he's up against tonight is the thing that he can't have and can never tear down. He won't live long enough to do it.

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

Welch's Questions To Moore

Now, as I told you before, I asked Mr. Moore these questions. about formulas. And if I've ever seen a man dodge in his teachings or at least that, I wouldn't say he willingly does it, but his concept here of being baptized reminds me, and I don't say this through criticism, of a little humorous thing I heard about one time. It was a sign in front of a hoe handle factory: "All Kind of Twisting and Turning Done Here". Now I don't say that critically; I think Mr. Moore's a fine man, and I'm saying this through humor. But when I ask him these questions, I want to show you what he does here in trying to get around the plain truth. I asked him this question:

- (1) Is it scriptural to use the words "I baptize you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and he said, "Yes." That's right.
- (2) Is it scriptural to use the words "I baptize you in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost"? He said, "Yes."
- (3) Is it scriptural to baptize a convert and not say anything? He said, "yes". Now, in other words, it all just means nothing, that's all. Why doesn't he come out and do like the apostles did and take his stand for the name of Jesus and baptize his converts in the name of Jesus Christ like they did?

I'd hate to run into something, I'm going to say this again, and try to fight something or get around it with something that was such a problem, when the plain truth of the Bible shows what it is.

- (4) Now, when you were baptized in water, did the one who baptized YOU say anything? He said, "Yes." I don't know whether Mr. Moore was or not, I'm not going to say that he was. But when he was baptized if the one who baptized him said, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost" now he's going to affirm that it's scriptural to do that. And I'm assuming, by his affirmation, that that's the way he was baptized; I'm assuming that. Of course, I don't know that yet. I'm just assuming that. Now he said here that Jesus is the name of the Everlasting Father. Well, if Jesus is the name, and by his own admission, of the everlasting Father, then

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

why does Mr. Moore try to find some other name to baptize in as Father? The apostles didn't. They knew what it was and they baptized in that name.

Historical Facts About Trinity Baptism

Now I want to give you historical facts on the trinity baptism. Now Mr. Moore can do whatever he wants to about it.

Collier Encyclopedia:

In the Collier Encyclopedia page 53: "The early church always baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus until the development of the trinity. Afterward, they were baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost,"

The International Encyclopedia:

The International Encyclopedia, Volume 22, page 476: "Trinity Doctrine, the Catholic Church is this, we worship one God in trinity, that there is one person in the Father, another in the Son, and another the Holy Ghost, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. The doctrine is not found in it's full development from the Scriptures; modern theology does not seek to find it in the Old Testament. At the time of the Reformation, the Protestant Church took over the doctrine of the trinity without serious examination."

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible:

Now I believe that. And I believe that with all my heart the trinity doctrine has no place in God. And to find the history of it, The Dictionary of the Bible, James Hastings: "It has been customary to trace the institution of the practice to the words of Christ in Matthew 28:19, but the authenticity of this passage has been challenged on historical as well as textural grounds; must be acknowledged that the formula of the three fold name which is here enjoined does not appear to have been used by the primitive church; so far as our information goes, baptize in or into the

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

name of Jesus or Jesus Christ or the Lord Jesus without any reference to the Father or Spirit." Or that in other words the trinity doctrine.

Catholic encyclopedia:

Now the Catholic encyclopedia, Volume 15, page 47, paragraph 3: "In the Scriptures, there is to yet no single term by which the three divine persons denoted together."

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia:

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia page 395, 396: "The formula for baptism, the formula for Christian baptism or mode which prevailed is given in Matthew 28:19: "I baptize you in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost", but it is curious that these words are not given in any description of Christian baptism until the time of Justin Martyr, they are not repeated exactly in a slightly extended form. In every account of the performance. rites of apostolic times, a much shorter formula is used.

Council Of Nicea:

The true believers were baptized, on the day of Pentecost, in the name of Jesus Christ. The same formula was used at the baptism of Cornelius and those that were with him. Indeed it would appear to have been the usual one from Paul's question to the Corinthians when Paul asked them, were you baptized in the name of Paul?" And he did do that. Said, "Was Paul crucified for you or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" Now, I can't find the word trinity in the Bible, so I have to go elsewhere to find it. And I find it in history, and you go back to the Council of Nicea, and that is the foundation of the trinity doctrine. That's where they taught the word "logos" as a second person from God. And from there on the development of the trinity doctrine appeared. The apostles didn't know anything about it; they didn't teach anything about it and neither is there anything in the Bible about it. So I've got to go where it started to find where it is. So consequently, although I realize tonight that we are

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

perhaps fighting almost fifteen hundred years or more of man-made tradition, that we do have the Bible truth. That's right, as far as baptism and as far as the person of God is concerned.

Britannica Encyclopedia:

Now in the Britannica Encyclopedia, Volume III, page 365, 366: "The triune and trinity formula was not uniformly used from the beginning, and up until the third century, baptism in the name of Christ only was so widespread that Pope Stephen, in opposition to St. Cyprisian said that "baptism in the name of Christ is valid." That was a Catholic pope.

Now, to find today, when we go back to the original, that the early church, and Mr. Moore can say what he wants to about the manual of the United Pentecostal Church, but I'll take him on the trinity of his church. He said something last night about us fellows teaching that trinity doctrine for so many years. Well, however that may be, Mr. Moore, if we did teach it, we stopped it; and according to history, you and your group of brethren have evidently been teaching yours ever since nineteen hundred and six; that's when your church started, in 1906, that's right. And don't you think I can't prove that. I can prove it by encyclopedia and history. Now getting back to my proposition, you talk about some body not touching nothing top, bottom, and side; but Mr. Moore didn't touch mine top, bottom, or side. And he can't do it. Not only did he not do it, but he can't do it. There isn't a man living that can come to this platform and take a stand to prove that trinity baptism is biblical and against baptism in the name of Jesus Christ.

Proverbs 30:4 "What is his name?"

Now, I go back again to Proverbs 30:4, "What is his name?" Now, he said a lot of my argument here didn't make any sense. All right, let's see how much sense it's making. Proverbs 30:4, the scripture asks the question: "What is his name, and what is his son's name?" I introduced that scripture to show that the Father and the Son, in the Bible, have the

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

same name. Well, Mr. Moore helped me a whole lot; because he admitted that Jesus was the name of the Everlasting Father. Well, then he got up and readily admitted that the name of the Son was Jesus, so he just helped me out there real fine. So according to his admission, the name of the everlasting Father and the name of the Son is Jesus. Then what is his name, and what is his son's name?

Colossians 1:27 and 1John 4:13

“Jesus Is The Holy Spirit?”

Now he had quite a bit to say about the scripture I introduced in Colossians where it said, “... Christ in you, the hope of glory.” The reason I introduced that scripture was to prove that the Holy Ghost was the spirit of Christ. My spirit tonight would not have a different name to what I have. That's right. My spirit should have the same name I have and therefore, Jesus Christ's spirit, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, is from him and it's his spirit, and I use the word omnipresent when I explain that. That's right. And his spirit is Christ in you, the hope, the hope of glory, proving that Jesus is the name of the Holy Ghost. That's why I used it and pointed out 1John 4:13, where it said, “Hereby we know that we dwell in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his spirit.” I was using that scripture to prove that the Holy Ghost was the spirit of the one whose name is Jesus. That's why I used it and did prove that the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost is Jesus, this highest name.

Apostles Baptism

Now, as I moved from that to prove that the apostles did baptize using that name, never is there any record in any place in the Bible that the apostles ever uttered anything that favored a trinity formula. They always baptized their converts into one divine person.

Galatians 3:27 (An Issue Or Not?)

Now, I introduced a scripture in Galatians 3:27, baptized into Christ. He said there's no issue there but there is an issue there. There's a great big

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

issue there. That's right. The issue is this. You baptize into somebody, they could be heathen baptisms. You could baptize people into heathen religions, into heathen deities. But the Bible teaches that baptism is the entrance into Christ, baptism of water and spirit and when I mentioned this I was proving the point that we're baptized when we were baptized into somebody. And that somebody I was proving was Jesus Christ, and his name is Jesus; and if I were to baptize a man into the Lord Jesus Christ, I would certainly tell him and let it be known who he was being baptized into like my brethren did in the early church. There's no mention there of being baptized into a trinity. That's right. It just isn't found there. Baptism into Christ, that's right. Now if you were going to baptize somebody into somebody, would you try to baptize them into them without acknowledging who you were baptizing into? Why, ten thousand times no.

Romans 6:1-3

Then in Romans, sixth chapter, verse one, two and three: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ", not into a trinity; no mention of three persons, but into this one, divine, wonderful Savior that is bringing to the world his highest name and teaching us that there's salvation in no other, and we acknowledge that wonderful Jesus when we baptize people into him, and they know who they're baptized into. Now there's the difference. There's a lot of difference. If you try to detour around that and use something that doesn't sustain you, as I said the word "name" and the word "authority" don't come from the same word, and he said it made no difference; it does make a difference. That's part of this argument here tonight. It does make a difference; that's right. That's part of it, and so when you're baptized into Jesus Christ, that means that you recognize in the water baptismal formula the name Jesus, that you're being baptized into one person who is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That's the difference in the water baptismal formulas; that's the main difference. So, therefore, that's why I introduced the scriptures proving that Jesus Christ was the husband of the church and emphatically proved that the church was his wife and that

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

this woman had only one husband, no trinity of husbands there. Now suppose you take the difference in the formulas. I'm discussing water baptism formulas here tonight. Now I compare the difference. Say that Mr. Moore, and I'm assuming he was, was baptized and they called the words over him: "I baptize you in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." All right, in that then he recognized, or should at least, that there are three separate, distinct persons in the Godhead, and he's being baptized with the recognition of each one of them. That's exactly why I called him a Trinitarian, and I still say he is. He may not like the word "trinity", he may not like the terminology of it, but that's exactly the doctrine that he's upholding and contending for just as sure as my name is Welch.

More on Apostles Baptism

Now as I come on to my argument showing that the apostles did baptize into one divine being, I introduced the scriptures in Acts the second chapter where Peter told them "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ." Jesus is the one there; he's the person, the individual and his name is Jesus, and they're being baptized into one divine person whose name is Jesus. They're being baptized, not into a trinity, but into Christ. And also, in the 8th chapter of Acts as I introduced the scripture they were baptized not in any trinity formula. There was no mention of any authority or saying by the authority of Jesus Christ I baptize you into a trinity formula. And nowhere in the Bible can you find it. Now that's the reason why I take the position that the name Jesus MUST BE USED. It specifies that he is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that name Jesus covers the Godhead because the Godhead is in him.

Conversion Of Saul

And he talks about falling off that mule or horse, but he fell from his beast, I believe the book says, and I could call it a mule probably if I wanted to, that is from his beast. That's right. I stand to be corrected on that if it doesn't say that. I'll use the terminology anyhow. But any way when Saul was confronted, that light shined around him and he heard

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

speaking to him in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" And he answered the question to heaven, "Lord, who art thou?" I'll tell you what it was worrying Mr. Moore I believe more than the animal Saul was riding. I believe this clear cut name the Lord gave back that Mr. Moore is trying to get around is the thing that is worrying him. I believe that, I can't help but say it. And he asked the question, "Lord, who art thou? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." That's right.

Conversion Of The Gentiles, Cornelius

Now in the 10th chapter when the, and I use the word door there, I especially use that word door, in John the tenth chapter showing the fact that the issue is there. What I'm talking about tonight is the entrance into that door and how you enter and what's said when you enter and who you're baptized into when you enter. And I use the verse in John 10:9 where Jesus said, "I am the door." I use that verse. Then when Peter was preaching to them the Holy Ghost fell on them and he commanded them, he didn't say you can be baptized any way, they can say anything over YOU, he didn't say that, he said nowhere about a trinity, but he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. As far as pulling this down, Mr. Moore has not done it and he can't do it. They were baptized and that chapter 9 tells you and me what that name was when Saul asked the question, "Lord who art thou?" And he said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. That's what I'm talking about, and if they were baptized in the name of the Lord, and they were, they were baptized into one divine person whose name was Jesus just like the Jews were and just like the Samaritans were and just like the others over farther on that were baptized in Acts 19:1-6. They were baptized the same way into one divine person whose name is Jesus.

Acts 19:1-6 "12 Disciples of John"

Now I come to the 19th chapter of Acts and verses 1-6, "And it came to pass, that, while Apollus was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coast came to Ephesus and finding certain disciples, he said unto

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? They said, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? They said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." That name Jesus is always used. That's what I'm showing you. That's what I am affirming tonight; that the name Jesus must be used and said when you're baptized. That's exactly what I'm affirming and that's exactly what I've proved. Then he asked a question.

Christ Is The Husband Of The Church

Mr. Moore gets up here and he said Mr. Welch said. Well, how much more would he want to be showed? How much more would it take to show him? Every place they were baptized they were baptized into one divine person whose name is Jesus. And then I concluded my argument by showing that Christ was the husband of the church, and that there's only one husband, and that church was his wife. And introduced the scripture to prove in Genesis 5:1 that the woman, the first woman and man that God created, that woman had his name and he gets up here and says a lot about his name. Yes, we do. I'm not going to deny that. We're known as a Jesus only, Jesus name people. We baptize in Jesus' name. And I might say this, Mr. Moore, with all due respect to you and your brethren and by what you call your church, that just because you hang up a sign saying hen house, that's no proof there's any eggs there. Now, getting back to this. I want him to grapple with this. Don't come up here and say Welch didn't make any argument. I want you to grapple with it. Tell us about the husband and if the wife bears his name. Tell us about that. And what the husband's name is. In Acts 10:48 as to the relationship of Christ and his church, we're married to him. I introduced that scripture in Romans 7:4, "you should be married to another," not to them but "to him that is raised from the dead." Well, when a woman

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

marries a man she takes that man's name. Every married woman here tonight that's married to a man, takes that man's name. Well, we're the only people on earth tonight that acknowledge His name and are baptized within His name, and separate from everything else and acknowledging that baptism in His name is the Bible baptism. That's the way of entering Him. And I've introduced that and proved it and if he'd live long enough to make Methuselah look like a school boy, Mr. Moore never could disprove it either. And he won't when his next thirty minutes is over and he won't tomorrow night when the two hours is over.

Baptized Into Christ

Now of course if you baptize into Christ as I proved in Gal. 3:27 you baptize into one. The church has one husband, 2Cor. 11:2. He's wanting us to be silent on using the name and that is an issue. That's a big issue. You can't laugh that off and detour and try to get around it by hollering authority all the time either. You can't do that. That's right. One husband, 2Cor. 11:2, Paul said, "I've espoused you unto one husband. You take the words he's got on this chart here. Acts 10:40, in, it's in the name of the Lord. Add this UPON the name of the Lord. That's in the second chapter of Acts there, and that's in the tenth chapter of Acts there, and in the 19th chapter of Acts he says that's the same word. It all deals with the name of God and in his name. There's not one word there, none of them words there are from the word authority in the Greek. Name and authority are from two different words all together. That means in or into. That's what those words mean, upon, that's what they mean. I know what they mean. He tries to use them as authority, but it means "in", "into", "upon", "at". I've got a Greek book there that will prove it to you on that desk right there. Each one of these words here, if he wants to challenge the authenticity of it, I'll take that book and prove it to him. "I've espoused you to one husband." The church is His bride, Rev. 19:7. Now, you see the inconsistency in the trinity doctrine. It teaches three husbands actually. It does. It teaches at least two. That's right. In the argument on the Godhead here Mr. Moore has said that. The Son should

Wednesday - Mr. Welch's Second Affirmative

give the bride to the Father, 15th chapter of 1Cor. or inferred that at least. I don't want to misrepresent him, if I did that it could cover up the argument. The trinity doctrine robs from Jesus, it takes from Him the glory that the Bible gives Him. He is the husband of the church. He is the Everlasting Father.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Two-B

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen both here and the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'm happy to come before you again to continue my part in this discussion, and trust that the next 30 minutes will pass hurriedly and pleasantly for you.

The Affirmative's Proposition Not Defined?

I want to take up Mr. Welch's speech item by item and statement by statement and look at it. He got up and the first thing he said was that he defined his proposition. He said, "I clearly stated it." Mr. Welch, your moderator did that. Your moderator clearly stated the proposition, you didn't define it. Do you think stating it is defining it? "Oh" he said, "I defined my proposition, I clearly stated it." You did no such thing. You didn't define the terms of your proposition. Now last night, Mr. Welch, when you were in the affirmative, you made the statement and the tapes and the book will show it, "that being in the affirmative," he said, "I'm obligated to define the terms of my proposition. And you then went into a definition of person. Now tonight you said when you stated the proposition you defined it, and you didn't define your proposition. Like I say, your moderator stated it, and you didn't define it then, and you haven't defined it now. And I still say to you that the proposition that he's supposed to be affirming is that the Scriptures teach that in water baptism something must be said, and that something that must be said is a formula. Now a formula is a prescribed form or rule; it's an exact statement, it cannot vary. And I asked him, you know, to tell us what the exact statement was, and he hasn't told us yet. And I also asked him if it would be all right if I said in the name of Jesus I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Now, Mr. Welch, if things work out as it's now planned, this book's going into print; and there's going to be forty times in these propositions where I've asked you questions like this that's going to be blank. I asked you to tell me, you wouldn't do it. I'm interested in this proposition, I want to get the truth of it. That's what I wanted to do. That's why I introduced these arguments.

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

And incidentally, he talked about what these references mean in the Greek, He said, "If you doubt it, challenge, I did challenge your last speech. I challenged you then, Mr. Welch. Why don't you come up and deal with it? Do you know the Greek alphabet, Mr. Welch? Do you?"

A Challenge

He challenged what I have here and it's an exact quotation of Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon. "Why" you said, "that isn't what that means. I know what that means." He said, "If you think I don't, challenge me." I challenged you in my last speech, sir. You're behind time. And he said that he had defined his proposition. He said "I stated that the name Jesus was the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that you must utter this name."

I know that you said that but I said define your proposition, the word formula and must and the matter of said. And he said, "Mr. Moore's trying to dodge. I'll just let you decide whether or not I'm trying to dodge. And that gets around to the questions. And he got up here and he referred to the questions and he talked about me dodging and wiggling and was like that sign out in front of the building, All Kinds of Turning and Twisting Done Here. Now, Mr. Welch, that was completely uncalled for. The best way on earth to answer questions is with a definite yes or no. And after he made all of that kind of a joke and got a laugh: like I told you last night that's an appeal to emotions, it's the evasion of the law of rationality. I answered your questions and your moderator knows that I did, and my moderator knows that I did. I answered the first question with a yes. I answered the second question with a yes. I answered the fourth question with a yes, the fifth question with a yes. Now you talk about twisting and dodging when I answered with a definite yes! Now that was uncalled for, it was completely out of order, and I think that you know that it was. Talk about someone twisting and dodging and trying to get around, when I gave a definite yes. These folks know I did, Mr. Welch. He said, "I can't get around it. " Mr. Welch says, I plainly said the name

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

Jesus must be said. I know you said that, Mr. Welch, I know that you said that. That's why I introduced the arguments that I did. Now did you hear him take them up?

Baptism Passages Have Titles In Them

He answered my question and said that no titles can be used. He said, "Yes, I said that." And that's why I called attention to the fact that he thinks that the words Lord and Christ are both titles, and yet every passage that he cites where baptism and the name occurs in the same verse it has titles in it. He cites these as a formula to say and they have titles. So he says they can't be said, cites them and argues they must be said. I know that you said that, that's why I introduced the charts and I'll come back to them in a moment. No titles to be used. And that of course deals with the matter of his vocabulary and he thinks that the word Lord and Christ are titles and the passages that he cited had those words in them, therefore, those passages are not the ones that teach a formula, are they Mr. Welch? By your own statement they are not.

Philippians 2:8-9: Highest Name

He said, God had numerous names, that was the point that he made. That God had many names but that he had one name that was above every name and he cites Philippians 2:8 and 9. Now once again I want to call your attention to this, and you notice that Mr. Welch very carefully ignored this completely. He had nothing to say about it, not a single solitary thing did he have to say about it. Now you people are looking, you're listening to what I'm saying. I want you to notice this, that the Bible does use the word name in these different ways. Did he take it up and notice it? You know that he did not. He didn't say a word about it. And yet the Bible very definitely teaches that the word name is sometimes used to mean reputation. In Proverbs 22 and verse 1 the wise man Solomon said that a good name is to be desired above riches. And I asked him about that. When he said good name did he mean the way that the name was spelled? While the word is used to mean reputation

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

the same thing is true in Rev. 3 and verse 1 where the word name is used to mean reputation, and many other places. You remember he cited Isaiah 63? And he left it completely alone, never came back and said another word about it, when I pointed out that the context told you how that he had an everlasting name. What did he say about it? Not a word. And you know something? If he lives long enough to make Methuselah look like a school-boy he won't say anything about it either. You wait and see. He won't say a thing about it because he took the passage where it had everlasting name and because it had that, ignored why he had that name. Didn't you, Mr. Welch? Why didn't you take the passage and deal with the argument? Now watch it if you will. The word name, ladies and gentlemen, in the Bible is used sometimes to mean character. Whenever the Bible says he that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, or he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, what's he talking about, Mr. Welch? The way that the man spells his name, a designation? Certainly not. In the sense of character or what he is, Jer. 23 verses 25 through 32. Now Mr. Welch see, he says that because the word name and the word authority do not come from the same word in the Greek that means they are not the same. Is that your argument, Mr. Welch? That's your argument isn't it? If here's two words and they're not from the same word in the original language they're not the same. Do you think the word Father and Son are from the same word in the original language? Is that the argument you're making? That's not even a third cousin to an argument. Because two words are not from the same word in the original he argues therefore they don't mean the same thing. Well now the word Father and Son do not come from the same word in the original language, or do you think they do? They don't come from the same word. He said, they're the same.

Ephesians 1:19: Power, Rule, Authority

I want now to call your attention to Eph. 1:19, you notice how he came back to that passage where I pointed out that you have a definition of the terms; the idea of power, rule, dominion, authority, name. All five of these

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

are used to mean the same thing. Why didn't he come up and deal with it? Now you know as well as I do that Mr. Welch is not dealing with my arguments, and no one knows that better than my good friend, Mr. Welch. Now, Mr. Welch, you know that you're not dealing with the arguments and I know that, and the book will reveal that. I wish you'd deal with them. That passage shows that these terms are used interchangeably. The passage that I cited over in the book of Jeremiah. I want you to note how that the expression name is used to mean authority. Listen to it now. "I've heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name." "I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies? Yea, they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart; Which think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams." Now watch it. These prophets were prophesying lies in the name of David, and what they were doing was causing the people to forget the name of David. Now they're prophesying in his name and causing people to forget his name, Mr. Welch. Now listen at the next verses, verses 31 and 32, "They use their tongues and say, He saith. Yet I sent them not, nor commanded them." That's why I cited the passage and put it on the chart for you to come up and deal with it. And then he comes up and makes the argument that because the word name and authority is not from the same word in the original they're not the same. All right now back to the notes. However before I go any further in connection with that. The term is sometimes used to mean a designation. I know that, but what kind, I asked him what rule that he uses. You remember I called your attention to John 5 and verse 43? Now you see, without any consideration as to why he does it, Mr. Welch cites a passage with the expression in the name of and states "That means you say it." Then he cites John 5 and verse 43, "I came in my Father's name." He said, "That means he wore it. " I asked him to give me your rule of interpretation that allows you to decide that one time it means you wear it and the next time you say it. Now you folks know that as well as I do.

Argues Everything But The Proposition

He said, Mr. Moore must be worried about last night. I'll leave you to decide whether I'm worried about last night. You know who brought it up, you know he's discussing the Godhead. He's discussing the Godhead question tonight, he's discussing the church question, he's discussing everything but what he signed to affirm: That you must say something in order for one to be scripturally baptized. And he cites passages that tell us what they did. We want to know what they said. We know what they did. We want you to tell us what they said, Mr. Welch. Do you know the difference in doing and saying? What is the difference in do and say? Now you see, Mr. Welch goes to a passage and he tells us something that they were to do, and Mr. Welch thinks that that means that he's telling us what to SAY. He doesn't know the difference in do and say, obviously. Then of course that's when he came to my questions and said I was twisting and turning and dodging like a sign. And yet I know of no way, I say this kindly to you and to Mr. Welch, I know of no way on earth sir, and I think your moderator knows this. (My moderator started to call you down and I said, "No, let him alone.") I think you know that there's no better way on earth to answer a question than with a definite yes or no, and that's what I did. And I think you owe me an apology for that. And I think he will because I think Mr. Welch is a fair man. He said, "Why not baptize like the apostles did?" I do. I baptize like the apostles did, and you assume that I don't. When I was baptized he assumes that someone said Father, Son and Holy Spirit. That's right, you did assume that. You do assume that, Mr. Welch.

No Formula Found In The New Testament

And then he cites the encyclopedias and every last one of them backfires on him. I want to show you something, ladies and gentlemen. I have three books in my hand now. I have the United Pentecostal Manual, I have the last will and testament of Jesus Christ, and I have a Catholic dictionary. You can find authority for formulas in the Catholic dictionary. You can find the authority for A formula in the United Pentecostal

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

Manual. You cannot find it in the New Testament. That's why he went to the encyclopedias and read from them and every last one of them told you when this idea of a formula came into existence. But you see I don't believe that a formula has to be said. Every last one of those authorities that you introduced, Mr. Welch, backfired on you because every last one of them say that a formula was not in existence until the Roman Catholic Church introduced it, and that's where you get your formula idea from. You don't get it from the New Testament. That's why he read from the encyclopedias. He couldn't find it in the New Testament and therefore he went to the only place where he could find it.

Proposition: "Scriptures Teach"

Your proposition tonight, Mr. Welch, says, "It is scriptural" "The Scriptures teach." That's what you said. That's what you signed to affirm, the Scriptures teach. Then he cited 1Cor. 1 and verse 13 where Paul said, "Were you baptized in the name of Paul?" That once again is just a passage that exposes his idea of in the name, because he had affirmed that "some of ye sayth I am of Paul." I am of Paul. That's one of the definitions that I gave. To profess the name of one whose follower we become. Then he cited the passage where that's precisely the case. And so these folks were saying that we are of Christ, or we are of Paul. And Paul said, were you baptized in my name? Since you were not then, you cannot say that you are of Paul. And that's not his passage.

The Manual

Then he mentions the manual again and the fact that my church started in 1906. Like I said, Mr. Welch, I intend tonight to get before this audience of people the truth on water baptism, they came here for the purpose of hearing a discussion on water baptism. As I said last night, and I think the folks that know me know that nobody's ever questioned my courage when it comes to defending what I believe. They've questioned my wisdom but not my courage. And, sir, I'm not afraid to debate you on the church that I'm a member of; I'm not afraid of that.

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

And that's all a bunch of play on his part and beside the point. You signed to affirm that a formula must be said. Why don't you come up and affirm it? I will not be led away from it?

Proverbs 30:4 Implies Two

And then he once again said something about his proposition, he got some laughs, evading the law of rationality, but he still didn't define the term formula for you. Proverbs 30 and verse 4, he said, "what is his name, and the name of the Father?" Well now this implies two of them doesn't it? Two names. (Moderator: 15 minutes) Talks about his name and the name of His Father. You see he cited that to talk about one name and it's talking about two.

Colossians 1 And First John 4

Then he said, "Col. 1." Now you see, Mr. Welch, you chided me and got on me because I didn't know the relation of your argument in Col. 1 and 1John 4, but you gave the wrong reference in 1John. That's why I couldn't and I asked you about it. There was no need of you rebuking me because you didn't know the reference you wanted to cite. I can't help that. You cited the passage where it talks about prayer according to his will, or at least that's the one I took down. I think that's the one you cited. Now, let's take a look at his argument then. He cites Colossians 1 and 1 and 1Jno. 4 and verse 13, Christ in you and the Holy Spirit in you, and he said, "Well now that proves that Christ and the Holy Spirit are one and the same thing. And the name of, in other words his argument is this: That Christ is in you, the Holy Spirit is in you and that proves that Christ is the Holy Spirit. And therefore he says, "Whatever is the name of Christ that's the name of the Holy Spirit. Is that your argument? That is it isn't it Mr. Welch? Now if Christ is in you and the Holy Spirit is in you, do you think that the Holy Spirit is a person? Do you think that Christ is a person? Do you, Mr. Welch, you think the Holy Spirit is a person? Tell us, is Christ in Christians just like the Holy Spirit is in Christians? Like I say it's still the Godhead question that's plaguing him.

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

Baptized into somebody

Certainly I know that. I've never denied that. I've debated that proposition over and over: That the Scriptures teach that we are baptized into Jesus Christ. I believe that with all of my heart. I believe also that the Bible teaches that we're baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And I believe that the word name is used there in the place of those who are mentioned. Liddel and Scott affirm that the word name covers those who are represented there and I'll introduce that tomorrow night as an argument. Matt. 28:18-20 simply affirms that one is baptized into the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; that's what the passage teaches. It doesn't teach that you have to say anything. There is no passage that teaches that you have to say some little set form. He hasn't found it except in the encyclopedias. "Somebody is Jesus", "his name is Jesus", and "I would tell him." Well, I might do that too. I might tell him many things, Mr. Welch, but you see what you're affirming is this: Not what you might tell him, or what you would tell him, but your proposition says something that you must say. That's what your proposition says, a little formula. You see, what he's implying in all of this now that I don't think that in my teaching, and in baptism and that I don't think that I ought to use the name Jesus. I don't think any such thing. That isn't the issue, Mr. Welch, in this debate and no one knows it better than you do. The thing that I'm denying is this: That scriptural baptism depends upon what the administrator says. That's what he's affirming. That's why he denies what the Book teaches about the Godhead. So that he can take a man out in the water and say a little formula over him. And he thinks that's baptizing in the name of Jesus. He thinks like those seven sons of Sceva, they thought that the power was in saying the name. Just like Jesus said in Matthew 7 verses 21 through 24, many would say to him, "did we not prophesy in thy name?" And the Lord would say, "I never knew you"; I never approved of you. They thought that all you had to do was utter the name. That's like Mr. Welch. He doesn't know the difference in do and say. And I say that kindly.

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

Name And Authority Not From Same Word

Name and authority not from the same word. Neither is Father and Son; tell us something about that, Mr. Welch. Now watch it. From the standpoint of a logical consequence from his argument, look at his argument. Here's what he says. He says, "If two words are not from the same Greek word they do not mean the same thing." Now if that's not your argument you don't have an argument. He further, in his minor premise, then affirms that the word name and authority are not from the same word; therefore name and authority is not the same thing. But now try his logic on Father and Son, they are not from the same word in the original so they're not the same. Mr. Welch says, "But I can logically deduce that from other passages." But you see, he doesn't think I could do that about name. That's what I'm talking about. Now, Mr. Welch, you've been debating 35 years and you don't know any more about logic than that. I think you do.

The Word Trinitarian

The word Trinitarian, like I said that's prejudicial. That's what you call emotive words and it serves to prove nothing on earth but to stir the emotion, try to arouse prejudice. And that also is a violation of honorable controversy, Mr. Welch. It has no meaning. One of the things that the rules that he signed to be regulated by affirms this: That all expressions that are meaningless ought to be left out of the debate, yet, he persists in doing it. Well, that's his business if he wants to but I intend to point it out to you.

Acts 2:38: Baptized Into One Being

Baptized into one being, Acts 2:38. But you see that passage didn't tell them what to say. That passage told them what to do. Now, look at it, Mr. Welch. (Moderator: 10 minutes.) Mr. Welch says, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. That means that when they were baptized that you had to say something over them. Now watch the argument closely. Repent and baptize are both connected together by the little word and. And when Mr. Welch is debating the Baptist, and he does, he calls attention to the fact that the expression remission of sins

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

modifies both repent and be baptized. Repentance and baptism both are necessary for remission of sins. Now I want you to tell me why that baptism in that passage in the name of Jesus means that you have to say a formula when a man's baptized, and you don't have to say the same formula when one repents.

Acts 8:16: No Mention Of Authority

He said: "there's no mention of authority here." I want to know, Mr. Welch. Do you think they were doing it contrary to his authority? You think they didn't have any authority to do it? Now I have some charts on this that I'll introduce in my affirmative speech tomorrow night, but I want you to just think, ladies and gentlemen, just think with me for a moment. The Baptism of Jesus, what is that? Why that's baptism in the name of Jesus. Now is that the baptism authorized by Jesus? Mr. Welch, I'll tell you what, you will get this question in written form tomorrow night anyhow, I want you to be able to think about it though. That is this: is baptism in the name of Jesus baptism authorized by Jesus? Now he says "in the name of" cannot mean authorized by. These folks know that it does, that's what I'm trying to get you to see; that the baptism of Jesus is baptism in the name of Jesus and is the baptism authorized by Jesus. He cites Acts 16 and he says no authority there. Well were they doing it without his authority, contrary to it? Then he cites Acts 10, the case of Cornelius. And that's when he talked about falling from the beast and got a laugh about that, and yet he admitted that he manufactured the passage. And then, because he manufactured the passage, he turned right around and accused me of being afraid of it and that I mentioned the mule just because I was afraid of the passage. There are several times you said that and I've just ignored it time and time again. I've talked about this expression Lord. I'm not afraid of that passage. These folks know that I've dealt with that. I told you last night, I tell you now again, and the book will reveal that I have. That in Acts the ninth chapter the apostle Paul knew full well at that time that some heavenly being had appeared to him and that's why he said, "Who art thou Lord?" I don't

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

deny that Jesus is Lord. Acts 2 and verse 36 says that he is, both Lord and Christ. There once again the word both and it means two, Lord and Christ. Talking about two things, Lord and Christ. Not two persons, I didn't say that. That's Mr. Welch's idea that whenever I say both that I mean two persons. When I say both I mean two, t-w-o. All right then he said John 10.9. He said, "I use this verse." I know that he uses this verse, but it doesn't help his cause any that Jesus said that He's the door. And there's no issue there. What does that prove? Acts 10 and verse 48, "Commanded to be baptized in the name of the Lord. "Lord" is a title so that's not a formula is it? That's not a passage for a formula. You see Mr. Welch says, "You can't use titles." Here's a passage that has Lord, that's a title. So it's not talking about baptismal formula is it, Mr. Welch?

Acts 19:1-6: A Contrast

In Acts the 19th chapter you have a contrast. Mr. Welch, are you familiar with the law of contrast? In Acts the 19th chapter you have the baptism of Jesus and the baptism of John contrasted. (I'll have a chart on this tomorrow night.) And in this contrast you have the baptism of John contrasted with the baptism of Jesus. Now Paul came down and he said, "Unto what then were you baptized?" What do you think he wanted to know? They said, "John's baptism." Then the record tells us that the Apostle Paul baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now watch it. There are certain things stated in this contrast and there are certain things implied, Mr. Welch. There is John's baptism stated. Like I say, you may not be familiar with the law of contrast, I don't know. You've been debating 35 years; I thought you were. The law of contrast is where you may have all of the points of a contrast stated, some may be stated, and some may be implied. The law of opposition or contrast. Now watch it. There you have stated John's baptism and it's contrasted with Christ's baptism. You have stated in the name of the Lord Jesus, you have in the name of John implied don't you? Now what does it mean when they were baptized into the name of John? That implies they simply were baptized according to the baptism authorized by John. And whenever it says they

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus they were baptized according to the baptism authorized by Jesus. That's what that passage teaches, and it's contrasted with John's baptism. (Moderator: 5 minutes)

Church And Husband

Then he talks about the church of Christ and husband. He made a big play on the fact that the church is the bride of Christ and the church ought to wear the name of Christ and he said, "We call ourselves Jesus only." And yet he said, "I indorse this manual." And this Manual says Manual of the United Pentecostal Church. Mr. Welch, unless I'm badly mistaken, I didn't take time to look it up a moment ago, this manual states: The United Pentecostal Church must designate by sign or some symbol that it is the United Pentecostal Church. Doesn't it? Doesn't it, Mr. Welch? Then I'll show you something else about that. Now he said, "Just because you put the word hen-house out in front of a house, that doesn't mean it's a hen-house. But it does imply that the fellow that put it out there thought that there was, doesn't it? And it does imply that the man that put it out there didn't think that it was a pig pen. Now watch it if you will. Mr. Welch's manual says that you must have the name United Pentecostal Church out in front of it. That's what the manual says it is. It implies that they know that it's not the Lord's church, doesn't it? So his illustration doesn't get him a thing. And not only that, now watch this, he's up here tonight arguing about there being so much in a name, and yet he says, "There's nothing in a name because the fact that there's a name there doesn't mean anything." So your illustration got you in trouble instead of helping you, Mr. Welch.

Baptized Into Him

And he said, "He'll make Methuselah look like a school-boy before he'll deny that." I've been preaching that ever since I've tried to preach, I've never denied it. I won't deny it now. I know that the Scriptures teach that one is baptized into Christ. I believe that the Scriptures teach that one is baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and I believe

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

that the name stands for the persons designated too. He knows about this language and he said that if I wanted to challenge him, and I already have.

The Trinity-Three Husbands

Then he talks about the trinity, three husbands in the Godhead. I do not believe any such thing. And that deals with the gentleman's speech.

The Formula

I want now in the closing minutes of my speech to call your attention to things regarding this proposition. Now Mr. Welch has been affirming that there is a formula that must be said. I asked him in a question to tell us what is the formula. We want to know what must be said. He says something must be said. Now you see the point is this. If there isn't one passage that teaches a prescribed form, then there is no prescribed form. You folks can see that. That's what a formula is. It is a prescribed form. Now watch it. If this passage is prescribing the form, then this one isn't, because they're not the same. If this one is stating the formula, then this one isn't. Don't you folks see that? I know these boys in school can see that.

All right, now back to the point at hand, and that is the idea of a formula. It is a prescribed form or rule, an exact statement. That's what Mr. Welch signed to affirm, and I want you to see if Acts 2:38 is stating the formula then Acts 8:16 isn't. He lumped them together as if they were. You see, if there is a prescribed form he ought to find it in one of these passages. And if there is no prescribed form, then why would the man sign a proposition to affirm such? And in these passages you have three different arrangements of the name, you have three different propositions. And he talks about the one name. What did he have to say about this? Not a thing on earth. That there are many names of the Son of God. The Bible talks about Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace, and incidentally in Phil. 2, I never did make my application a moment ago.

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

The Name J -E- S- U -S

When he talks about a name above every name, you think that's the word J-E-S-U-S. Is that right, Mr. Welch? Is that what you think that means? Now you see that's the implication. That it means the spelling of the word J-E-S-U-S. I deny that it means any such thing. It means reputation, it means character, and it means authority and this man takes the idea of designation. Down in the valley there are numerous people of the Latin Americans who are called Jesus. There's the name Jesus, if that's all it means. Of all things. Observe this idea of the names of the Son of God. The Bible said that his name should be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. I want you to note, Mr. Welch says, "He has only one name," but the Bible says that's he had many names. That's just a case of Mr. Welch verses the Bible. His name was called Jesus, call his name Emanuel, His name will be called the Word of God, the King of Kings, Lord of Lords. And he wears the name my Son, Hebrews 1 verses 4 and 5. And so it is a case of Mr. Welch verses the Bible. I want to leave this thought with you, ladies and gentlemen. The Bible tells us what to do, but nowhere in the Word of God does the Bible tell us what to say when we baptize someone. And I appreciate your very kind attention.

The End of Speech

Wednesday - Moore's Second Negative

This ends Mr. Welch's Proposition that a formula must be said when baptizing a convert. Mr. Moore will now affirm that the Scriptures do not that a formula must be said and that the word Father, Son and Holy Spirit may be used.

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Three-A

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen both here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'm grateful that once again, through the providence of the Lord, we're privileged to be present, and that we might continue our investigation into these matters. I appreciate very much the very fine remarks that you've made concerning the debate thus far and all the efforts that have gone into making it possible.

Proposition and Terms Defined

I want at this time to read the proposition and then very carefully define the terms of the proposition that you might know exactly what we're talking about and what we're not talking about. As I suggested to you last night, in honorable controversy it's very important that the precise terms that occur in a proposition be defined in such a way that there can be no misunderstanding. The proposition reads: "The Scriptures do not teach that a formula must be said when one is baptized and we are at liberty to use the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in Scriptural statements, when one is baptized. Now the definition of the terms. By the word Scripture I mean the Bible. By do not teach I mean demand or make imperative. By a formula I mean a prescribed form, a rule, or model. By must be said I mean orally spoken. By the word liberty I mean we are privileged. By the word to use I mean to state. By Father, Son, and Holy Spirit I mean the three beings or individualities in deity. By Scriptural statements I mean not contrary to Bible teaching. When one is baptized I mean the immersion of a penitent believer. Now I trust that this will define the terms that occur. A simple definition then of the proposition is this The Bible does not tell the administrator what to say when he's baptizing someone and that he may make some scriptural statement and these statements may include the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I call your attention to a chart that's on the front of the stand, that we had before you last night, and I suggest it to you again, that we know what was done. We know what they did. We are concerned about Mr. Welch telling us "What did they say?" As I emphasized to you last night, there's

Baptismal Formula Debate

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

a difference in doing and saying.

Clarifying Statements Of Proposition

I want now to clarify the issue by suggesting to you what I am not denying. I am not denying the right to use the name Jesus when one is baptized. It's not the right to use the name I'm contesting. I'm not denying that baptism is in the name of Jesus. I believe this with every ounce of my being. I am denying that the Bible tells us what we are to say, when we baptize someone. I am denying that we have to say anything. I do deny that the validity of baptism depends on what the administrator says. I'm simply defending the right to state spiritual truths when someone is is baptized, and, this truth that I state may include the words Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I submit to you that the real issue in this debate tonight and the case last night, is simply this: "Does scriptural baptism depend on what the administrator says?" That's what the issue is and I intend to keep it before you.

Possible Ways Of Refuting My Argument:

- (1) My good friend may cite the passage that specifies that an administrator must say something, and what he must say.
- (2) He may find an example where the administrator stated a formula, and then show that the example is illustrating a requirement and not just a liberty.
- (3) He may find what one must say and not what he may do.

These are the only three ways, that I can imagine, he could refute the position before us.

Welch's Questions

I don't know of any reason why I ought to be any different toward Mr. Welch this evening than I've been each evening; however, before I read the absurdities and the contradictions that he's made, I want to answer his questions:

- (1) "When one is baptized in water using the words: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is that to recognize the

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

three persons of God as you teach”

Not for that purpose Mr. Welch, no. That's not the purpose of it. If I did that, that is not the purpose of it.

(2) “Could you be scripturally baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and believe there's only one person in the Godhead?”

Now, I want to give him a qualified answer. I've tried in this debate to be as specific with my answers as I can, and I want to give you a qualified no. I want you to consider a question I'm going to pose for you, Mr. Welch. And I trust you'll answer it. I hope this evening that you will follow me in my speech so that we may be able to dispute the things that are under consideration.

He asked me whether or not one can be scripturally baptized in the name of Jesus and believes there is only one person in the Godhead? I say no, and I'll ask you to tell me this. Can one scripturally be baptized in the name of Jesus and believe there are three persons in the Godhead? Will you tell us, Mr. Welch? And when he considers this question, you listen to him about that. “In the name of Jesus the highest name of deity?” There's a word known as ambiguity that means a word may be used in two or three different ways by a speaker. The word “name” may be used in that very way. And it depends on what Mr. Welch means by the term name. I called your attention to that fact and I've yet to have Mr. Welch take a look at this chart and consider it with us and I want to show you something. The word “name” in the Bible, ladies and gentlemen, is used in four different ways. The word name is sometimes used to mean reputation, Prov. 22:11. “A good name.” I might refer to a man, (and if there's a John Smith here tonight I'm not talking about you. This is simply for illustration) I may say that John Smith has a good name and I may turn around and say John Smith has a bad name. I've used the same terminology and yet one time it was good and another time it was bad. You know that. So, the word name may mean reputation. The word name may mean character, Mt. 10:41. The word “name” may mean authority, Jer. 23:25-32. It may be used to specify a person, place, or

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

thing as a designation, (Jno. 1:6). Now, you see he puts the word "name" in; what does he mean when he uses the word name? How can I give you, Mr. Welch, an answer to this question when you'll not come up and tell me how you're using the term. Now here's what I do believe, because the Bible teaches it concerning the name of Jesus Christ. In Eph. 1:19-21, the Bible affirms Jesus Christ has been given to be head over all things to the church, which is his body. And in that very context he talks about him being above all rule, authority, dominion, power, and name. Now if that's the way you're using the term "name", in the sense of authority, the Bible affirms that Jesus has been given all authority. Tell us what you mean by these terms.

(4) "Does water baptism induct a believer into Christ?"

One is certainly baptized into Christ, Rom. 6:3-4 and I believe that's water baptism.

(5) "Is there more than one way to enter Christ?"

No.

Absurdities, Contradictions, and Blunders

I'd like to pass these to Mr. Welch, Mr. Gamblin, if you will please sir. I want to suggest to you, and I point these things out not in any way to be mean to Mr. Welch but because I believe that actually he's in this position. I've titled them absurdities, blunders, and contradictions of Mr. Welch. Observe if you will:

(1) He argued that the church being the bride of Christ wears the name of Christ; yet, they refuse to do it. They must identify themselves as "United Pentecostal Church."

(2) His argument is to the effect that the church which does not wear the name of Jesus Christ is not the church of Jesus Christ. Hence, they are not according to Mr. Welch's admission, the church of Christ.

(3) Mr. Welch took a position that authority and name could not mean the same thing because they do not come from the same Greek word. Yet, the words Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not from the same Greek word, so not the same as he has been contending. Observe further.

(4) He argued that we're going to hell for not saying the right thing

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

when baptized but refuses to tell us what to say.

(5) He cited Isa. 63:12 to argue for an everlasting name, and said the name was Jesus yet, that passage told how he obtained that name. It was by destroying the Egyptians in the Red Sea.

(6) He accused me of twisting and dodging in answering his questions. Yet, I gave a specific yes to each and every one of his questions. This explains why he won't answer my questions I suppose. He doesn't want to give a yes or no, he doesn't want to be guilty of twisting and dodging. Now I hope tonight, Mr. Welch, you'll come up here and be guilty of twisting and dodging and give me some definite answers to these questions that I'm asking.

(7) Mr. Welch said that titles could not be used in the baptismal formula, only the name Jesus. I want you to mark this closely. The only time the word title occurs in the New Testament, it occurs in Jno. 19:19-20 and it has reference to Jesus. Now Mr. Welch said titles couldn't be used, only the name Jesus and the only time that the word title occurs is used with reference to Jesus. Not only that but the passage that he cited in an effort to prove the obligation to say a formula included terms that he says are titles: "Lord" and "Christ."

First Affirmative Arguments

I want now to present my first argument: The Bible teaches that every religious act must be performed in the name of Jesus. In Col. 3:17 the book says, "Whatever you do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." So every religious act is to be done in the name of Jesus. The reason is because Jesus is the mediator of the New Testament. He's the One and only lawgiver, Jas. 4:12.

Mt. 28:18-20, Mk. 16:15-16 Lk. 24:46-48

Now I have on the board Mt. 28:18-20, Mk. 16:15-16 Lk. 24:46-48. I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the first four books of the New Testament, "Matthew, Mark, Luke and John" are four men's account of the same thing. I introduce this first of all to show you what it means to

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

do something in the name of Jesus Christ. In Matt. 28 Jesus said, "All authority has been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I've commanded you." Mark's account says, "Go preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." I trust you are aware of this fact, these two accounts are referring to the same thing. These men are talking about the same thing. They're describing it with different language but they're talking about the same thing. It's the same account. In Lk. 24:46-49, the passage says repentance and remission of sins are to be preached in the name of Jesus Christ unto all the world beginning at Jerusalem. I submit to you that the term NAME in Lk. 24 is the equivalent of all authority in Matt. 28. Just like the matter of preaching the gospel is the equivalent of teaching in Matt. 28. So that you have in this commission outlined the fact that ALL authority has been given unto the Lord. Therefore, these things that are to be taught are to be taught in the name of the Lord, Mt. 28.

Observe then. They were to Preach, believe, repent, and be baptized for salvation or the remission of sins. Now let Mr. Welch take these passages up and tell me what the expression all authority and name means, if I've not made proper analysis of them. And so these passages affirm that Jesus has been given all authority. I cited, a moment ago, Eph. 1:21-23, that says he has been given to be "head over all things to the church". Eph. 5:24, "The church is subject to Christ in everything." Now watch it. The Bible teaches that Christ possesses all authority. He's the one and only lawgiver. He's been given to be head over all things that pertain to the church. We are instructed to be in subjection to him in all things. Jesus is the one who has the authority to direct us in every religious act. Note if you will. When it comes to the matter of what I'm to preach and what men are to obey in order to be saved, it must be that which Jesus Christ has directed me to do. When it comes to the matter

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

of how men are to worship, we are to worship in the name of Jesus, in the way that Jesus directs. When it comes to the organization and work of the church, these are to be done in the name of Jesus, as Jesus directs. I believe that every religious act must be done in the name of Jesus. Now watch it if you will. In the second place, baptism is a religious act, therefore, it must be done in the name of Jesus. Acts 2:38, Acts 8:16, Acts 10:48, Acts 19:5.

Now I suggest to you the chart I have over here on my right, and I would like for Mr. Welch to pay attention to it. I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that baptism in the name of Jesus is simply by his authority. Every religious act is to be in the name of Jesus. Now note if you will. Baptism in the name of Jesus is the baptism of Jesus and is the baptism authorized by Jesus. Now let Mr. Welch deny it. Will you deny that Mr. Welch? When you come up here, pay attention to the chart and tell us. I submit to you that baptism in the name of Jesus is simply the baptism that's authorized by Jesus, The general scope of the New Testament affirms this. Every religious act must be in the name of Jesus. Obviously then, since baptism is a religious act, it must be in the name of Jesus. But what does the expression baptism in name of Jesus mean?

"Baptism In The Name Of Jesus"

Note if you will. I have also on my chart, baptism in the name of Jesus. I introduced this last night to suggest to you what it means to be baptized in the name of Jesus and I introduce it again. In Acts 2:38, these references are coming from J. Henry Thayer, I mentioned to you last night that Mr. Thayer is a man who to the Greek language is the equivalent of Webster to the English language. Now I don't know much about the Greek language, and I don't think Mr. Welch does either, but I believe Mr. Thayer does. And on the passage under consideration, here's what he says about it: "The expression in the name of Jesus is an expression that means upon the name, relying upon the name, that is the authority." Page 232, In Acts 10:48 he says: "It's by the name, by one's

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

command and authority," Page 447. This is the passage that he's referring to. In Acts 8:16 and Acts 19:5 it says, "into the name," That means to profess the name of one whose followers we become. So I submit to you that baptism in the name of Jesus is the equivalent of saying baptism that has been authorized by Jesus. I want now to introduce an inspired writer for the purpose of confirming this passage. All right now, the purpose of this is to illustrate what it means to be baptized in the name of Jesus. Like I say, I hope Mr. Welch comes up here and takes up these arguments so that we can discuss them yet further. I'd like for him to contest them.

A Contrast

In Acts 19 you have a contrast. Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is, in basic science of interpretation, what is known as a law of contrast, or the law of opposition, where certain things are being contrasted. In Acts 19 you have the baptism of John and the baptism of Jesus being contrasted. Many times in the contrast, things that are contrasted may be stated and they may be implied. Now I don't think Mr. Welch will deny that. Let's see if he will. In Acts 19 John's baptism is stated. He said, "into what then were you baptized?" They said, "John's baptism." And I want you to note that language, "Into what then were you baptized?" There was implied in that statement, by the way of contrast, Jesus' baptism. Observe further if you will. There was stated that whenever they learned the truth they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. There was implied, by way of contrast, that when these folks were baptized into John's baptism they were baptized in the baptism of John. Now that's why Paul said, "Into what then were you baptized?" Mr. Welch, take this up and consider it. Into the name of John means according to the baptism authorized by John and into the name of Jesus means according to the baptism authorized by Jesus. And here you have, by an inspired writer, what the expression in the name means.

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

Matthew 28.18-19.

I want briefly to call your attention to Mt. 28.18-19. I do not believe that a formula must be said. I do not believe that anything has to be said and any effort to put me in that light is out of order. This passage affirms that all authority has been given to Christ and that he authorizes baptism to be administered into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But what does the passage teach? Note if you will. Here the name stands for everything the name covers, (J. Henry Thayer, page 447.) Secondly, it's used with the names of persons, Liddel and Scott's Greek Lexicon, page 409. The baptism authorized by Jesus then puts one into the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That is, into a relationship with them that they did not before possess. Simply put, when one is baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he sustains a relationship with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit that he did not sustain before baptism.

What Baptism Requires

I want now to consider what baptism in the name of Jesus requires. Baptism in the Name of Jesus requires certain things. Now how do I know whether a thing is required or not? I know it's required when I can turn to the New Testament and find that it's required. Baptism in the name of Jesus, the baptism that the Lord has authorized, requires a proper SUBJECT. The reason why I know this is because the Lord has told us so. For instance, in Mt. 28:19 the Bible teaches that one must be taught. Therefore, I know that you cannot baptize the untaught. Secondly, the Bible specifies that one must be a believer, in Mk. 16:15-16. "Preach the Gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Not only that, but the Bible teaches that we must have repented, Acts 2:38. In other words I'm simply showing you what baptism does require. It requires a proper subject; one who has confessed that he believes that Jesus Christ is God's Son, Acts 8:36-37. And so it requires a penitent believer and I've defined one. Secondly, it requires a proper ELEMENT. By requires I mean that it's essential. These things are bound. They are necessary. In Mt. 28:18-20 man is to administer it, and

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

man can administer only water baptism. That's why in Acts 10:47 the record says, "Can any man forbid water?" So the Lord has specified the element. The Lord has also specified the MODE or the action involved. In other words the New Testament requires that whenever one is scripturally baptized he must be immersed. For instance, in Rom. 6:3-4 the Bible says we are buried with him in baptism. In Col. 2:12, the Bible also affirms that we are buried with him in baptism. The point is simply this: that the New Testament makes these things a requirement. They are necessary. The reason why they are necessary is because the New Testament says that they are necessary. Not only that, but baptism in the name of Jesus requires a proper DESIGN. By design I mean purpose. There must be a proper purpose for baptism. The New Testament teaches water baptism is in order to obtain the remission of sins, it's for the purpose of salvation. It is very significant, ladies and gentlemen, that every time in the New Testament where you have baptism and salvation in the same passage, it's always baptism first and salvation afterward. In Acts 2:38 for instance, the Bible affirms, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Mk. 16:16, "Preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." First Peter 3:21, "The like figure whereunto baptism doeth also now save us." Acts 22:16 "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Rom. 6:3 affirms that one is baptized into Christ. You can search the New Testament until your back is bent with the burden of years and you'd never find, except in two places, how one gets into Christ. That's Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27. And so one must be baptized in order to get into Christ. But the Bible teaches in 2Tim. 2:10 that salvation is in Christ. Therefore, one must be baptized in order to be saved. I submit to you then, that these arguments are advanced for the purpose of suggesting to you what baptism in the name of Jesus requires.

Now, how did we find water baptism in the name of Jesus requires one

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

who's been taught? We turned to the Book. Jesus said, "Teach them and then baptize them." I want you to see this now. How did we find out that one had to be a believer? We turned to the New Testament. Jesus said, "believe and be baptized." How did we find that he had to repent? We turned to the Book which said, "Repent and be baptized." How do we know that it requires confession? (Acts 8:36-37 and Rom. 10:9-10). The thing I want you to see is this. To determine a thing is absolutely required you turn to the Book and you find it and read it. How do you know that it involves a proper element? Because we turned to the Book and found it. The Lord bound these things. These were matters that were bound! And the reason why they were bound is because the Lord bound them. Why do we believe it must be immersion? Because the Lord bound it. For instance, if someone should call upon my worthy opponent to establish the proof that water baptism is essential to salvation, he would turn to a passage where the Bible describes the design of water baptism.

If someone wanted to know about the mode he'd turn and say, "right here it states it must be a burial." and he'd be correct. That's the thing I've been trying to get him to do in regard to the matter of what one must say when he baptizes a person. That's why I called upon him and continue to call upon him for the passage that tells US what to say, not what to do.

What Baptism Does Not Require

There are some things that baptism in the name of Jesus does not require. By does not require I mean that it's simply a matter of liberty, it is a privilege.

In the first place, baptism in the name of Jesus does not require a particular PLACE. This is a thing that has been loosed, that's incidental. Whether or not one's in a baptistery, in a pond, or in the river makes no difference. The Lord has loosed in this matter. Any place where there is enough water to immerse.

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

In the second place, the Lord has loosed the TEMPRATURE of the water. This is a matter that's incidental, whether it's warm, whether it's hot, whether it's cool, or whether it's cold. Expediency will dictate along this line. The Lord hasn't specified. He hasn't specified the place, he hasn't specified the temperature of the water, and he hasn't specified a particular administrator. The validity of baptism is not determined by who baptizes you. This is a matter that has been loosed.

In the next place, and this is the point at issue, something in particular to be SAID. This is a matter that has been loosed. This is a matter that is incidental. The Lord has not specified what we are to say. This is a matter of liberty, it's a matter that's incidental.

Second Timothy 4:2

Now then, I want to cite 2Tim. 4:2. My proposition says that I have the right to use scriptural statements, and that I may use in them statements with the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In 2 Tim. 4:2 Paul said, "Be urgent in season, out of season" If I understand the passage, and I think I do, that simply means to take advantage of every opportunity that I might have to teach the truth.

I believe that Jesus stated the truth in Mt. 28:18-20. Don't you Mr. Welch! I want to know. Can you think of any time that it would be inappropriate for me to read a passage of Scripture! Jesus said in Matt. 28:18-20, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit." I think that it's scripturally right for me to refer to that statement at ANY time.

In conclusion:

(1) I submit to you that the Scriptures teach that baptism is in the name of Jesus. Now, any effort on the part of Mr. Welch to argue this point is not germane. I believe that with all of my heart.

Thursday - Moore's First Affirmative

(2) These Scriptures do not tell us what we are to say when we baptize someone. If they do, Mr. Welch, come over here to the board, will you please come over here to the board, will you please sir. I want to give him a little box on the board and there's a piece of chalk under here and that box is for you to put the passage in that tells us what to say. Will you do it for me? When you come to the stand will you take the piece of chalk, go over to the little box, and put the passage of Scripture that tells us what to say! We'll be waiting to see if he'll do that. Observe further.

(3) I've, called your attention to the fact that Scriptural truths may be stated, and that Scriptural baptism does not depend on what the administrator says. I have shown that the expression in the name of Jesus does not mean that you have to say a formula. Will you come up here and take these matters up that we've considered before you in regard to the name! I've suggested to you that baptism in the name of Jesus is baptism that's authorized by Jesus, Let him take these matters up and consider them. The expression in the name of Jesus does not mean that you have to say a formula. Let him prove it. The expression in the name of Jesus means as he directs. As the Lord directs.

That's why I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that everything that we do, every religious act that we perform must be in the name of Jesus: But that doesn't mean that we have to say a ceremony before we do it. It simply means as the Lord directs. That Jesus has all authority in all things hence has the right to direct concerning baptism. That baptism in the name of Jesus is the baptism according to the Lord's direction. I invite you to hear Mr. Welch in response to these arguments.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Three-B

Mr. Moderators, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Moore. It is indeed with happiness in my heart that I come back tonight to participate in this Bible discussion, and to be with you and enjoy your presence; and I believe, your good will. We'd like to say to the radio audience that we appreciate this chance to talk to you. And I want to say that if I refer to any historical remarks that bring in any religion, I have nothing against you, it's only in pursuit of truth that I make these remarks. I want to say again that I appreciate being here with Brother Gamblin, my old time friend of many years, and the fine church that he's the pastor of here, my brethren, and then Mr. Moore and his people. I've had so many debates with them (chuckling). I and Mr. Guy Nichols had so many he said we could keep time for each other. I do appreciate the chance of being here tonight. There's no ill feeling on my part whatsoever, and I want to assure you of that.

Is Baptism in Jesus Name Or Trinity?

Now, the discussion continues tonight, actually involves the Godhead question until the end of tonight. And this baptismal subject is actually coming down tonight to the essence of what the difference is between what I teach and what Mr. Moore teaches about water baptism. That is, whether it's done in the name of one divine person, whose name is Jesus, or done in the recognition of the trinity. I said Mr. Moore's a Trinitarian; I'm going to say that still. He is. I don't say that through any ill feeling, but he is a Trinitarian. The questions that I asked him, I asked to get him out on actually what he believes, and I did. He can get up here and tell you he believes in baptism in Jesus' name all he wants to, but I know better. He's put his argument up here tonight. I know better than that and I'm going to keep pressing him that way.

Discussion Of Questions To Moore

I want to note the questions first that I asked him.

(1) When one is baptized in water using the words in the name of the Baptismal Formula Debate

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; does he recognize the three persons of God as you teach?

He finally said, “No”, but before he got through arguing he said, “Yes”. It’s on the tape, if you don’t believe it, play it back. I listened to him, because I knew what Mr. Moore believes and I know what the trinity doctrine is. Now the reason I put that question like I did, the next one, number two, is, I knew Mr. Moore had to come out and say no on this one. I knew he would do it.

(2) Can one be scripturally baptized in the, name of the Lord Jesus Christ and believe there is only one person in the Godhead.

He said, “No”. In other words, Mr. Moore believes, whether he admits it or not, whether he will take his stand for it or not, he believes actually in a trinity formula on baptism. That’s right. And he’s going to say that again and again in so many words. In the name of Jesus the highest name of deity? He said, “well, yes and no.” And he went to the chart, one of his charts here, what chart did you refer to about that, Mr. Moore? (Mr. Moore from seat. ‘On name”) Yes, that’s right, on name. And he said, “No, it was not the highest name.” Of course I’m not saying anything against the debate last night because it was all right, but we found that last evening Mr. Moore actually didn’t in so many words say it, but he made mention of someone named Jesus in Latin America. Well, there is a Roman in my church named Lord, but she’s not the Lord I’m talking about here tonight. And I wouldn’t care if 15,000 people were named Jesus that would make no difference about the name the Bible speaks about. We find in his name here, authority, (Jeremiah 22) a person or thing, he speaks about that. The reason I said that, that this particular name was the highest name given and we find the Scripture he quoted awhile ago in Eph. the 1st chapter, he used it in his argument, that when he was set, put him up above all names, every name that is named. Now Philipians 2:8, 9, and 10 tells us what the name is, and here’s what it says, Paul of course speaking of Jesus Christ, “God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in earth, and things

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

under the earth, and in heaven.” That’s right and in hell, too. Now he comes up again to make some arguments about the Israelites coming out of Egypt, about the name, an everlasting name. And actually God, who led them out, was Christ. The Bible said that that rock which followed them was Christ. That’s right. It was he under another name, as far as I said the other night, God had many names, but looking forward to this everlasting name. Now I want to notice his chart here on water baptism in the name of Jesus. Every place that anybody was baptized, it was done in the name of one divine person whose name is Jesus. Now Mr. Moore can argue until he drops dead, and I hope he doesn’t because I’d like to baptize him right before he does. That’s right. But if he did that, he could never prove anywhere, that any place, and he might try it night after night, where there was any instance of water baptism where anybody was ever baptized into anybody or anything but one divine person whose name was Jesus.

Now let me go over this one over here. Definitions: Father, God, Father, Rule, Webster, the formula, like I said last night, his scriptural name is Jesus.

Woman Takes Husband’s Name

Now he admitted in this debate that Jesus was the name of the everlasting Father. He did that, he admitted that. Then if Jesus is the name, it’s the highest name, and he’s the husband of the church, as I argued last night, and the church is his wife. And every woman takes, not the name of him because he’s a man and not the name man, not the name husband, and not the name Son, because he could be the son of some woman and would be, but she takes his name, whatever that name is and she does it at the time she becomes his wife.

Use Of Name In Baptism Vs. Church Name

Now he gets up here and talks about all the ways I cross myself up. He argues the church, being the bride of Christ, must wear the name of Christ, yet he refuses to do it. Well, if I were you, if anybody asked me

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

what name my church has I’d give him that ----- don’t have to say anything about name. I Give him that sound and sigh. That is what you’re arguing about, baptism exactly! You don’t have to say a thing about a name when you’re baptized, so why say a thing about a name about your church? That’s not hard to see is it? All right, now. And then he talks about United Pentecostal Church, about the name. I told him last night that because there was a sign out, hen-house, that was no proof there was any eggs there. Just because you call yourself Church of Christ, that’s no proof you’re the church of Christ. No sir. And furthermore, I’ll say this to you, Mr. Moore. Will you affirm that the church is only called one name or one thing? No, sir. He shakes his head, he sure won’t. No sirree, he gets up here and tries to make a play about the name because our brethren are known in the coalition of work as United Pentecostal Church, but we have no certain name for our local congregational church, our local church here. All of our churches are not called locally United Pentecostal Churches. And that is for your information. You thought the manual said to do that, but it doesn’t. Now let me go up to some of the charts.

Thayer’s Chart (The Word “In”)

Let me get on to Thayer’s chart here tonight. I’m not going to criticize Thayer, I didn’t say that last night. I said I had a Greek and Hebrew book laying on that table there, telling what these Greek words mean here. That’s right. And it does. I have the words written down here. This one up here, the meaning of it is into. The meaning of this one is on, upon, and on. Acts 2:38. Name listed here in Acts 8:12 and Acts 19:1-6, and in the 10th chapter here, in emphasis upon the authority, and I want to show you something in the 5th chapter of the book of Acts. I want you to notice this word in and how it works here. “And laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison. The same Greek word there, the word “in”. They were in the prison. They were not outside it, they were in it. Another one “an angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth, and said, Go and stand and speak in the

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

temple.” That wasn’t just some authority about the temple, but in the temple. Now down in the 22nd verse of Acts the same Greek word, “And when the officers came and found them not in the prison.” That’s right. That’s exactly what it means there. They were not in the prison. That meant they were out of it. Now when Peter said, “Be baptized in the name of the Lord”, he meant that they get into the name of the Lord when they were baptized. That’s exactly what he meant. And Proverbs 18:10 said, “The name of the Lord is a strong tower”. And if that word means in, then they were into it when they were baptized in the name of the Lord. But of course it isn’t hard to find out what the name of the Lord is. We turn to Acts 9th chapter, and we find the conversion of Paul. And this is an acknowledgement by the Lord himself as to what his name is. And Solomon, Proverbs 18:10 said, “The name of the Lord is a strong tower and the righteous runneth into it, and is safe.” And when Saul was knocked down, and the Lord spoke to him in the Hebrew tongue and said, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? He said, “Lord, who art thou?” And the Lord said, “I am Jesus.” That’s his name. He said that himself. That is his name. Then if the name of the lord is a strong tower, they were baptized into the name of the Lord. And they became a part of this church that I and my brethren belong to, that is the wife of the everlasting Father, and his wife has got his name. Now Revelation the last chapter while I’m on this name. Revelation the 22nd chapter and the 16th verse, “I, Jesus have sent mine angels to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and offspring of David, the bright and morning star.” Over here in the 6th verse, the same chapter, he tells that he’s the God of the prophets in the Old Testament. “And he said unto me, these sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angels to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done.” That tells who he is. They were baptized into his name.

The Contrast Of Acts 19

Now let’s look with him on these charts. I don’t think Mr. Moore can ever put anything up that I wouldn’t deal with. I might not reach everything; he

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

might not either. Now he tried to make a comparison here. The baptism of John the Baptist and Paul here about trying to argue around the name of Jesus. Let’s find out what happened here. Paul said unto them, “Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized...” not into the trinity by the authority of Jesus Christ, but “When they heard this, they we’re baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” In every place it’s that way. He’s got to find yet one single place that even favors a trinity dogma baptism in any of those men’s days of baptizing.

First Corinthians 1:12

Paul writes to the Corinthian church in Chapter one and emphasizes more about how he baptized. It said in the 1st chapter of Corinthians and verse 12, “Now this I say that every one of you saith I am of Paul; I of Apollos; I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?” That shows how Paul baptized. Furthermore, he writes back and says that there is only one baptism. There’s only one, and he baptized these people in the name of one divine person whose name is Jesus. That’s right. And Mr. Moore can be living long enough to make Methuselah look like a school boy and never, never, never begin to find anything that favors where they ever baptized in a trinity formula.

Authority: Luke 24:46-49 And Matthew 28:18

Luke 24:46-49, talks about authority. Jesus said in Matthew 28:18, “All authority is mine.” Well of course it’s his because he is God. He’s the everlasting Father. He was glorified with eternal God. He said he would be, and consequently everything must come from him. All authority, all power, everything. And as far as God is concerned it’s now his because he is God and he told them, “Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father.” What is the Father’s name? Proverbs 18:10, “The

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

Lord, the name of the Lord is a strong tower.” Proverbs 30:4, “What is his name, and what is his Son’s name, if thou canst tell?” Well of course Mr. Moore will agree with Matthew 1:21 that the name of the Son is Jesus. And he’s already conceded in this discussion that the name of the everlasting Father is Jesus. And if the name of the everlasting Father is Jesus, and the name of the Son is Jesus, as I proved last evening in Col. 1:25 and 26 and then 1John 4:13, that it was Christ in you, He’s omnipresent when his spirit comes in and in 1John 4:13 he said, “Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.” Therefore, the Holy Ghost is the Spirit Jesus and the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost he’s talking about is Jesus.

Would Become A Catholic

Now this man won’t accept that and he wouldn’t baptize me if I did. Now, I’m going to say it again tonight to Mr. Moore. If I were him and could not accept the plain Biblical facts on baptism as the apostles taught and carried out after Christ told them to baptize, and if I were going to contend for that trinity formula, I still say I’d join the Roman Catholic Church. I’d do it. As sure as my name’s Welch, I’d do it.

Baptismal Formulas

Now in Luke 24:47 he said, “that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among ALL NATIONS, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM.” That’s where this church that I belong to was set up. Now last night I made some statements about formula. It’s on the tape last night. Of course I know a man, I don’t just accuse Mr. Moore of this, sometimes a man will not catch everything you say. Sometimes he might misrepresent something you say. And I don’t think he’d do that intentionally, I’m not accusing him of that. But last night he made mention of formulas and said that all formulas started this side of the original church. Well I had already read from this one. I’ll read it again, the New International Bible encyclopedia, pages 395 and 396. The formula for baptism for Christian baptism or mode was commanded as given in

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

Matthew 28:19, “I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” But it is curious that these words are not given in any description of Christian baptism at the time. They are not repeated exactly but in slightly extended form. In every account of the performance of the rite in apostolic times a much shorter formula is in use. The 3000 believers were baptized on the day of Pentecost in the name of Jesus Christ. The same formula was used in the baptism of Cornelius, those who were with him. And it appeared to have been the usual one from Paul’s questions in Corinthians when Paul asked them, “Were you baptized in the name of Paul?” That’s right.

Catholic Encyclopedia And Trinity Doctrine

And if you want to find out where these three persons of God started, I won’t have to drag out histories and encyclopedias. You go down here in your own city of Orange, Texas to your nice library. There’s a Catholic Encyclopedia in that library that’s 12 or 15 pages giving you the history of the trinity doctrine. And it’s the first doctrine, and I don’t say this to criticize Catholics. I love them just as well as the Baptist, Methodist, or anybody else. But facts are facts. And it’s the first doctrine in the catechism and it had its birthday beginning, according to all authentic history 325 years this side of Christ in their first council. The Council of Nicea.

Commission Of Matthew 28:19

Now examples, Mr. Moore says of carrying out the commission in Matthew 28:19. I don’t see how he could possibly present me there, with no more than he has to go on, and face these hard cold Bible facts. After Christ told these apostles to go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. They started out and on the day of Pentecost when these 3000 Jews were baptized, we find the trinity was not around. There’s NOT an inkling of it anywhere. These apostles, if they knew anything about it, kept as silent as an oyster. There on that day, when these men were carrying out the commission and the command of Jesus Christ to baptize like he told

Baptismal Formula Debate

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

them, they knew what the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was. They knew who God was, and they baptized these converts in that great worthy name which is Jesus, and they were baptized that way in Acts 2:38. They inquired and said, “Men and brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said to them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” That’s the examples Mr. Moore.

Acts 8: Conversion Of The Samaritans

The next one is in the 8th chapter of Acts. This is the Samaritans, how they were baptized. Carrying out the commission of Jesus Christ by the men that he called to act. Philip went down to Samaria and the Bible said, “He preached Christ”. If there was any trinity in that day he didn’t know anything about it because he preached Christ. “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” Now that particular verse doesn’t tell you how they were baptized. But the 16th verse does. “Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (For as yet he had fallen on none of them, only they were baptized....”

Point Of Order

(Mr. Moore’s moderator standing: “Mr. Gamlin, I’d like to rise on a point of order for just a moment. We’d like to have the answers to the questions.”)

Answer To Questions

Yes sir, thank you sir. Hold my place there in the 8th chapter of Acts. Thank you mister.

1) “Do you believe that the baptism in the name of Jesus is the baptism authorized by Jesus?”

I believe to baptize, Mr. Moore, the only way you could baptize

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

anyone, is the baptism authorized by Jesus, is baptize them and use the name Jesus when you baptize them.

2) Would it be scriptural for the administrator to state the following when he baptized someone? “In the name of Jesus I baptize you into the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost?”

No, I wouldn’t do that. What would be the use of it, to acknowledge the Trinitarian formula, when you’ve got the right one there the first time?

3) When Paul said in Phil. 2:10 that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, did he mean when the name Jesus was mentioned or stated?

It meant, Mr. Moore, that the Bible said that God swore this back yonder in the book of Isaiah. God swore that unto me every knee’s going to bow. There’s coming a time when everybody’s going to bow to this name of Jesus. You’re going to bow to it. That wouldn’t necessarily mean that every time you would just bow your knees all over the place. But this particular scripture and its setting was a time to come when they’d bow their knees to that name.

4) “When we worship in song, must we sing in the name of Jesus?”

If the Bible said sing in the name of Jesus, Mr. Moore, like it did baptism, I’d say yes. But it doesn’t do that. It teaches baptism in a specific name and to sing you sing of course the songs about the name of Jesus. I think all of them ought to have something about that.

(5) Is the following expression, the formula which must be said when one is scripturally baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?

The name is Jesus, Mr. Moore. The name Jesus must be spoken. It must be uttered. That’s what I’ve contended all through this debate, that the name is Jesus. And you must say the name Jesus when you baptize. I’ve contended that all through this debate, and in Acts the 15th chapter and the 17th verse, along there it said, “and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called.” So that’s your questions.

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

You can take them down as you will and so there.

Back To Acts 8

Now, let me get back to the 8th chapter of Acts. “Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: Who when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)” And that’s in, that little Greek word there, the second one we were talking about, that means into. It means in, although that’s why the translators translated ALL these Greek words they translated in in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ because it’s to be baptized into him. The word upon of course in the name Jesus Christ, you call his name upon them when they’re baptized.

Acts 10: Gentile Conversion

Now let’s go on to the 10th chapter of Acts. We find these scriptures here. I want to cover them as fast as I can. In the 10th chapter of Acts, we find that the Gentiles came in and they were baptized in the name of the Lord. That’s the same Greek word that I read awhile ago, that says in when they were in prison, the same thing. And they got into the name of the Lord. Now! The 19th chapter of Acts, verses 1-6, I covered that, They were baptized into or in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. And that’s every place that the apostles directed, that is the records where the apostles baptized. And they baptized the converts. And I want Mr. Moore to find one place, just one (I won’t ask him for 15 or 20. I want to ask him for just One.), if he’ll find one place in the Bible where anybody was baptized by the apostles after the church was set up, where there’s any mention of the trinity formula dogma. I want him to produce that. I found every place where they were baptized into one divine person whose name is Jesus.

Do All In The Name Of Jesus

Now, he comes to this scripture here in Colossians 3:17, “Whatever you
Baptismal Formula Debate

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Well, of course, the baptism is a deed. John said, “I indeed baptize you.” Now to baptize a person in the teaching of God’s Bible, as the Bible teaches on baptism, baptize in the doctrine of baptism, that’s what I’m discussing tonight, the name of somebody. Now, there’s the name to start with, in the name of. They carried it out. That name was the Lord Jesus Christ, and is tonight. In Phi. 2:8,9,10 as I have already used, His name, the highest name that ever could be. And now he comes to other scriptures about baptism in Mt. 28:19, Mark 16:16, the commissions in which you say, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Mark 16:16 where it said, “He that believeth and is baptized.” He that believeth WHAT? Believes what the Bible teaches about baptism. Then in Luke 24:47, the other time he told them, “That repentance and remission of Sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

Husband, Wife Question

And now since Mr. Moore has brought up the husband and wife question, that he writes me about. He wrote that one just last night. Of course, I think some one got the impression Mr. Moore said he wrote it after he got here, but I think he wrote it before he got here. But he introduced the thought of husband and wife. Now, the very fact that Jesus Christ is the husband of the church and in 2Corinthians the 11th chapter and verses 2 and 3 Paul said, “I’ve espoused you”, talking to the Corinthian church, “to one husband.” I’ve contended all through this discussion, and will, that there’s one wife and one husband. That husband has that wife’s name. Is that right or wrong? That’s wrong. That she has that husband’s name. Is that right or wrong? That’s right. Every woman that ever married a man takes his name. And we are people who are not ashamed of his name, although we know what it is and we know who HE is, we know who our Father is, we know who the husband is. And any church or woman that claims to be his wife and did not recognize him as the Father of her children could never be identified as

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

being his wife. Now then, Paul said, “I espouse you unto one husband, that I may present you a chaste virgin to Christ.” Isaiah 54:5 said, “Thy maker is thy husband.” Rev. 19:7 said, “Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to”, not them but, “to him”. Now the scripture he introduced there in Romans the 6th chapter, and Galatians 3:27. If he didn’t introduce it, I will. It’s the same thing. “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ.” Not into trinity. Did you hear that? “As many of you as have been baptized INTO CHRIST.” Not into trinity. You hear that? The 6th chapter of Romans said, “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we’re buried with” not the trinity but “with him.” But Mr. Moore won’t take that. He’s got to be buried with them. And I’ll say again, if I were him, with all due respect to him, that I’d just join the Catholic Church. Cardinal Gibbons said this, a Catholic Cardinal made this statement, “Every person that had been baptized in the trinity formula was in reality a Catholic because it was the formula brought forth by the Roman Catholic Church, and in it was their mode of inducting into the church and thus by that they were in reality Catholics.” There’s no place found in the Bible for their trinity doctrine. It isn’t found, it’s not true, it isn’t so. It came far this side of the apostolic times, as I’ve shown you and will repeatedly show.

Moore Challenged To Produce Instance Of Trinity Baptism

I’m going to ask Mr. Moore to do this here. When he comes back up here, he’ll have 30 minutes, and then this it’ll be over as far as I’m concerned. That’s all the time he’ll have now. I want him to come back and if he can take any instance of baptism that shows any inkling of anything that appears like a trinity dogma, a trinity formula, I want him to produce it. Now he says this, “You don’t have to say anything.” Well, why do you say anything then? Why don’t you just take him out and give him a silent baptism? Why do you say anything? Why do you want to hold on for the trinity dogma? I know how you people baptize, I’ve been discussing it with you for years. I’ll guarantee you tonight, I’d like to see the hand of every one of you here that belongs to that church, if Mr.

Thursday – Welch’s First Negative

Moore asked you when he gets up, that was baptized and nothing was said when you were baptized. I just want to see how many of you were baptized that way. That’s right. Mr. Moore can detour; try to get around the facts, and he’ll never get around them. He won’t ever live long enough to do it. He will take the position in baptism that nothing has to be said, and then he says, “Oh, you can say something if you want to.” Like the water getting hot or the water getting cold in a creek or a river. Would you tell me that a woman that was going to be married to a man could take his name, but didn’t have to, it’s not necessary. All right.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Four-A

Gentlemen Moderator., ladies and gentlemen both here and the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I’m happy to be back before you to address myself to the speech you’ve just heard.

Comments On Welch’s speech

I want to take up Mr. Welch’s speech in the order in which he delivered it and observe some of the things that were said. I would, however, call your attention to the fact that even though Mr. Welch said much about a trinity formula, the little box on the board is still just as blank as it was. He hasn’t, as of yet, put the passage up there that tells us what to SAY. I wanted the passage, Mr. Welch. You didn’t put it up there, did you? There is a reason for not doing that, because he has addressed himself to a proposition that says FORMULA. Yet, he runs from that, he’ll not tell us what the formula is. Now here’s the point. If it’s not a formula, then he says, now watch it. Mr. Welch says that the name of Jesus MUST be stated. And that’s all he implied. He wouldn’t accept what I had typed out. He said that “I take the position that the name of Jesus must be stated.” Yet, when I ask, if someone said in the name of Jesus I baptize you in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. He said, “no, that wouldn’t do.” The name of Jesus was in it, why wouldn’t it do? The reason why he won’t put a passage up there is because formula means “a prescribed form, a mode, a rule.” It does not vary. It had to be the same every time. And when he puts a passage up there, he’d find himself crossed on the other passages. And as I suggested and will show you in the speech, there is no uniformity. And that’s why he didn’t put a passage up there.

The Godhead

He said then that it involves the Godhead question. And I suggested to you last night of the absurdities and the ridiculous position that Mr. Welch took on the Godhead the first two nights. I’ve called this to your attention numerous times; it was done that he might be able to take a man out into the water and say a little ceremony over him. That’s precisely why he

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

takes the position that he does on the Godhead. In reality he’s right. He has to take the position he does on the Godhead.

Welch’s Questions

(1) He says that I can say that I believe that baptism is in the name of Jesus, but that he knows better. Let me look at his question in regard to whether or not a formula has to be said, and whether or not baptism is in the name of Jesus. He says that I say that I believe that, but he knows better. Well now, Mr. Welch, how did you find out? You didn’t find out by what I said did you? Now watch it. I’ve repeatedly said that I do not believe that a formula of any kind MUST be said. I have repeatedly said I do believe that baptism is in the name of Jesus. Now Mr. Welch said, “I know he did that, but I know that he doesn’t believe it.” How did you find out? How’d you find out? You didn’t find out by what I said, did you? Are you capable of looking into my mind, judging my motives. He tells me what I don’t believe. I wonder where he found out. He said I crossed myself. I deny that I did. Produce the time that I crossed myself in answer to question number one. He asked me the question and here’s what I said. “Not for that purpose, no.” That’s what I said.

(2) “Could one be scripturally baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and believe there’s only one person in the Godhead?” I told him, “No.” And then I asked him a question. Mr. Welch, did you forget the one I asked you on that? Did you forget that, Mr. Welch? He has a good forgetter on these questions that I ask him, doesn’t he? I asked him the question: “Can one be scripturally baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and believe there’s three persons in the one Godhead?” You see he didn’t answer the question did he? All right.

(3) “Is the name of Jesus the highest name of deity?” And he implied that I said no. Now Mr. Welch, I said no such thing. I took time out to explain to this audience that the word name was a term that could be used in an ambiguous sense. I went over here and I asked you how you were using the word “name”. And I pointed out that the Bible affirms that Jesus has all authority, is given to be head over all things to the church. I didn’t say

Thursday – Moore's Second Affirmative

what you said I said. It's an easy thing for you to build up a straw-man; and that's what he's done for two nights. He builds up a straw-man; that straw-man is the idea of a trinity formula. I've repudiated it time and time again. I do not believe it. But he can fight that a lot easier than he can the position that I am advancing. So, he talks about the trinity formula. Then he referred to my chart on name, and yet, he just referred to it, he just pointed to it. I want to know. Do you accept this as a fact, Mr. Welch? Do you accept this, on the chart, as a fact? I stated the truth that the word "name" sometimes means reputation, sometimes means character, sometimes means authority and sometimes means a designation? There's more to answering a chart than looking at it, isn't there.

Ephesians 1:19-20: Rule, Power, Authority, Dominion And Name

I have called your attention to this fact in Eph. 1, I know that this is at least four times. I'll do it once again, and as he said before, this is the last time that I'll have an opportunity to do it. And I would appreciate your saying something about it, Mr. Welch. I have suggested to you repeatedly that in Ephesians the first chapter there are at least five words that are used to mean the same thing. Now listen to them. Observe if you will. Paul writes, "For above all rule, authority, power, dominion, and name not only that's named in this world, but in that which is to come." I called your attention to the fact that all these words are used substantially to carry the same idea. Now that's the argument that I've advanced on it and he hasn't touched top, side, nor bottom of it.

Philippians 2:5-10: Every Knee Should Bow

Then he cites Phil. 2:5-10, and I asked him a question on that. And you didn't answer that question, Mr. Welch. You didn't answer that question. And the reason why he didn't answer that question is because of the trouble he'd get into with the definition of name. My question was this, when Paul said in Phil. 2:8-10, "in the name of Jesus every knee should bow" did he mean that the name of Jesus was mentioned or stated?" Now he said it meant that all would bow. You didn't answer the question,

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Mr. Welch, and nobody knows that better than you. You see his implication is this, that the expression “name” means that something must be stated. Now this passage says that in the name of Jesus and I want to know; is it when the name is mentioned or stated? And he just says that that passage says that every knee will bow. That isn’t what I asked. You know that isn’t what I asked you, Mr. Welch, don’t you? Now how is the word name used in Phil. 2? Is it used in the sense of a person, place, or thing; as a designation? ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to your reason, think for a moment. Paul said in Phil. 2, “That in the name of Jesus.” How is he using the term? Don’t you see how that he’s using the term? He’s not using it as the mere mention of the word J-E-S-U-S as mentioned or stated. That’s what Mr. Welch is contending in water baptism. That’s why I’ve tried to get you to see how the word name is used. He implied in his speech about the name or the church, that I thought that the name never did mean that you said something and you know better. I trust that you were able to look up here and see that I have one of the definitions of names here on the chart. You’re able to see this. Mr. Welch, I have one of the definitions on my chart to deny what you were saying. It was behind your back all the time you were talking.

Isaiah 63:2”Everlasting Name”

Then he cited Isa. 63:2 where I called attention to the fact that last night he introduced this passage, talking about the everlasting name. Then he says that that was Christ back there. I know that in 1Cor. 10 the writer talks about the preexistence of Christ. Mr. Welch take this down please. Deal with what I’ve said. I will not have another chance to say anything. You’ve ignored my speech, now take this down and deal with it, will you? Come on now, deal with the argument. In Phil. 2, you cited this last night along with Isa. 63, and affirmed that the name was everlasting because he submitted himself to die in the flesh. That was the thing that I challenged you on. Now he cited these two passages together last night, you see. He cited Isa. 63 and he cited Phil. 2 together and he took the position that because Jesus came in the flesh and died, he had an

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

everlasting name. I showed you that Isa. 63 said that the everlasting name there was the result of his destroying the Egyptians in the Red sea. That’s what I said, and you haven’t dealt with it yet. Now come to the platform and deal with it. Will you? You underestimate this audience, Mr. Welch.

What Is A Scriptural Baptism?

He said he would “Like to baptize me right.” He hasn’t yet told us what it takes to make it right. All it is, he says, is the name mentioned, and he told me or asked me last night if something was said. And he implied or he assumed it was said. And what he assumed that was said, included what he said needed to be said, so how do you know that I haven’t been baptized right? He said, “Can’t find where baptized into anyone but Christ.” I haven’t looked for such. I don’t believe anything to the contrary. That’s not the issue.

Moore’s Definition Chart

And then he looked at my definition chart. I want you to make a note, ladies and gentlemen. He talks about the word TITLE, and what did he say about John 19? Now, Mr. Welch, that’s a very important point, and I wanted you to take it up so I’d have a chance to reply to anything YOU said. You folks know that these fellows do that. They talk about, “Now you have to use a name but you can’t use a title.” And that’s why I put these definitions up here. The “name”, according to Webster, is the title by which any person or thing is designated. And TITLE is a descriptive name, and appellation. Now he said, “You can’t use titles.” You can’t use titles, but you can use names. And yet Webster says a name is a title. And look over here on the board. He cites these passages in Acts 2, Acts 8, and Acts 10. Ladies and Gentlemen I appeal to your reason, look at it now. Mr. Welch says that you can’t use titles. He says that these passages are teaching what he’s affirming; And what he’s affirming is that something MUST be said.; And yet they use the term Lord and Christ, and he says they’re titles. How could a man be any MORE crossed up than that?

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

The Church Name

And then about the church and name. “If someone asked for the name, why say Anything?” And I’ve already mentioned that, but I never have taken the position that the word “name” does not sometimes mean person, place, or thing. I had it on the chart all the time. Then he said, and of course these things are actually not involved in this proposition; he brings them up; he talks about a hen-house and because there’s a sign out in front that says hen-house that doesn’t mean that there’s eggs in there, implying that because we have the sign church of o Christ that doesn’t mean that we are the church of Christ. I grant that. I know that the shingle on the front of the building doesn’t make people the church of Christ. But now watch the logic if you please. WOULD YOU LOOK IN A SNAKE PIT FOR HEN EGGS? Would you Mr. Welch? In other words, if you came up on a building that said Snake Pit, you wouldn’t look for hen eggs in there would you? Because you’d figure that the man that put the sign up knew that you wouldn’t find any in there. Now, he gets up here, and I wasn’t able to tell what he was talking about, when he got to talking about the name of the United Pentecostal Church. Now I know this much, you said you endorsed the manual, and I’m reading on page 83 and here’s what it says. “Identification. Each church that is either affiliated with United Pentecostal Church, or is pastored by a minister who holds a license or credentials with the United Pentecostal Church, shall identify by sign or otherwise on the outside of its church building that it’s associated with the United Pentecostal Church.” Now that’s what your manual says, that’s what I was going by.

Welch On Thayer

“Then,” he said, “Let me get on Thayer.” He wants to get on Thayer. Now, Mr. Welch, did you miss my argument that completely? Ladies and gentlemen my argument wasn’t on these prepositions. Now, Mr. Welch, I was talking about N-A-M-E wasn’t I? You didn’t know that I was talking about name? You didn’t know that’s what Thayer was talking about? You think Thayer was describing these words in? Was that what you thought I

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

was talking about? Observe if you will. This little preposition in is in a prepositional phrase that relates to the word name, and that’s what Thayer was talking about. And he comes over here and he takes up the preposition and ignores Thayer’s definition, after going to the prepositional phrase, and the word name. And he’s going to take up Thayer! Now, you folks can deny this. It doesn’t make any difference you know. You can go ahead and deny it, but here’s exactly what this says about the expression in the name. He says that it means, “upon the name, relying upon the name, the authority.” He says in this passage that it means; “in or by the name or one’s command and authority.” He says that it means, “in or into the name to profess the name of one whose followers we become.” Now that’s what Thayer says the expression in the name of is. Mr. Welch comes up here and very carelessly takes Young’s Analytical Concordance and he looks in there, a preposition in, and finds out some place where that preposition is used. Was it used with respect of name? Was it a prepositional phrase where the expression name occurred? That’s my argument. Of all things! And he’s going to take a look at Thayer. And he got a laugh about it. Like I say, throughout the debate, Mr. Welch has appealed to doubletalk and the matter of laughter. And that’s not answering an argument.

The Lord’s Names

Then he talks about the Lord’s name, a strong tower. And, of course, he makes no argument on the passage, whatsoever. Then in Acts 9, Prov. 18:10 that the Lord is Jesus. Well, I have never denied that, Mr. Welch. But you know, I tried last night to get you to come up and deal with this. Now you see, he’s making you think that I deny that Jesus is Lord. I’ve never denied that. I believe that, but I want you to look. The Bible teaches that Jesus has a number of names. He hasn’t yet looked at this chart, he hasn’t dealt with it. Now, he may do it when I have no chance to reply. But I want you to observe that these passages all are talking about the names of the Son of God. And like I say, he could have referred to it last night. He had an opportunity and he didn’t do it. He had an

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

opportunity tonight and he didn’t. Observe if you will. The reference in Isa. 9:6 says that his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, the everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Lk. 2:21, “his name was called Jesus.” Mt. 1:23, “call his name Emanuel.” Rev. 19:13-16, “his name shall be called Word of God; King of kings, and Lord of Lords.” Heb. 1:4-5, “a more excellent name, my Son.” All of these are said to be the name of the Son of God. I want to get this into the discussion, and so I want to present it at this time, that Mr. Welch might have an opportunity to deal with it, if he wishes. That is in regard to this matter of title and name.

Title And Name

Now I want you folks to look at this. You hear a lot about titles and names; and I call your attention to the fact that the definition of these words does not bear out what you’ve been taught. In Isa. 42:8 the record says, “I am the Lord: that is my name.” Welch says that Lord is a title. That passage says that it’s a name. In Isa. 47:4, “As for our redeemer, the Lord of hosts is his name,” Mr. Welch says that it isn’t. In Isa. 9:6, we have it on the board and I’ve called your attention to it. Heb. 1:4-5, “He hath by inheritance a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son.” Now observe in connection with this. Jno. 19:19, “And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH, KING OF THE JEWS.” Now I want you to look. I recognize that a title is a name and a name is a title. Mr. Welch doesn’t and I want you to see that the Bible teaches that Lord is a name, that Father is a name, that Son is a name, and that Jesus is a title. Mr. Welch turns them around, just turns them around. All right.

Revelation 22:16 and Revelation 22:6, “I Jesus.”

Mr. Welch, what does that have to do with the proposition? Now there’s no issue there whatsoever.

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Contrast In Acts 19:1-5.

He came up to the chart and said that I tried to make a comparison. Now, Mr. Welch, those things are uncalled for in honorable debate. There’s no excuse for you in that. Do you know the difference in comparison and contrast? Now, ladies and gentlemen, you take a look at that, now you just look at that. That’s uncalled for. I said, “IN CONTRAST.” Why didn’t you deal with the argument I advanced? What did you say about the expression, “INTO WHAT THEN WERE YOU BAPTIZED?” And I suggested to you, that by implication he was saying into what name were you baptized? And they said, “into John’s baptism,” or into the name of John. That was my argument, and he hasn’t touched it yet. He talks about a comparison between the two, and yet, look if you will, there was stated John’s baptism. By implication Jesus’ baptism in way of contrast, there was stated in the name of the Lord Jesus. There was implied in the name of John. Now tell us what it meant to be baptized in the name of John. Did it mean they had to say the name of John over them in some ceremony? It’s in accordance with that authorized by John, and that’s what it means over here on the chart; “in the name of Jesus.”

First Corinthians 1:2

Then in 1Cor. 1:2, I advanced an argument in rebuttal to this last night. Mr. Welch. You bring the same thing up over and over. Why didn’t you deal with the argument I made on the passage. In 1Cor. 1 Paul said, “I thank God that I baptized none of you, lest some of you say that I baptized in my name.” I pointed out to you that Paul said that some of you said “I am of Paul”. And it says right here, that that’s the reason why I’m glad I didn’t baptize in my name. So that you’d have no reason to say I am of Paul. I pointed toward my chart to the definition of Webster, to show that’s one of the definitions of name. Paul said, “I didn’t baptize in my name” therefore, you don’t have the right to say I am of Paul, or I am a follower of Paul.

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Parallel Passages:

Mt. 28:18, Lk. 24:46-49, Mk. 16:16

Then on my blackboard argument. Mr. Welch, my argument is this. Now folks you observe this referring to Mt. 28:18, Mk. 16:16, Lk. 24:46-49 that in Mt. 28:18, Jesus said, “All authority.” And all three of these are referring to the same account, it’s the same incident. You know that don’t you? Don’t you know that Matt. 28, Mk. 16, Lk. 24 that in these accounts you have the same instance. Do you have the gospels paralleled where you can look in your Bible and see that these are parallel accounts? I called your attention to the fact, and the purpose of this was to show you that the expression DID indeed mean authority. And see he actually, by implication, has denied it. And yet, that’s precisely the way he’s used it all the time. Therefore, he said, “repentance and remission of sins in my name”. These two terms are in these passages, and I introduced it for that purpose. I’ve called your attention to the fact that the word, from the standpoint of the scholarship of the world, is said to mean authority. I have illustrated it in these passages. I have suggested it to you here in Acts 19:1-5. I have cited passages where it was used interchangeably, and he stands up and ridicules it and denies it. Because Matt. 28 says, “name” he’s implied that since this is singular he’s going to find out the one name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Now when you come back up, you deal with the following.

I want to give you a couple of passages to take into consideration. Observe if you will. It is not uncommon for a figure of speech to be used where the singular is put for the plural or the plural for the singular. Observe if you will. In Deut. 18:20, “speak in the name,” singular “of other gods”, plural. In Josh. 23:7, “neither make mention of the name,” singular, “of their” plural “gods,” plural. Observe in Gen. 48:6, “called after name” singular, “of your gods” plural. Gen. 48:16, “the name”, singular, “of my fathers” plural, “Abraham and Isaac”, “ Now these fellows go around making an argument on the singular name and it’s not uncommon for the singular to be used for the plural or the plural for the

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

singular, as it is in these passages. (Moderator: 10 minutes) All right. I’ve never denied that the name of Jesus is Jesus. I’ve never denied that Jesus is said to be our Father, I’ve never denied that. I’ve never denied that Jesus had a spirit and it was holy. All of this is beside the point, and doesn’t touch top, side, nor bottom of the issue of the proposition.

Trinity Formula

Contend for the trinity formula. Now, Mr. Welch, I don’t know how, sir, I can get you to understand that I don’t believe that. Now that’s a violation of honorable controversy. You are attributing to me something I disavow. Mr. Gamblin, I disavow that, I do not believe that. Mr. Welch, you are dishonorable in ACCUSING me of that. I disavow it! I do not believe in a trinity formula. I do not believe anything has to be said. And whenever you accuse me of that you are accusing me of something I’ve disavowed, and that’s a violation of the rules that you’ve agreed to be regulated by. I don’t know how I can make you believe that I DON’T BELIEVE ANY SUCH THING!

The Encyclopedias

Now tonight he said I misrepresented the encyclopedias. If I did, that just adds one more to the lists of proofs that he has to say a formula. I called to your attention last night, that the Catholic Encyclopedia affirms the necessity of a formula, that the Oneness Pentecostal Manual affirms the need for a formula, and now he cites an encyclopedia that says that it’s necessary for a formula to be said. So, he found it in those books, three of them, but he didn’t find it here in the Bible. You may find a number of books that tell you that you have to say something, but you don’t find it in the Bible, in the New Testament. We know what they did. He hasn’t told us what to say. He wants to know where there was some example where somebody was baptized and they mentioned the trinity. Show me the example where someone was taken out into the water and they used the name Jesus when they baptized them. There is no such account, but I’ll tell you what; he cited Acts 2 and he cited Acts 10, and I’ll just give him a

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

little work to do on this.

Trinity Named: Acts 2:22-23

This was a sermon that Peter preached and the purpose of the sermon was to get them to be baptized. I don’t think you’ll deny that. In the sermon that he preached, here’s what he said, “This Jesus did God raise up.” Now watch it. “This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we are all witnesses. Being therefore at the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father.” Watch it now, “Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye now see and hear.” Now Peter preached that to those people on the day of Pentecost, who were baptized. Mr. Welch said, “Where do you have anything like that?” In Acts 10, a passage that he cited. Look at Acts 10:38, Mr. Welch, observe, if you will. In Acts 10:38 the passage says, “Even Jesus of Nazareth, has God anointed him with the Holy Spirit.” “On the day of Pentecost trinity not named” and we’ve already called attention to Acts 2:22-23, Acts 8:1 -17.

Examples

These are examples, Mr. Welch, you said, “These are examples”, look at it. What does Acts 8 say? Mr. Welch tells me that you can’t use titles, he says, “no, you can’t use titles.” Now he says, “Acts 8:16-17 is an example of it.” Mr. Welch, look at this. You said that Acts 8:16-17 was your example, didn’t you? Now there’s his example. Then he says, you can’t use titles. “He says, Lord and Christ are titles” Let’s read this now. The record Says, “when they were come down, they prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit for as yet it had not fallen upon one of them: only they had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now he said there’s his example. “You can’t use a title.” Lord is a title and therefore you have a title in your example and you can’t laugh it off. You answer an argument by laughing.

Moore’s Questions To Welch

- (1) Do you believe that baptism in the name of Jesus is the baptism authorized by Jesus?”

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

And I guess that from what you said, “Yes.” If you didn’t say that, you can take it back now, But I assume that he said, in ALL the statements that he made, that baptism in the name of Jesus was the baptism authorized by Jesus. But that’s the thing I’m contending, that the expression “in the name of” may mean authorized by. And you’ve given up your entire contention, because his contention is that because the passage says, “baptized in the name of,” that means you have to say something. Yet, he comes up and he says, “The only way you could baptize anybody, in the baptism authorized by Jesus, is to baptize them and use the name “Jesus”. I knew he had to say that because he said, “I’m practicing this,” and if it’s not authorized then he’s practicing something that’s not authorized.

- (2) “Would it be scriptural for the administrator to state the following when he baptized someone? In the name of Jesus I baptize you into the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost?”

And of course he said, “No, it wouldn’t.” Then when I asked him regarding a formula in question number five, he said that “if I take the position that the name Jesus must be stated” Well what was wrong with the one in number two? The name Jesus is there. You assign yourself a formula, an exact form or rule, and what I had jotted down, and he read, is precisely that which I was told by a Pentecostal Preacher was the formula. And then Phil 2:10 as I’ve already called your attention to.

- (3) “When we worship God, must we sing in the name of Jesus?”

Well, he said “no”. He said, “If it said, sing in the name of Jesus, like it said, be baptized in the name of Jesus we’d have to.” But he said in question number one, “in the name of Jesus meant authorized by Jesus.” Therefore, he says that our singing doesn’t have to be authorized by Jesus. In Acts 10 and that’s where he dealt with the in in the Greek and I’ve dealt with that. In Acts 19:1-5 and I’ve dealt with that. Just one place where someone baptized in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? He wants to know where that is. I’ve asked him repeatedly where is the case where someone was baptized and

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

they took him out and said some formula over him. He hasn’t found it yet. He found where they baptized in the name of Christ. But he hasn’t found where they SAID something.

(Moderator: 4 minutes)

You told me that they did what Jesus told them to do, Mr. Welch, Didn’t you? You said, “They did what Jesus told them to do.” And Jesus told them to baptize in the name of the Father the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Did they do it? “Why yes,” he said, “every time they baptized they did it.” Col. 3:16, and he said I indeed baptize in deed. Now baptize is a deed and therefore you have to baptize in the name of Jesus. But singing doesn’t have to be in the name of Jesus therefore, it’s not a deed. You see, singing is not a deed. Because he said “I indeed baptize you,” that means baptism is a deed, and you have to say in the name of Jesus, but singing is not a deed. Therefore, you don’t have to do it in the name of Jesus.”

Husband Wife Relationship

Then the husband and wife relationship. Mr. Welch repeatedly talks about the husband wife relationship. You don’t have the right, and I suggested this to him numerous times, to take an illustration and use everything that you can think of about the relationship that the Lord uses to illustrate a truth. And he takes that and he wants to make it just mean anything that he wants it to. Well, I’ll give you something to work on. I recognize the very close relationship of Christ and the church is illustrated by that of a husband and a wife. But now watch it. Mr. Welch’s contention up here is that the Father and the Son are one and the same. He comes over here and he says the wife and the children are one and the same. Now you have the Father being the husband of the children. Is that right, Mr. Welch? When you begin to try to take an illustration that’s being used and just make it be anything that you want to. Is that right then? The father then is the husband of the children: Is that right? Then you have an illustration. ladies and gentlemen, one of the basic rules of applying an illustration is you never place it beyond it’s intended purpose.

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Not Ashamed Of His Name

“We are not ashamed of his name.” We’re not either, Mr. Welch. Gal. 3:26-27, “into Christ.” LITERALLY? That’s talking about a spiritual relationship isn’t it, Mr. Welch? “Then got to be baptized with them.” No, I deny such. I’ve never said that. I cited Rom. 6:3-4. We’re baptized with him. I’ve never said that. That’s just something you’ve manufactured. “Come back and take any instance of baptism where trinity necessary.” And here once again it’s implied that I’ve taken a position that you have to say a formula, and I deny such. Why do I do it? Mr. Welch, I do it because I have the right to speak spiritual truths. Now observe if you will, and I appreciated this the other night when your brethren sang without a mechanical instrument. You think they had the right to use instruments but did you think they were wrong when they did not. The idea that I can’t have a liberty. He wants to know why I do it. I don’t always do it. But I have the right to do it, as I pointed out in my first speech and he didn’t deal with it. And that deals with the man’s speech, item by item, statement by statement, passage by passage.

Closing Remarks

Now in the last remaining moments that I have. How much time do I have left? (Moderator: 1 minute) I want to call your attention to the fact that in the New Testament, the expression in the name of, ladies and gentlemen, is an expression, according to the scholarship of the world, that means authority. I suggest to you further, in connection with this, that baptism in the name of Jesus is simply the baptism of Jesus and it means the baptism authorized by Jesus. Observe if you will, in connection with this also; and I hope that this will break through on your mind as I close my speech, and that is this. That the word name, ladies and gentlemen, as it occurs in the Bible, is used in these four different ways. And, my friends, whenever you read a passage, look at the context and determine how the word is being used there. Don’t just take any idea that you want. But look at the context. As you look at Phil. 2 you can see that whenever the passage said that Jesus willingly subjected

Thursday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

himself to death, wherefore God highly exalted him and gave him a name above every name. Don’t you see that that has to do with reputation, and character, and authority. And it’s not in the mere stating or the mention of the word Jesus. Don’t you see that? And I invite you to hear Mr. Welch.

The End of Speech

Baptismal Formula Debate: Part Four-B

I can speak this last thirty minutes just as quickly as anyone. And I’m going to do my best to bring to you again the differences between what Mr. Moore teaches about God, who God is, the name of God, water baptism, in the trinity faith, and in the Jesus only or oneness faith. These last four nights including tonight have been dealing with the difference between what the people who believe that Jesus is God, and who believe that he’s the only person in the Godhead, and how they baptize, in opposition to those who believe that there are three separate, distinct persons in the Godhead, and how they baptize.

The Highest Name Is Jesus

Now, I want to take up, while it’s fresh on my mind, the Scripture in Colossians, or Ephesians, rather that I’ve already dealt with, and Mr. Moore introduced it and I’ve dealt with it before. But I want to show the difference now in the name Jesus as I have already proven, the Bible teaching in the highest name. I repeatedly said that God had many names. I even quoted Hebrew names: Elohim, El-Shaddi, Jehovah, and the Greek word Theos. I quoted that in this debate, but I’ve contended throughout this debate about Christ, that the name Jesus is the name that God had come to the world in when he brought his perfect testament of will to man. That’s right. His last Testament. Inasmuch as that is it, God has revealed his name, and who he is. Eph. 1:20 says, “And which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.”

I introduced an argument in this same line that Jesus said in John 2:19, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.” I introduced that. It was actually the eternal spirit that glorified this man Christ and raised him from the dead, and made him the person of the Godhead. The scripture explains that, “Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named,” that is, all the others come under this one, “Not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,”

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

Philippians 2:8-10 Revisited

Now let’s go to Philippians the 2nd chapter and find out, without any doubt in our minds, what that name is. I’m talking about the name above every name. Mr. Moore might mention titles, he might mention all these names about everlasting Father, and the mighty God. That won’t help him any when it comes to trying to do away with the name of Jesus, and its power, and authority, and its beauty above all of these. That’s right. He’s lost. He can’t do it. Can’t handle it. Now, in Philippians 2:8 and 9 and 10, “Wherefore God hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above EVERY name,” title or anything else that can be thought of. That’s what I’ve been contending for in this debate, night after night. That God has revealed to the world his highest and outstanding name.

Acts 9 Revisited

Now, I introduced a scripture in the 9th chapter of Acts, and Saul asks a question. That’s why I did it. “Lord, who art thou?” He could have said to Paul of course, I’m the everlasting Father. He could have said I am the mighty God. He could have said I am the Prince of Peace, Wonderful Counselor. But from heaven right to that man, he was revealing to him, what his now recognized name for eternity, all time will be. That’s right. “And said to him, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.” That’s why I introduced the scripture in the last chapter of Revelation that said, “I Jesus,” when he gave the revelation of Jesus Christ. That’s right. He acknowledged in the last book in the Bible, the last chapter in the book, and the last verse in the chapter, he acknowledged what his name was as the book was closed, and said “I Jesus...” ,(22:16). That’s right. “Given him a name which is above every name, Mr. Moore.

Pity For Moore

And I say this with all pity for him. I love him. That’s right. There’s not one ounce of bad feeling in my heart about him. That’s right. I think he is a nice man and he’s a good debater. I’m going to say that about him, he’s not bad. I appreciate being here with him. I think that he and I would be

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

good neighbors if we lived close together. But I want to say this to him, that in as much as every place the apostles baptized it was in the name of Jesus; and since Jesus Christ the last time he acknowledged what his name was, was Jesus, then I wish Mr. Moore could take his stand with me and other men who have found this truth from the Bible and preach it that way, and baptize their converts like the apostles did. I’m not here to get Mr. Moore to say that I’m some great debater, I care very little about that. I’ve got a nice family in Florida, a nice home, a nice church down there, a wonderful bunch of brethren throughout the whole country, revivals, and I have an obligation to people. And that obligation is to take the Bible and exalt this great, wonderful name that Jesus Christ has recognized now throughout all time and eternity, and get everybody I can to be baptized in it just like brethren did and the apostles in the early church. Let us never say that his name is some secondary thing.

Proverbs 18:10 Revisited

I introduced the scripture, Proverbs 18:10, showing, “the name of the Lord is a strong tower: the righteous runneth into it, and are safe.”

Moore And Catholicism

And of course when I introduced the argument about the church and the wife of Christ, and him the husband; I had a reason in that and that was the strong tower of this argument. That’s right. Whenever Mr. Moore gets up here, he makes me feel sorry for him. I see him, putting it, trying to get by it, and he can’t do it. He gets up and tries to preach around it and every where he runs into something he can’t get around. And yet it’s like Saul when the Lord spoke to him and said, “It’s hard for you to kick against the pricks.” He taught that in order to be baptized right, you had to be taught there was a trinity of persons of God, and believe in it before you were baptized. I know what he believes. I know what he taught. He may not want to call it trinity, but it’s that just the same. That’s exactly what the Roman Catholic Church teaches. They say unless you believe and acknowledge there are three separate, distinct persons in the

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

Godhead, you can't be saved. That's why I asked Mr. Moore that question. I place him tonight with the Catholics. I'm going to keep doing that. He sits there with them. His argument places him there. If I were him I'd go join the Catholic Church. I'll say it again. If I believed in the trinity, I'd take it just like they made it, and they did make it. His teaching is that, that he believes that when you say and believe there are three separate, distinct persons in the Godhead, that's why he twists and turns on this formula business. He says this, he won't take a definite stand for nothing to be said. But yet, in his heart he believes that you have to recognize the three separate persons, and he argued that in his sermon here, I mean his last speech.

He brought in the 2nd chapter of Acts, the 10th chapter where God had raised him from the dead, trying to preach at least two persons. I know what he's doing. I know what he believes. I haven't argued with these fellows for years for nothing, I know what they believe. But mind you, when he finds himself so hard pressed, then he does that. And they're changing some. I don't know whether I've changed them or what changed them, but they³re changing their arguments some since I last debated with them. But he won't come out and take a clear stand for any set form to baptize, yet he tells you that baptism is a cardinal doctrine of the Bible. It inducts you into Christ. In fact, it's through baptism that you enter the door into Christ, and yet you can just do it however you want to, whether or not the water's cold or hot. That's right. I'm not going to do that. I'm going to take a definite stand, that the name Jesus is this highest name. It is the name of the everlasting Father. It is a name of the church. It is the name of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. That one, that one glorious name Jesus, and he's coming back after his wife.

Genesis 5

Adam A Type of Christ; Eve A Type of The Church

I introduced a scripture in Genesis 5:1, about God creating man and Adam was a type of Christ. God took that woman out of his side. She's a type of the Church. "He said this is bone of my bone and flesh of my

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

flesh.” And the 5th chapter of Genesis, verse 1 said these words, “And this is the generation of man. In the day that God created man, male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam.” And that woman had his name. And his true church today has his name. They carry it with them. They know what it is. As I quoted a scripture previously, Revelation, the last chapter, they’re going to see his face and his name is going to be in their forehead. The Bible said that. “And there shall be no more curse: and around the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it: They shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads.” They know what it is! They haven’t been led off into some nameless formula or no formula at all when they get into Christ. They are baptized into him in water and spirit. And through that you were baptized into him, and you’re born of the water and the spirit when you’re baptized of the water and the spirit, and thus by that you become a member of his church, which is his wife. And he’s the husband of the church, and the Father of the children. And his name is Jesus, and he is the everlasting Father.

Names

Now to get back to the argument upon these charts here. About authorized and name here. Proverbs 22:1 talking about the name means this and means that. Some name. Well, that doesn’t help him. If that were true, he can’t argue away the fact that Jesus Christ told his followers to baptize in some name. And he’s so hard pressed himself, he won’t admit it.

Baptism

Now I wouldn’t baptize you, Mr. Welch. And I asked him that question. Know what I said when I asked him. I know what he believes. I wrote that question of his down this afternoon especially to bring Mr. Moore out on his definition in what he believed about baptism, the Godhead in water baptism. And I asked him this question:

If a person believed there was only one in the Godhead, and was to be baptized in Jesus’ name, the name of Jesus only, would he be scripturally baptized?

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

No, so he doesn’t believe that. He answered my question, “No.”

I knew he’d do it. Here’s what he believes. He believes that you, through the teachings he claims are Christ’s, don’t have to have any name said at all. That you have to recognize the trinity and it’s all right to say and recognize the members of it in baptism. Now I know exactly what he’s arguing, the essence of his argument. That’s the difference between what he and I believe. Now, let’s go back again to his chart right here, about the name in.

Into The Name: “Name Does Not Mean Authority”

I said last evening and I’ll say it this evening, in Acts the 10th chapter, in Acts the 2nd chapter, and in Acts the 8th chapter, he did not mean authority. There was a name involved there. The 10th chapter of Acts, I use that scripture there to show they were in prison, that same Greek word was used. They were put in the prison. All right. When you’re baptized in the name of Jesus, you get in the name. Proverbs, 18:10 said, “The name of the Lord is a strong tower: the righteous runneth into it, and are saved.” That’s why I introduced that scripture to start with. That’s why I used the Greek word there. It means in. Like they were in the temple, and then they put them in the common prison. It comes from that Greek word in. To baptize that way does not mean to baptize by any authority. It means you baptize into Jesus Christ, and into his name. And because he’s the one we baptize into.

Galatians 3:27: Not Into Trinity

I asked him this question and he couldn’t cope with it. I knew that he couldn’t when I asked it. Gal. 3:27, “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ.” It didn’t say into a trinity, however he would recognize that. The book doesn’t say that, “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ.” Not three persons. Well, what is the name when Saul was knocked down, and the Lord acknowledged himself out of heaven? “And he said, lord who art thou? And he said, I am Jesus.” And the last book, as I’ve already stated, in the New Testament said

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

these words, “I Jesus”. Yes sir, now he could have said, the rock that followed the Israelites; he could have said all that. He was all of that. But this name I’m talking about, that’s above every name, is the name. And the Bible said, Acts 4:12, “Neither is there salvation in any other; there’s none other name given under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved.” There is no other. There’s no other name given by God Almighty, that your sins can be remitted through.

Welch Hopes Moore’s Understanding Is Opened

In Luke 24:45, he told these men, “Then he opened their understanding.” I hope that some day Mr. Moore’s understanding will be opened. I stand here tonight in all sincerity. That’s why I discuss the Bible. I don’t do it just to go around and have debates. NO! I do it for the purpose of bringing the truth of his great name and who he is. It affords me a chance to do that.

Philippians 2:10 Revisited

Paul said in Philippians 2:10, “At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in earth, things in heaven, and things under the earth” I do hope that Mr. Moore will consider and find out the greatness and the beauty of this wonderful name that the apostles were beaten for, and commanded not to teach in. “we did straitly command you not to preach in this name.” And they went forth and filled the town with it. And that’s what I and my brethren are going to do, so help us, Good Lord, fill this whole country with it if we can. Why? Because of the power, and because of salvation, and because of what his name means to those who find him. If we’re baptized into him and into Christ, just the one. Now, when he gave them this commission and said, after he opened their understanding, and I hope Mr. Moore gets his opened, in Luke 24:47; “That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.” It didn’t say their names. It said, “In his name, beginning at Jerusalem.”

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

Trinity Baptism In Encyclopedia Not Bible

I read this encyclopedia statement here. You can trace any in the world, any authority upon earth. You can't find the word trinity in the Bible you can't find anything that looks like a trinity baptizing. So you have to go somewhere else to find out where it came from. And you can find where it started, where it had its birthday. Every encyclopedia under the sun will take you back to a little town of Nicea, 325 years this side of Christ. It'll show you how the development of the doctrines of the trinity started. It took them some 325 years to develop it and as one authentic writer, said, "When the Protestant Churches started, they accepted trinity without any serious consideration of it." But mind you, when these men went forth preaching and teaching, and men were getting saved, and they received the remission of sins, what did they do? He had told them after he opened their understanding. That's what Mr. Moore needs. He needs his understanding opened. That's exactly what he needs. And I say that with all respect to him. "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And that's where the formula began, just mine, the one I contend for; not the one Mr. Moore's arguing for. Peter stood UP on the day of Pentecost and said these words when they said to him, "men and brethren, what shall we do? And he said to them Repent." This is where it started. "And be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," One divine being; The Everlasting Father, The Mighty God, The Prince of Peace, the Bright and Morning Star the Root and off Spring of David; who said to Paul, "I am Jesus." These apostles had his spirit. His Spirit was the spirit of truth, and his spirit led these men to preach the truth and that's what they did. Three thousand were added to the church, I and my brethren belong to, that day. That's right. They were baptized like the ministers of the United Pentecostal Church baptize. They took them out and baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and said the name Jesus if the Book is true; and it is true. And we move on from there. He said repentance and he said there's salvation in no other

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

name. In Acts the 15th chapter he said, “That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called.” It was called on them. The name Jesus.

The Samaritans Revisited

Now we move into the 8th chapter of Acts, the Samaritans. There was kind of a mixed generation of people, we have in there, and this commission is carried out. Given by Christ after he opened their understanding and carried out by the apostles. This Philip had been chosen by the church. He was down there preaching Christ, and he preached Christ to them, the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. When they believed Philip’s preaching concerning the kingdom of God and the NAME of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. There was an old fortuneteller baptized too. His name was Simon, and it goes on down in the verse and says, “And when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God; they sent unto them Peter and John: Who, when they came down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: Only they were baptized.” That’s in the Greek word that means “in”. They translated all of them, in. “They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” I emphasize the fact that Jesus is a name. I realize he had many titles. There was a title written over him King of Kings and King of the Jews. He had many titles, but he wasn’t talking about that when he told them to baptize. He opened their understanding, and specifically showed them exactly what he was talking about AND THEY CARRIED IT OUT!

Gentile’s Conversion Revisited

And now we come down to the Gentiles and this is a door. We’re Gentiles here tonight. In the 15th chapter of Acts as I use the scripture, and about the 17th verse on down, God said, “That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called.” Now, for hundreds of years God had not visited the Gentiles, but

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

the door is fixing to open to them now. And God picks out a Roman Soldier. That’s right. A man by the name of Cornelius, and his heart and his alms come up as a memorial. God sent an angel to him and told him to send and get this man, Simon Peter. And Simon Peter would come and tell him words whereby he and his house would be saved. And this is the opening of the door of Faith to the Gentiles. And the trinity is missing there, when this door swings open. And Peter begins to preach to them. Finally he comes down after he preached to them. He said these words in Acts 10:43, “To him speaketh Jesus Christ, gave all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him should receive remission of sins. And while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. And they of the circumcision as many as came with Peter.” The six Jews that came with him, “were astonished because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” And he knew as well as being baptized in Spirit they had to be baptized in water. And he said this. And he didn’t have any quibbling about his preaching. He didn’t leave any little doubt. He didn’t leave any slack line. He told them what to do. He didn’t say now you can do it this way if you want to. You can do it that way if you want to. You can do it another way if you want to. But he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Trinity is missing there.

Back To Paul’s Conversion With Supporting Passages

And then the Bible said, and as I’ve already explained to you, when Saul was converted he asked what is your name Lord? And he said, “I am Jesus.” Then they were baptized in the name of Jesus, because that is the name of the Lord, and they were Gentiles, and he said, “Upon all the Gentiles whom my name is called.” In Acts 14:27 the apostle calls it, “The opening of the door of faith unto the Gentiles.” I want to ask this question tonight. If that’s the opening of it, where, what’s it, who, and how has

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

anyone else ever found any other way to open it? There is no other way. There is no other way to baptize. These men baptized right. Every one of them did, because the Holy Ghost of Christ, the Spirit of Truth moved these men to do what they did.

Acts 19 “The 12 Disciples of John” Revisited

Now we come to the 19th chapter of Acts again. In this chapter are converts that had been baptized one time before. Mr. Moore talks about the contrast of that, and me and my analysis of it when I came up here. His argument had nothing to do with the power of what it meant; none whatsoever when it comes to the baptizing of Paul. He said these words to them, “Unto what then were you baptized? And they said, unto John’s baptism.” John’s baptism was not, New Testament baptism. John died before there was a New Testament. These people had been baptized, in all probability by Apollos who was probably a convert of John the Baptist. And he said to them, “Unto what then were you baptized? They said, unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying”. They knew what John said about Jesus. Did you know he said these words about him? And, oh, they’re ringing so in my heart now he said, “I’m not the bridegroom, I’m just a friend of the bridegroom.” That’s what he said about him. He said, I’m not the man that’s going to be the husband of the church. I’m not the one that’s going to be the everlasting Father to the children. I’m not the bridegroom, just a friend of the bridegroom. “And when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. And when Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.”

Closing Appeal

Well, I’d just like to tell you if you haven’t been baptized like the apostles were baptized, and you want to belong to the right Church, let me tell you what you do. You embrace the faith, the teaching of those men that he lived with and gave his Spirit to. And they got their gospel directly from Christ then and they made statements such as this, “Though we, or an

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we preached, let him be accursed.” I’ll tell you what I could do tonight. If the minute came for me to die, I’d like to die exalting that great and worthy name of Jesus Christ. There’s no other given that man can be saved by. My purpose here has been that, and may God bless you is my prayer

The End of Speech

Thursday – Welch’s Second Negative

This ends the debate on whether or not a formula must be said when baptizing a convert. This baptism dealt with water baptism. The next debate involves Holy Spirit baptism. The following are the propositions for this debate:

1. The Scriptures teach that Holy Spirit Baptism has ceased and no one today is receiving the Holy Spirit in the baptismal form.

Mr. Moore affirms

2. The Scriptures teach that men are being baptized in the Holy Spirit as were the apostles on the day of Pentecost.

Mr. Welch Affirms

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part One-A

Gentlemen Moderators, ladies and gentlemen, both here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'm happy that once again we're privileged to be here in this capacity and that I'm afforded an opportunity to be before you to affirm the proposition that's been read in your hearing.

Proposition And Terms Defined

I want to get right into the discussion and being in the affirmative I'm obligated to clearly define the terms that appear in the proposition. The proposition reads as follows: "The Scriptures teach that Holy Spirit Baptism has Ceased, and no one today is receiving the Holy Spirit in the Baptismal Form." By the "Scriptures" I mean the Bible, the Word of God. By "Teach" I mean to say in so many words, either by command, approved example, or necessary inference. By "Holy Spirit Baptism" I mean the gift of Spirit referred to as baptism such as the apostles received on the day of Pentecost. By "ceased" I mean to be at an end or as the proposition states not being received. No one today is receiving the Holy Spirit in the baptismal form I mean that not a single person is being baptized with the "Holy Spirit" now. Very briefly then, the proposition is: "The Bible teaches that Holy Spirit Baptism has served its purpose and hence is no longer received by men or women."

Clarifying The Proposition

I want tonight, as I have each night that I have been in the affirmative, to endeavor to clarify the proposition so you might know what the issue is and what the issue is not. I submit to you then that the issue is not a question of the power of God, I believe in the omnipotence of God but God is not doing everything that he's able to do. In Mt. 3:9, we are told that God was able of those stones to raise up seed unto Abraham. But just because he was able to do it that didn't mean that he was doing it. In the second place, the issue is not whether some were baptized in the Holy Spirit, I believe that. The issue is not whether some claims to receive Holy Spirit baptism. I'm fully aware of the fact that there are

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

many religious people who claim to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. For instance, the Assemblies of God claim to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. This, according to them, is a second work of grace. And our Baptist and Methodist friends take the position that the Spirit operated in some unidentified operation to produce regeneration. The Mormons take the position that miraculous gifts of the Spirit produce signs and wonders. So, I'm not denying that some CLAIM to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. I'd like to pose this thought for your consideration and I'd like to hear Mr. Welch comment on it. Do you believe that all of these people, Mr., Welch, are receiving Holy Spirit Baptism? They claim to have it. Do you THINK they have it? The issue is then: Does the Bible teach that Holy Spirit Baptism is to be perpetuated throughout this dispensation, or does it teach that Holy Spirit Baptism had a distinct purpose and that this purpose has been accomplished and there is no longer any need for continuation of this gift? The issue is that God had a distinct purpose in giving the Holy Spirit in a baptismal form, that this purpose has been accomplished, that there is no further need for this gift of the Spirit, and that the Bible so teaches. To this then I address my self.

Filled With The Spirit Is Not Holy Spirit Baptism

Brother Bruce, would you hand me my glass of water? I'm having a little throat problem. (Mr. Welch and I both are. Mr. Welch spoke from seat, we are in fellowship in that.) There are some facts about the Holy Spirit that I want to call to your attention. And I want to impress this upon your mind as the discussion continues. That is that every mention of the Spirit being received is not necessarily Holy Spirit Baptism. Now mark this well because it is an important point in the debate. That every mention of the Holy Spirit being received is not necessarily Holy Spirit Baptism. My opponent recognizes this for he realizes that Holy Spirit baptism began on Pentecost. Yet, men had the Holy Spirit before Pentecost, hence, men may have the Holy Spirit without being baptized in the Holy Spirit. Observe if you will. In the Old Testament in Num. 24:2, the Bible says the Spirit came upon Balaam. In Num. 27:18, the Spirit was in Joshua.

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

In Ezek. 11:5, it fell upon Ezekiel. Coming into the New Testament we read in Lk. 1:15, a man by the name of Simon was filled with the Spirit; Elizabeth, Lk. 1:41, was filled with the Spirit; Zacharias, Lk. 1:67, was filled, with the Spirit. Now here are some folks who were filled with the Spirit; here are some folks who the Spirit fell upon; here are some folks that the Spirit came upon; some folks who has the Spirit in them; and yet, my good friend recognizes that they were not baptized in the Holy Spirit. So I submit to you that just because a person received the Holy Spirit THAT DOES NOT WITHIN ITSELF MEAN HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM. Reference is to Holy Spirit baptism only if so labeled. Now mark this well. It refers to Holy Spirit baptism ONLY IF IT IS SO LABELED.

Manner Of Establishing The Proposition

I purpose to establish my proposition in this manner. In the first place I want to consider the question to whom was the promise of Holy Spirit Baptism made. In the second place I want to consider the PURPOSE. In the third place to examine its FULFILLMENT. In the fourth place I want to consider its DURATION.

Welch's Questions

I want at this time to consider the questions Mr. Welch has handed to me.

(1) "Can a person in this age receive the Holy Spirit separate and apart from the word of God?"

Mr. Welch, the Bible teaches that the word, the truth, must be obeyed in order to receive the Holy Spirit, Acts 5:32. My answer to that is no.

(2) When does a believer receive the gift of the Holy Spirit as mentioned in Acts 2:38 when he is baptized in water, or before baptism in water, or after baptism in Water?

The passage says, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." That indicates that it's future or after baptism in water.

(3) "Does the scriptures teach that people who had spiritual gifts and

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

inspiration from God had to be taught by man?”

There are two parts to the answer. In the first place, not in that which inspiration enabled them to reveal. I want to repeat that again because I have it written down and I don't want to be misrepresented on my answer. In the first place, not in that which inspiration enabled them to reveal. Now watch the second part: Certainly inspired men were taught by other men. The Corinthians, for instance, who had spiritual gifts, had to be taught how they ought to use spiritual gifts.

(4) When Jesus said in Jno. 14,15,16 that the Comforter, which was the Holy Ghost, which would abide with you forever; does the Holy Ghost abide in believers by direct operation of his spirit or by believing and receiving the word of God only?”

In the first place, Mr. Welch, this passage and the promise in this passage was made to the apostles and the apostles ONLY, and not as you suppose. Now let's just take a look and this will be considered more in detail in a moment in my speech. But in Jno. 14:16-18, not only do you have the promise of the Comforter but, in verses 16,18,26, you have what he would do. Observe, “But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, who the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.” In this same discourse in Jno. 15:26 when this promise again was being discussed, “That when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me.” In this same discourse in Jno. 16:13 “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.” You need to consider what these passages say about the promise of the Comforter, Mr. Welch.

(5) “Is receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost in Acts 2:4 the same experience that the Gentiles received in Acts 10: 44-46?”

I believe they were, but for a different purpose and this will be

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

considered in the process of my speech.

First Argument:

“To Whom Was The Promise Made Concerning Holy Spirit Baptism”

I want now to present my first argument, and that is a consideration of the question:

“TO WHOM WAS THE PROMISE MADE CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM” And I want to say this very kindly to Mr. Welch. This book is going into print. You have two more nights to rid yourself of the infamous reputation that you have gained by ignoring my arguments. I hope tonight you’ll take up my arguments and examine them. Let us discuss these passages that are being considered. And I trust that when you come to the stand you will give me an answer to my questions. I intend to get an answer to those questions tonight.

So, observe if you will. There’s a very basic principle that needs to be considered and that is this: Whenever a passage of Scripture is read one needs to give consideration not only to what is read but to WHOM is the passage being spoken. Who’s being addressed. In others words we need to recognize who is speaking, who’s being addressed, what is said under what dispensation. You don’t just reach in and take a passage without considering the context.

Holy Spirit Baptism Promised To The Apostles Only

Observe if you will the passages that I read just a moment ago in John 14:26; 15:26 and 16:13. These promises were promises that were made to the apostles and the apostles ONLY. Observe if you will. This was the occasion when the apostles were eating the Last Supper with the Lord. Mt. 26:20 is a parallel account of this and tells us that Jesus was with the twelve disciples. In the second place in Lk. 24:46-49 where you have the Lord promising them, “Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, to die, and to be raised from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

sins should be preached in his name throughout all the world, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city until ye be endued with power from on high.” This statement was made to the eleven and the eleven ONLY. In Mk. 16:14; in a parallel account, we read, “Afterward Jesus appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat.” In Acts 1:8 the record says, “And ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you. And ye shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria and the uttermost parts of the earth.” This is a recount of Lk. 24:46-49. In Acts 1:3-8 the context shows that in this instance the Lord was talking to the apostles, for the record says that he was assembled together with them and he enjoined them not to depart from Jerusalem. In Mt. 3:11 the record says that Jesus would baptize them with the Holy Spirit and fire. And I hope Mr. Welch comes up and challenges what I’m about to say. Mt. 3:11 DOES NOT, I repeat, DOES NOT EVEN INDICATE WHO IT IS THAT WILL BE BAPTIZED IN THE HOLY SPIRIT. That passage is talking about who WILL NOT DO IT. That passage is talking about whom will be able to do it and you have in this instance, the power of John being contrasted with the power of Jesus. John simply says I’m able to do this; but he that comes after me, he is able to do THIS. And that’s a question of who is able to do it and not who will receive it. Jesus refers to this instance in Acts 1:5 where he made reference to the fact that John had indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence. So I submit to you that these passages were not only to have reference to Holy Spirit baptism but every last one of them are references that were made to the apostles.

The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism To The Apostles

I call your attention to the chart that I have. And I’ve lost my pointer. Observe if you will. In Acts 1:8 - and for those of you who are in the radio audience — the passage says, “Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you.” That passage promises the apostles power.

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

This power would accomplish for them certain things. For instance, in Jno. 16:13, the passage that I read a moment ago, the Lord promised them that this power would enable them to reveal divine truth. You need to take into consideration the fact that here are men who have accompanied the Lord during his personal ministry. He now charges them with the responsibility of making known his message. And he simply says to these men, you'll not have to depend upon your own ability to do that, but you will be inspired for the purpose of revealing divine truth. In the second place, the Bible affirms that the Holy Spirit fell upon the apostles for the purpose of enabling them to perform signs and wonders that they might be able to CONFIRM this word that they spoke. In 2 Cor. 12:12, "The signs of an apostle" Paul said, "were wrought by me in your presence." And it also enabled the apostles to impart spiritual gifts. In Acts 8:17-18 where we read that, Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given. Now observe if you will, the apostles received power; it enabled them to do these things; they also had the ability to impart spiritual gifts. Let me illustrate it in this fashion. A man is selected to serve in the capacity of sheriff of some particular county. He has the right to make arrests, he has the right to do a number of things, and he also has the right to appoint deputies. And that is precisely the case here. That these men had the ability to lay their hands on others and impart spiritual gifts. This was done in the absence of a completely revealed and written down message. Ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you to think for a moment, that here is a new dispensation that's being ushered in; here you have an instance where the Lord is simply saying to them, a message must be preached; and here you have the Lord saying to these men, "I will not depend upon you, by your own ability, to remember the things that I taught you but you'll be INSPIRED."

Whenever a church was established, it was necessary that there be some way in which they might be protected from every wind of doctrine, from error that was taught. They had no New Testament as we have

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

tonight. You know that don't you? They did not have this book as we now have it. But they had men who possessed spiritual gifts for the purpose of protecting the church. And the apostles were able to impart these spiritual gifts.

Cornelius An Exception

As I suggested to you a moment ago in answer to a question, that in Acts 10 and 11, you have an exception to this rule in the case of Cornelius. I want to suggest to you that not only do you have the exception cited but also you have the purpose for the Holy Spirit falling upon Cornelius in the fashion in which it did. Observe if you will. In Acts 11, when the apostle Peter went back to Jerusalem to explain to the Jews why he went unto the Gentiles to preach to them, he began and expounded the matter in order to them - we are told in v.4. He called their attention to the fact, v.15, "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning." I want you to take a look at this. That passage says, "It fell on them as on us at the beginning." The apostle Peter had to go back to the beginning of this dispensation to find another case like this. He said, "It fell on them, even as on us at the beginning." Why the mention of the beginning if this was just an ordinary occurrence or happening? So he said, "It fell on them as it did on US at the beginning." While in Jerusalem then, in a matter of trying to convince these Jews why he went into the house of a Gentile and acted in the fashion that he did, he said, "As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning." Then he said, "I remembered the word of the Lord, how that John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence. If God gave unto them the like gift as he did unto us when we believed, who was I, that I could withstand God." (verse 17). Now verse 18 tells us that they held their peace, (the Jews who had challenged Peter for going into the Gentiles) and glorified God saying, "then unto the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life". There was ONE purpose: to convince the Jews that the Gentiles were fit subjects of the gospel. In Acts 15:7-8, Peter said, "Brethren ye know that a good while ago that God made choice among you, that by my mouth

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

the Gentiles would hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God, who knoweth the heart, BARE THEM WITNESS, giving unto them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us.” Now observe then, that passage says that it was for the purpose of assuring the Gentiles, purpose #TWO. I submit to you that these passages affirm the purpose of Holy Spirit Baptism upon Cornelius. It was for the purpose of convincing the Jews. You’re not unmindful of the prejudice that existed between Jews and Gentiles are you? You certainly know that that’s the case. And hence, in this instance it convinced the Jews that God had accepted the Gentiles. That’s why as I suggested to you two nights ago that later on in the chapter the writer quotes a statement from Amos and indicates that now GOD’S provision has been offered upon the residue of men. In other words, that which remains or the Gentiles. And so, it fell upon the Gentiles to convince the Jews and to assure the Gentiles.

Fulfillment Of Holy Spirit Baptism

I want now to consider the fulfillment of this. Acts 10 we’ve already considered. I want now to take a look at Acts 2. And if you have your New Testament I invite you to just open it and read along with me. And like I said a moment ago, I enjoy coming to the New Testament and getting down to a passage and taking a look at it and examining it and that’s what I want to do. I hope my good friend will come up to these passages tonight and let’s take a look at them. In Acts 2 the record says, “And when the day of Pentecost was now come they were all together in one place.” I submit to you that the little word they is a plural pronoun and it stands in the place of a noun. If I write you a letter (these boys and girls that are going to school know exactly what I’m talking about) if I write you a letter and I put a word such as “they” in you would have to have some particular rule to go by to find out who I’m talking about. And you know that “they” stands in the place of a noun. And here is a rule and I just challenge him with ever ounce that I have to deny it, that when you come to a pronoun it refers back to the LAST NOUN UNLESS IT’S IMPOSSIBLE FOR IT TO DO SO. Let’s take a look at the text in Acts

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

2:1, “When the day of Pentecost was now come they were all together.” Now what is the antecedent of they? Who is he talking about? Look back in the preceding verses. You are mindful of the fact that chapters and verses were simply put there by men for the sake of identification. Let’s just begin reading and take a look. V. 26 (chapter 1), for instance, “And they gave lots for them; and the lot fell upon Mathias: and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. And when the day of Pentecost was come, THEY....” Now what’s the antecedent of they in that passage? Why, ladies and gentlemen, you know just as well as anything that the antecedent is the APOSTLES in verse 26 of the preceding chapter.

My second argument:

That passage says, “they were all together in one place. And there came a sound from heaven as the rushing of a mighty wind and it filled the house where they were sitting.” Now I lay this down at this moment and ask Mr. Welch to grapple with it. This sound that they heard was of such a nature that they could hear it all over Jerusalem because it was the sound that brought them together. When this sound was heard they came together the record said. But observe, “They, were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.” Now this passage says that those who were filled with the Holy Spirit spake. Now watch it. Those who were filled with the Holy Spirit spake. Now who spoke? In Acts 2:14 we note, “Peter, standing up with the eleven, spake forth unto them.” Now the passage says that twelve of them spoke. Now observe as it’s presented in a logical form of argument. “Those that were baptized with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost spoke, but, only twelve spoke. Therefore, only twelve were baptized in the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

The third argument in regard to its fulfillment:

In Acts 2:43 the record indicates that signs and wonders were wrought. My point, ladies and gentlemen, is that you do not find an instance of anyone other than the apostles performing signs and wonders until the

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

sixth chapter of the book of Acts. Isn't it significant that when you read in Acts 2:43 that signs and wonders were wrought through the apostles or were done through the apostles? Observe also in connection with this, in Acts 3:1-10 the healing of the lame man done by the apostles. In Acts 5, for instance, and verse 12 where the Bible affirms, "and by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people, and they were all of one accord in Solomon's porch." The point is: Up to this point NOBODY but an apostle is said to be performing signs and wonders. And it is very significant that in Acts 6:8 the record says that Stephen worked signs and wonders and in the preceding verses (6 and 7) we are told that he had the hands of apostles laid upon him.

Inspiration

I want now, before I consider the "duration" to call your attention to the chart that I have over here on the right. I have it titled inspiration. You remember I held my New Testament up a moment ago and I pleaded with you to listen and observe. You certainly are aware of the fact that in the first century those men did not have this written New Testament as we now have it. The word was in MEN, inspired men! In 2 Cor. 4:7 the Bible says that we have this treasure in earthen vessels. We now have an inspired book, (2Tim, 3:16-17) but they didn't have it then. You take for instance when Philip went down to Samaria to preach, the people at Samaria didn't have a New Testament to open as some of these good people have tonight and examine what I'm saying. They couldn't examine what Philip said could they? They didn't have this New Testament. But the record says that Philip was able to perform signs and wonders to confirm his word. They didn't have this book but Phillip was able to perform signs and wonders to convince them that what he was saying was the truth.

Now observe if you will. There was a time when the word was in men. There was a time when all of it was oral. We're told that there was approximately ten years, I don't know just how long but I know there was

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

a period of time from the time that Jesus died and ascended back to the Father that the word was all oral. You know that as well as I. All of it was in men, they didn't have any of it in written form. Then we're told in 2Thess. 2:15, "Hold fast the word which ye received by me, whether by word of mouth," (that is, orally) "or whether by an epistle," (that is, written) There was a time when some of it was oral and some of it was written. It wasn't always written out like now and you know it. Some of it was oral and some of it written. I submit to you that during the age of inspired men it was necessary that these men possess the gift of inspiration. Why? Because the word was in men, it was oral! Now watch it if you will. The New Testament teaches that this inspiration was to last till the faith became a unit.

The Duration Of Spiritual Gifts

In Eph. 4:13, where Paul talks about the matter of these gifts that were given unto men and he said it was for the purpose of protection. I called your attention to the fact, a moment ago, that the New Testament church there needed something to protect it from error. They did not have the written Testament as we now have. It was necessary that they have something. Now listen to what Paul says about this. He affirms, "And we have some to be apostles; and some, prophets, and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till," he just affirmed in verses 8 and 9 that he gave gifts unto men. Now he marks the duration of it in verse 13. The word "till" marks duration doesn't it, Mr. Welch. It marks duration. "Till we attain unto the unity of the faith," Now that didn't say until all believers become one. That's talking about unity of the faith, and the faith is the gospel. Until the gospel became a unit. (Moderator: 5 minute). There was a time that it was all oral; there was a time when some of it was oral and some of it was written. And during the time that any part of it was oral it was necessary that there be the element of inspiration, and was to last till the unity of the faith. In 1Cor. 13:8-10 the apostle Paul is in a discussion of spiritual gifts. In the 12th

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

chapter he named these spiritual gifts. In the 13th chapter he shows the importance of the Corinthians manifesting an attitude of love in the use of the spiritual gifts. In the latter part of the 13th chapter he shows duration of them and in the 14th chapter the regulation of them. But in 13:8-10, the apostle Paul affirms that these will cease when that which is perfect is come. In James 1:25 the Bible affirms that there is a perfect law, the law of liberty. In James 2:12 the Bible affirms we'll be judged by that law of liberty or that perfect law. We are told in Rom. 2:16 that we are to be judged by the gospel. I submit to you then that the gospel of Jesus Christ is identified as that which is perfect. And note, if you will, that the apostle affirmed that when that which is perfect is come, when that perfect completely revealed will would come, these **WOULD CEASE**. And I submit to you then during the age of inspired men that it was necessary that there be these miraculous gifts of the Spirit.

Duration Of Holy Spirit Baptism

I now submit to you this argument regarding the duration of Holy Spirit baptism. Water baptism is the only baptism that men can administer, (Matt. 28:18-20). And it was to last till the end of the world. I don't think he'll take issue with that. If he wants to, let him go ahead. But water baptism is that which men can administer. And it was to last until the end of the world, (Mt. 28:18-20). Jesus is the only administrator of Holy Spirit baptism, (Jno. 1:33). There were two baptisms in Acts the 10th Chapter, Cornelius and his household were baptized with the Holy Spirit and in water. Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized as well as we?" But when Paul wrote to the church at Ephesus (Eph. 4:4-6) he affirmed that there was only one baptism. Now observe if you will. One of them had ceased at the time that he wrote to the church at Ephesus. Note if you will, there were two baptisms in Acts 2, there were two in Acts 10 but Paul says there is only ONE in Eph. 4:45. Now I ask you this, what baptism is it that men can administer? It is water baptism! But how long was that to last? Jesus said "till the end of the world." Well which one is it that is in existence in Eph. 4? It's the one that

Friday – Moore. First Affirmative

will last till the end of the world. Which one was that? IT WAS WATER BAPTISTISM!

Summary

I want to summarize then, the points that we have covered in this speech. In the first place I submit to you, my good friends, that God does not act indiscriminately. He had a definite purpose for Holy Spirit Baptism. That purpose was to insure an accurate message to the human race. Men would not have to depend upon their own intelligence to make known God's will. For some time the New Testament was not revealed and written down hence, God saw to it that there were inspired men in the absence of an inspired book. The apostles were able to impart spiritual gifts to enable men to protect the church in the absence of an inspired written book, (Eph. 4:8-13). And I invite you to hear Mr. Welch.

The End Of Speech

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part One-B

Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Moore. It is with pleasure again this afternoon that I come before you to investigate this all-important question. I'd like to say with my opponent I'm just a little bit hoarse tonight. That's one thing that he and I are kind of in fellowship on. It is hoarseness but however I do appreciate the opportunity of discussing with you and Mr. Moore the subject of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, because it's troubling the country today in more ways than one. A doctrine that's much talked about throughout the country; and I do enjoy the opportunity this evening of appearing here to discuss with him this all-important subject. And to our radio audience tonight I want to call your attention to the fact that this is an important doctrine that you yourself can listen to also.

Answers To Moore's Questions

Now Mr. Moore's questions that he asked me I'd like to answer. And I want to clarify my position when I answer them.

- (1) Does baptism in the name of Jesus include both water baptism and Spirit Baptism?

Baptism in the name of Jesus is water baptism, the water element of the new birth. There are two elements to the new baptism, this one baptism. The Spirit element is Jesus himself, that comes in. Jesus said in John 3:5, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." So there's two elements in that birth or baptism. All right.

- (2) Does the Holy Spirit lead its recipients to teach conflicting doctrines?

No. Even though I'll answer that no, but say this that it's possible to have the baptism of the Holy Spirit and receive the Holy Ghost baptism and not know all the truth and be taught it later and learn it later. That's right. But the Holy Ghost wouldn't lead you to believe anything or teach anything that wasn't right.

- (3) Are you an inspired man as were the apostles?

I'm not an apostle, however I do have the baptism of the Holy

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

Ghost. Take it any way you want to.

- (4) What puts man into Christ, water baptism, Spirit baptism, or both?

The two elements of the one birth, the one baptism. The Bible said in Col. 3:15, I mean in 3:27, “As many as have been baptized into Christ...” and 1Cor. 12:13. “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.” There’s the two parts of the birth. The one baptism has two elements and two parts, that is the water and Spirit of course. Now back there on the Godhead question, Mr. Moore’s argument was one, but his one was three back there; but tonight his one’s one. I prophesied that. All right.

- (5) How many baptisms did John teach?

John taught the baptism of water and baptized people in water; but he did teach this; that in the New Testament era, when the kingdom of God comes that Christ would baptize in the Holy Ghost; which is the Spirit for the new birth of St. John 3:5.

That takes care of his questions and he wanted me to answer them and I did. All right.

Two Elements In Holy Spirit Baptism

Now in his first beginning here Mr. Moore starts right off saying that other men or people had the Holy Ghost before the day of Pentecost. I’m aware of that. Many people in the Old Testament had the Holy Ghost and the Holy Ghost came to many people back through them times. The very fact that the word baptize is used in receiving the Holy Ghost in this age specifies it is part of a birth. That’s right. That’s why that everybody that is born of the Spirit is baptized of the Spirit. I don’t think Mr. Moore will argue against the fact that when you’re born of water you’re baptized of water. That’s the same thing in St. John 3:5 where Jesus said these words, “That except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he could not enter the kingdom of God.” That’s right. Now the two elements of that birth; that’s what I’m contending for. And I shall be contending for that. And the Spirit element is baptism. And when John the Baptist came preaching, he said, “I indeed baptize you with water but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I’m not worthy to stoop down

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

and loose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire.” And the Bible said of course, “Our God is a consuming fire.” And when the Spirit of God comes in, it is God in us, the baptismal form of the new birth, the baptism form which is the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

The Comforter

Now the next Scripture that he goes to is the 14th chapter of St. John and where Jesus said, “I’ll pray the Father, and he’ll give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.” Now I asked Mr. Moore some questions and I knew he’d have to answer them like he did. I knew; I know what he believes about the Spirit, baptism in the Spirit, brethren receiving the Spirit. He believes that when you receive your baptism in water, the name in Acts 2:38, he believes that when you’re baptized in water that you receive, entitled to receive, the word, which is the word of the Spirit. That’s why he makes it afterwards. But he don’t believe in the direct operation of the Spirit. He don’t believe that. Now I’m going to prove tonight that there is a direct operation of the Holy Ghost. I’m going to prove that. And I’m going to disprove what he tried to prove. The first place here in the 14th chapter of St. John the word there for Comforter, it’s a Greek word paraclete.. That Greek word paraclete means advocate. That’s what it means. And the word advocate means call to one’s aid, one that pleads the cause of another. Now in Romans the 8th chapter and verse 26 the Bible said, “we know not what we should pray for as we ought: But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered.” And since the promise of the Comforter means advocate, paraclete, that’s a Greek word for it, where Jesus said that he’ll give you another Comforter that he may abide with you for ever. And it is receiving the Holy Ghost in this dispensation, the establishment of the New Testament. That’s not nearly right that is right. All right. Then Jesus said he should abide with you forever and the Comforter which was the promise of the Father.

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

About The Holy Spirit Teaching Or Revealing Truth

Now of course as you go on from there in the 15th chapter where it speaks about - the 16th chapter. “The Holy Spirit will teach you all things, bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” Why, there’s no argument there to help him or to condemn us on that. The Holy Spirit does that. That’s right. All Scripture, he brought the Scripture himself, has it on his chart here. All Scripture is given by inspiration, and whoever wrote the Bible, whether it was the apostles or whoever it was; they were inspired. In fact I’ll ask him this question. If the apostles wrote all the New Testament? He can answer that any way that he wants to when he comes back. That’s right. I’ll ask him that.

Now, he comes over here then on into the Holy Spirit leading you to all truth. And then he goes to Matthew 3:11;

John The Baptist?

John the Baptist was just talking about the twelve apostles. I don’t believe that! I believe John the Baptist was talking about the people he baptized. He came as the forerunner of Christ, he was putting them into the kingdom of God; and I believe that when he was putting them into the kingdom of God that he was talking about the time that God’s kingdom would be set up.

The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Challenged

Now the argument he presented about the purpose of the baptism of the Holy Ghost; he’s wrong on it. That’s right. Now I’m going to show you. Here in the 8th chapter of Acts he has on his chart here. In Acts the 8th chapter and verses 8-18, to impart spiritual gifts. Now that isn’t a spiritual gift there. That’s receiving the Holy Ghost. I asked him the question, you know, these questions I gave him here; and I asked him this one: “When a person is baptized, as mentioned in Acts 2:38, if a man is baptized when he receives the Holy Ghost?” Then I asked him if the gift of the Holy Ghost in Acts in 2nd chapter and the 10th chapter were the same

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

thing? And he said, “Yes.” Now you know why he said yes to that and no to this? That’s right. It’s not because it’s the Biblical truth but it’s because of his theory. Now in Acts the 8th chapter this verse here, the gift they received there comes from the Greek word dorea it doesn’t come from the Greek word charisma the one that the 12th chapter of 1Corinthians comes from. It comes from the Greek word dorea here in the 8th chapter of Acts. All right. The 10th chapter of Acts and the 2nd chapter of Acts come from the same thing. It is the same thing. That’s right. Now you notice in the 10th chapter of Acts that they received it and it’s called the gift of the Holy Ghost. That’s right. Notice that. In the chapter where Peter was preaching to the Gentiles the Bible said, “While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost”, paraclete the word Comforter comes from this Greek word, “the Holy Ghost fell upon them. They of the circumcision, as many as came with Peter were astonished, because on the Gentiles was poured out” the dorea, “the gift of the Holy Ghost.” That’s right. “For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God.” Now in Acts the 2nd chapter it’s the same Greek word, where Peter said, “Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the” (dorea) “gift of the Holy Ghost.” It’s the same Greek word in the 10th chapter. It’s the same Greek word in the 8th chapter. Yet he tells you that this one is one thing and that’s another. It is not. It’s the same thing. That being the case and that is the case. That’s right. That is the case. Then the promise Peter said in Acts 2:38, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Well in the 10th chapter what happened when they got the gift of the Holy Ghost? They spoke with tongues and magnified God. And in the 8th chapter when Simon wanted to buy this power and Peter said, “Thy money perish with thee because you thought that the gift,” that same word is used here, “might be purchased with money”. That’s right. All right and so we move on into this argument. Now that being true and that is true when the kingdom of God descended on the day of Pentecost, it came into existence with the Holy Ghost baptism, receiving

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

the Holy Ghost. That’s the way it started, in fact Paul said, Romans 14:17, “The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but is peace, and joy, and righteousness in the Holy Ghost.” Now the gifts of the Spirit comes from the Greek word charisma and means favor, kindness, help. Now if there should ever be any measuring you couldn’t measure the Holy Ghost. Who could measure the Holy Ghost? There is no measurement to God. That’s why the Scriptures said, “That he giveth not the Spirit by measure.” And that is that he had it because he is the Spirit of God. That word measure means the measure of length or capacity. Second chapter of St. John—I mean in John the third chapter and 34th verse where it’s speaking of Jesus and said it giveth not the Spirit to him by length or capacity or measure. That’s right. Comes from the Greek word methrone. That’s right. And so when you come down to receiving the Holy Ghost after the day of Pentecost there’s no difference in receiving the Holy Ghost, baptism of the Holy Ghost and the gift of the Holy Ghost. It’s the same identical thing every place and I wish to show that tonight.

Two Elements Of New Birth

Now in the 10th chapter of Acts where Peter had preached to them; I asked Mr. Moore this question about the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now this shows you the two elements of that birth and you can’t get into the kingdom of God unless you are born of the water and the Spirit. Now in Acts the 10th chapter they received the gift of the Holy Ghost the same Greek word as in the 2nd chapter and the 8th chapter; and when they received it, it fell on them. When Peter said, the Jews that came with Peter said these words “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” What happened to them? They received the Holy Ghost; that’s what it is. Now in the 8th chapter of Acts we find it’s the same Greek word there. That’s right. The 8th chapter of Acts. That’s what this Young’s Analytical Concordance I’ve got declares over here, I’m using as my authority tonight.

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

Philip In Samaria

Now in the 8th chapter of Acts, when Philip went down to Samaria and preached Christ to them; the Bible said, “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women,” All right. “And whenever the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God,”

Direct Operation Of Holy Spirit

I want you to notice something here again. Mr. Moore said this here, “That you receive the gift as you receive the word. I want to show here tonight why that there is a direct operation of receiving the Holy Spirit apart from receiving the word. Now according to Mr. Moore’s argument here, he’d have to say this: that they had already received what he calls that ordinary measure. I don’t know where he got it. God didn’t put it in the Book. I don’t know where he -where he gave him authority to do it. All right. That is, his brethren do; I presume he does too. I’ve debated with many of them. Then they had already received the ordinary measure when they’re baptized or just as soon as they could receive it of the word after they’re baptized. All right.

Still Referencing The Samaritans

Then when the apostles came down he claims they laid hands on them and they received what he calls the laying on of hands measure. I don’t know where he got that at. The scriptures said that the apostles said these words, “They heard that Samaria had already received the word of God.” That shows you plainly that receiving the word of God is not receiving the Spirit.

[The Bible said in John 4:24, “God is a Spirit: they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. For the Father seeketh such to worship him.”]

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

And then when they got down there, they had already been baptized; and they had received the word. And what did these apostles go all the way down there for? It was to pray for them. That you have a right to pray for people to receive the Holy Ghost. Brings in some of this mourner bench talk we talk about. They got down there. They prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost.

[What happened there on the day of Pentecost? They received the Holy Ghost. Peter said in Acts 10, “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we.”]

Now, the apostles came down and prayed for them and they received the Holy Ghost. That same Greek word says, (this lexicon I’ve got over here) that’s used in Acts 8, here in Acts 10:45. That’s right.

The Twelve Disciples Of John, Acts 19

Two Elements:

Here were people; I’m showing you the two elements of that birth. ALWAYS the two elements. Never did it happen at the same time. They received the Spirit and they were baptized, apart, never did it happen at the same time. In the case of Cornelius they received the Holy Ghost first, but they got the water. In the case of these folks here they received the water first but they got the Spirit. Now let’s go to the 19th chapter of Acts. And in the 19th chapter of Acts when Paul was down at Ephesus and he found certain disciples and he asked them this question” “Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed? They said. We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.” Or as one translation puts it, “whether the Holy Ghost be given.” And he said unto them, unto what were you baptized? They said, unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, they should believe on him that would come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were baptized in

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

the name of the Lord Jesus. And then Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.” That’s a clear-cut picture of the new birth as taught in the New Testament, to induct one into Christ.

Duration Argument Refuted (First Corinthians 13)

Now Mr. Moore comes over here with his chart on this side here, speaking about the New Testament church. Of course that’s his idea and opinion. He talks about Paul in 2Tim. 3:16 that said, “All scripture is given-by inspiration.” That’s right. I think that all of it is given by inspiration. The Bible said that the holy men of old wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And I think all of it comes down to Ephesians, Ephesians 4:13; I mean—”But when that which is perfect is come.”, the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians. I disagree with him on that. I do not believe there that the apostle had in mind the coming of the completion of the New Testament. I believe that he had in mind the resurrection of the dead. He’d been talking, in the 12th chapter, of the Spiritual gifts and how God giveth to every man to profit withal. About the aid and help in the body of Christ in this life here. That’s right. How that the Comforter, the paraclete, and then the kindness of the charisma to the gifts of the Spirit, that God’s Spirit would divide to everyone, so many as God’s Spirit would. The work of the Holy Ghost because he searches the mind and hearts of men, as Paul said in the 8th chapter of Romans. The thoughts in man. And he was talking about the end of the world, the end of time. And he spake about an imperfect state of man and then he talks about the perfect ending of man or state of him; of the church, the body of Christ; and speaks about when that which is perfect is come. There’ll be no more need for an advocate or paraclete or comforter; there’ll be no more need for the kindness of the Spirit helping our infirmities or the gifts of the Greek word charisma or the gifts of the Spirit. He tells us that he’s talking of the time when he’d participate in the resurrection and be perfectly received that as far as the church that is perfect at that time.

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

On The Word “Perfect”

Jesus said in his teaching one time, 10th chapter of Matthew, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” That could be the only time. Let me talk to you, you’ll never reach that status in this life here. There’ll be a day to come and a time to come, if we’re obedient to God, that we can reach that place in life or that place in the change of life.

Resurrection Of The Dead:

The 3rd chapter of Philippians and I want to call your attention to it. As the apostle Paul speaks of that time. In the 3rd chapter of Philippians he speaks about the resurrection of the dead. And he says here, “Yea doubtless, all things I count but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ. And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is law but that which is faith in Christ, the righteous which is by God of faith: That I may know him, and the power of the resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; that if by any means I might attain...” There’d be no need then for an advocate. There’d be no need then for one to heal my infirmities. There’d be no need then for the kindness and grace of the Holy Spirit. There’d be no need then for the edification of us as Paul said in the 14th chapter of 1 Cor. verse 2, “He that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God.” And “for he edifieth himself.” And the Spirit helpeth our infirmities; makes intercession for us.

That Which Is Perfect Continued:

In Romans 8:26 here’s the advocate, or the Comforter that Christ promised to his church. Mind you this takes place when we become perfect, there’ll be no one of his churches made perfect in that hour. There’ll be no need for knowledge partial. There’ll be no need for languages of tongues. There’ll be no need then because he’ll return to all

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

of them the language that God had in the beginning. And we’ll be in that perfect state; his church will be in that perfect place that is said, “Be ye perfect, also, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” Now, in the next verse Phil. 3:12, “Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.” Now that’s what he had in mind there. Mr. Moore says it means that,(Pointing to the chart) but he can’t prove it. He makes assumption it does, but he can’t prove it. That’s right.

Laying On Of Hands

Now let’s notice his argument on the 8th chapter of Acts. And then he talked about the laying hands on. Let’s go down and notice just a little, how we know what kind of men they were. Now of course he claims that they’re going to lay hands on them and give them, these men’s going to give them, a spiritual gift. That’s it, that’s the argument he’s putting up here tonight. All right. That’s exactly what Mr. Moore’s arguing here tonight.

The Selection Of Seven:

But in the 6th chapter of the book of Acts we find, as they were to call these men, “Wherefore, brethren, look you out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost,” they had to be full of it before they could even pray for them. His Job is putting something else of the same kind in something that’s already full of it. That’s his job. That’s not mine. But look at these men out here.

Back To Pentecost:

Now on the day of Pentecost they were filled with the Holy Ghost. That’s what happened in Acts 2:4, “They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

Back To Acts 6, The Selection Of Seven:

You know another thing about his doctrine, I want to show you another way he crosses himself up, and the Bible crosses him. In here they looked out men FULL of the Holy Ghost. Already had to be full of it before they laid their hands upon them. And he comes along here and tries to tell you that the apostles laid their hands on them and measured down and gave them a measure of what they were already full of. Now, I would like to see him work that one out.

Holy Ghost Not Given By Any Man:

Now, in the 13th chapter of Acts, right in here he talks about apostles laying hands on people and administering the Holy Ghost to them. There can’t no man give nobody the Holy Ghost. I take issue with Mr. Moore there. They may pray God and get the mind of the Spirit of the Lord in prayer. Fasting, they prayed when they laid their hands on these men. They ordained them to speak; prayed for God to direct them, in the men for this work here; and of course if they were typical men the Holy Ghost knew that. The Holy Ghost knows all and could use some men and these men here were full of it and these men became wonderful men. But they were full of the Holy Spirit before these apostles laid their hands on them.

Hands Laid On Saul And Barnabas:

Now here’s a man that’s an apostle getting hands laid on him. He’s getting hands laid on him. That’s right. He’s an apostle all right. He’s got him on his chart over here. Let’s see the works of an apostle. He’s got him on his chart. That’s only one of them. At least that’s the argument anyhow. In the 13th chapter of Acts and beginning with the 2nd verse, “And they ministered to the Lord, speaking of these prophets in the church there, 1st verse, “And the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” Now

Friday – Welch’s First Negative

here’s an apostle. Now this man, I’m showing you how it turns backwards to him in the verse here. He claims the apostles are giving people these spiritual gifts and here’s an apostle meeting with a bunch of brethren here and of course they all have the Holy Ghost already and all of it, just like over there in the 6th chapter of Acts. “When they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them they sent them away. And they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost.” Now these men didn’t give the apostle the Holy Ghost there. It was a recognition through their prayers that the Holy Ghost, manifestation of it, that these men would be blessed of God in this work that they were going to do. In other words that’s why it was. I’m going to ask him when he comes back here if these men here by laying their hands gave them spiritual gifts? And another place we find, that crosses him again. In the 9th chapter of Acts we find a man that’s not an apostle laying hands on a man that is an apostle, or becomes an apostle when he gets the Holy Ghost. Acts the 9th chapter in the conversion of Saul. And he said, “But the Lord said to him, go thy Way.” Speaking to Ananias, “For he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and the kings and the children of men. I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name’s sake. And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him.” That’s where he puts his hand on this man Saul. Here’s a man that’s not an apostle laying hands on a man that is going to be an apostle. That’s right. “And, putting his hands on him said Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee by the way, has sent me, that thou mightiest receive thy sight, and the Holy Ghost.” Now I wonder if Mr. Moore here tonight will say that Paul had the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that’s the way he got it. And that crosses him up, that’s many, many reasons why I cannot accepted the theory that these men produce about the cessation of the Holy Ghost and the dwelling of God’s Spirit in the hearts and bodies of those that believe in God.

The End of Speech

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Two-A

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I’m happy to be before you to reply to the speech to which you’ve just listened, by my friend and opponent Mr. Welch.

Who Has The Holy Spirit?

I want to take up his speech as I have endeavored to do each time, item by item, and statement by statement, and examine what he has to say. He talks about this being a much talked about subject even as I suggested to you in my introduction and posed a question to Mr. Welch, which he conveniently failed to notice. Not only is it a much talked about subject, Mr. Welch, but there are people who claim to have it, who teach theories contrary to yours. I asked you if they had it and you answered a question and said that the Holy Spirit doesn’t lead its recipients to teach conflicting doctrines, so obviously you think they don’t. For instance the Assemblies of God, believe there are three persons in the Godhead. They claim to have Holy Spirit baptism. Mr. Welch answered my question number two and said that the Holy Spirit doesn’t lead its recipients to teach conflicting doctrines. He thinks he has it; he’s teaching the truth. He doesn’t think they do!

Answers To Moore’s Questions

- (5) “Does baptism in the name of Jesus include both water baptism and Spirit baptism?”

And he answered the question by saying that baptism in Jesus’ name was water baptism, but he said that the Spirit element is Jesus. That’s what you said wasn’t it, Mr. Welch? That’s what you said. Yet, you affirmed the first two nights that Jesus was the only person in the Godhead and the definition of person is a fleshly bodily form. Now he says that the Spirit element is Jesus IN THE NEW BIRTH, A FLESHLY BODILY FORM.

- (6) I’ve already dealt with that about this idea of the Holy Spirit LEADING its recipients.

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Now let me suggest that to you again as that may not be just as funny as you think it is; it’s not funny to Mr. Welch. But observe if you will. Answering this question he said that the water is the element of the baptism in the name of Jesus and that the Spirit is the element and that’s Jesus. He nodded and said that was right. But you know that he affirmed that Jesus is the only person and that a person is a fleshly, bodily form. Therefore, You have a fleshly bodily form being that element that he calls Spirit!

- (3). “Are you an inspired man as were the apostles?”

He said he’s not an apostle but that he does have Holy Spirit baptism. Well, Mr. Welch, do you think that it fell upon them for one purpose and upon you for another purpose? Is that what you intend to convey? Is that what you intend to convey by that, that the apostles received it for one PURPOSE but that you received it for ANOTHER purpose? That it inspired them but that it didn’t inspire you? By the way, back to that question number two, the Holy Spirit does not lead its recipients to teach conflicting doctrine. You say you had the Holy Spirit. I AM JUST WONDERING WHICH TIME IT LEAD YOU TO DEFINE PERSON. You defined it one way with brother Belue and another way with me. Which time did the Holy Spirit lead you to those definitions?

- (4) Which puts one into Christ, water baptism, Spirit baptism or both?

He cited Gal. 3:27 and I assume from that, that you meant that that was water baptism. And in 1Cor. 12:13 that that was Spirit baptism. “For by one Spirit were ye all baptized into one body.” And he said that’s the two parts of the one birth. And I have in my notes, in a moment, to take up the statement that he made concerning one and three, and I’ll deal with that answer when I get there.

- (7) “How many baptisms did John Teach?”

And if he told me how many I never did get it. He said water baptism. That is not what I asked you. I knew it was water baptism. I wanted to know HOW MANY IT WAS! One! TWO! Or three, Mr. Welch? Now that wasn’t hard for you to answer was it? You could

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

have said one, two, or three, or a half something and then qualified it. That’s what I’ve said to you each night; give me a clear, definite answer. I’m going to assume that you said one. Now observe, ladies and gentlemen. His idea is this: That when you have the matter of the new birth and since the Bible teaches in Jno. 3:3-5, “Except one be born of the water and spirit” now he thinks that is saying except you’re baptized in water and baptized in the Spirit, and he says that’s not two baptisms, that’s two elements in one baptism. I want you to observe, for instance in John’s baptism you had an element, you had a design, and you had an action. That was one baptism. In baptism in the name of Jesus, you have an element you have a design and you have an action. That’s one baptism. In Holy Spirit baptism you have an element you have a design, and you have an action. And that’s two baptisms. And he’ll never get out from beneath the force of the fact that he’s affirming two baptisms.

Baptism With Fire (Mt. 3:11):

Then he cited Mt. 3:11 and said baptism with fire and then cited the fact that God is a consuming fire and he thinks that Mt. 3:11 is related to something that happens to the child of God, NOT, in this life, that whenever you’re baptized in the Holy Spirit, you are then baptized in fire. I just want to take a look at the passage. As I suggested to you, it’s important to turn and read behind these fellows whenever they’re talking. Let’s just do that. Let’s just take a look at the context of Mt. 3 beginning with verse 10, “And even now the axe lieth at the root of the tree: every tree therefore that brings not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.” What do you think that’s talking about, Mr. Welch? That’s verse 10. Now listen to verse 11. “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.” Fire occurs in all three of these

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

passages: He takes verse 11 and says that’s what is going to happen when you get the Holy Spirit baptism. You remember I called your attention to this fact a moment ago when I went to the board and suggested to you that in Mt. 3 this passage is not talking about who will get anything but it’s talking about WHO CAN DO IT. And just look at what John says. John said, “I baptize you with water but he that comes after me is mightier than I.” He tells us what Jesus is able to do. He is able to baptize men in the Holy Spirit and he’s able to baptize them in fire. John said I can only baptize them in water. And the fire of that passage is identified in verse 10 and verse 12 and has to do with ETERNAL FIRE.

Direct Operation

Jno. 14:26 – he’s going to prove a direct operation. And he gets in trouble on his use of the Greek word he first cited here. I want to show you now what he did. In Rom. 8:26 this word “paraclete” is used. He said this has to do with the matter of one of like kind or a Comforter, and of course that’s right. Then he went to 1Cor. 13 at the close of his speech and he said, “Now that’s that paraclete that’s the same thing” didn’t you, Mr. Welch? That’s right isn’t it, Mr. Welch? And yet, when he went over to Acts 8 he found the word “gift,” and said that is one kind of Greek word and that’s another kind over in 1Cor. 13. Not talking about the same thing. So he cited the word paraclete and it’s talking about the same thing; then, he cites the word gift and it’s not talking about the same thing. I’ll deal with that gift argument that he made, a little later on. There’s no issue with the word “paraclete” meaning one of like kind or Comforter.

Promise To The Apostles:

Jno. 15:26, he said that doesn’t help me. I call your attention to the fact that the context of these passages indicates that Jesus WAS present with his apostles. I cited the passage that showed that to be so and this was a promise made to them. He didn’t take up the arguments I made at all.

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Did Apostles Write All The New Testament?:

He wants to know if I thought the apostles wrote all the New Testament. I do not think any such thing. Of course not! Eph. 3 affirms that the apostles and prophets both could. Now observe, if you will, and take it down and answer my argument. One of the spiritual gifts that the apostles were able to impart was that of prophecy, 1Cor. 12. The gift of prophecy enabled them to reveal divine truth, Eph. 3:1-5. That’s why someone other than an apostle could do it.

John The Baptist:

He said “John the Baptist was talking about those he baptized.” I deny that he was talking about any such thing, as I’ve already pointed out.

On The Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism

Then in regard to the purpose of baptism, or my argument on its purpose. Acts 8:16-17, and then I said Acts 2:38. Now, Mr. Welch you misrepresented me on this and you misrepresented your question. You misrepresented your question and you misrepresented me! Now he talks about the matter of the Spirit in Acts 10, the Spirit in Acts 8 and that in Acts 2:38.

Charge Of Misrepresentation:

You said it in your speech. But your question said Acts 2:4! Your question said Acts 2:4! Now, I want to show you the question that he asked me and he replied as if I was answering about Acts 2:38. Now look: the question is, “In receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost in Acts 2:4, is it the same experience that the Gentiles received in Acts 10?” And then he cited Acts 2:38. Your question is not talking about Acts 2:38. It’s talking about Acts 2:1-4. I didn’t say that I thought Acts 2:38 was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I said Acts 2:4 Mr. Welch.

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Gifts Of The Spirit

Now Welch comes to the term gift and his argument is this: that because you have in Acts 2:38 the gift of the Spirit, and because you have in Acts 2:1-4, the apostles being filled with the Spirit and later on in Acts 10 and Acts 11 the gentiles about to receive the gift of the Spirit, he concludes that they all received the same thing. Are you arguing that because two things are said to be a gift, they are the same, Mr. Welch? Is that your argument? Is that what you’re arguing? Just because two things are said to be a gift they must be the same thing; that two things can’t both be referred to as a gift and be DIFFERENT. Because the apostles received the gift, because Acts 2:38 promises a gift, because Cornelius received a gift, and because other places refer to a gift, he thinks that means they are all the SAME gift. Well, in Rom. 6:23 the Bible says, “And the gift of God is eternal life.” Does that make eternal life baptism in the Holy Spirit? Oh, some one in the audience is going to help Mr. Welch. They think that he needs it. They say yes, that it is! Eternal life is the gift OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. Note this if you will. When Mr. Welch is debating the Baptist on the matter of the impossibility of apostasy he argues with them on the idea of eternal life being a present possession. Now, Mr. Welch, you’d better teach your brethren something on that hadn’t you? He argues with the Baptist that eternal life is not a present possession. He thinks Holy Spirit baptism IS. Now, some of his brethren said, “Yes, eternal life is Holy Spirit baptism and is therefore a present possession.” DO YOU BELIEVE ONCE SAVED, ALWAYS SAVED?

And of course Mr. Welch, Mr. Gamblin and my moderator have all asked the audience not to demonstrate. You’re out of order when you do.

In Rom. 14:17 the matter of not eating and drinking in the Holy Ghost is brought to our attention. And, as I pointed out to you, that just because a passage says the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit that doesn’t mean that it’s Holy Spirit Baptism. What did he have to say about the passage I cited that pointed out that here were folks who had the spirit, were full of the

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

Spirit, were filled with the Spirit but that it wasn’t Holy Spirit Baptism? He didn’t touch top, side or bottom of it!

Measure Of Holy Spirit

He throws the word measure around, and I don’t think that I used that in my first speech. I usually talk about the gifts of the Spirit. I don’t think that I even said it. I may have but I don’t think I did. And yet, he had his speech made up that I was going to talk about the measure of the Spirit, so that’s what he talked about. He cited Jno. 3:34 and of course, the Revised Version says that he giveth not the Spirit unto his Son by measure, doesn’t it, Mr. Welch? DOESN’T IT? He says that there is no difference in the measures of the Spirit, or the gifts of the Spirit.

Differences In The Gifts Of The Holy Spirit:

I want at this time to suggest to you, Mr. Welch has advanced the argument that all of these gifts of the Spirit are the SAME; that there is no difference in them whatsoever and that if you have the Spirit, you have the baptism of the Holy Spirit and there’s no difference whatsoever. Now observe the argument I’m going to advance regarding the difference in the gifts of the Spirit. Note if you will. In the first place, the fact that two things are said to be a gift does not argue that they are the SAME. You know that as well as I do. This New Testament might be a gift and my watch might be a gift, but my watch is not my New Testament. Simply because two things are said to be a gift doesn’t mean that they are the same things. Note in connection with this. The gift of God is eternal life, Rom. 6:23. In Acts 8:20 the Apostle Peter said that Simon thought you could buy the gift of God with money. Was he talking about eternal life there? The New Testament makes a definite distinction. Note if you will, for instance, the apostles received Holy Spirit Baptism in Acts 2:1-4, they could perform signs; they could impart Spiritual gifts. But notice if you will that Philip went down to Samaria where he preached the Gospel. He was able to preach, he was able to perform signs and wonders; and yet, the record states the apostles came down from Jerusalem and laid their

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

hands on the brethren. NOW WHY DIDN'T PHILIP DO IT, Mr. Welch? Now watch it if you will. There is a difference then in what the APOSTLES could do and what PHILIP could do. Philip could perform signs he couldn't impart spiritual gifts to others. Note also in connection with this. In Rom. 8:9 the record says, "If you have not the Spirit of Christ you are none of his." I assume you recognize that all the Romans had the spirit. That's right isn't it, Mr. Welch? And yet, in Rom. 1:11 the Apostle Paul said, "I desire to come unto you that I might impart some spiritual gifts." DON'T YOU FOLKS SEE THAT? They needed some spiritual gifts, Paul said. But yet, they had the Spirit. There is the distinction. There's a distinction in the gifts of the Spirit that all obedient believers have the gift that was given by the laying on of an apostle's hands and Holy Spirit Baptism. He says there is no difference. The Bible says there is.

Incidentals On worship In Spirit:

And then Jno. 4:24 and that passage simply affirms that God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth. That just simply affirms that in Worship there must be a proper OBJECT. There is a proper LAW that must regulate man, and there is also a MANNER involved. It doesn't touch top, side or bottom of anything that he's talking about.

Purpose of The Spirit In Acts 10:47-48:

Now why didn't he come up and deal with the argument I advanced on this passage concerning the matter of Cornelius? I pointed out to you that the Bible not only affirmed that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit but it told us why. Mr. Welch, why did you ignore it? Was that just convenient for you to ignore it? Why didn't you deal with my argument? You have the negative tonight. You are suppose to be following and examining what I am saying. You've been debating 35 years. You do not know that the negative is suppose to examine the arguments that has been presented by the affirmative? (Moderator: 15 minutes). I pointed

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

out that the New Testament not only affirms that Cornelius had the Spirit but told us the PURPOSE.

Audience Demonstration:

Hold my time brother Bruce. Now I know that Mr. Gamblin doesn't want that and that's uncalled for. Laughing does not answer an argument and I'm going to ask you kindly to refrain from it. And I make this explanation again to the radio audience. That doesn't represent the entire audience, this laughing and giggling. There's just a few that's doing it. The majority of the people are orderly. Start my time Mr. Bruce. These matters are serious and I think Mr. Welch recognizes it; I know his moderator does. They have been gentlemen in this respect. And when I press him for an answer there is nothing wrong with that and he knows there isn't..

Acts 10 Continued:

Observe then, in connection with this. The New Testament teaches that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit but it tells us why he received it. In Acts 11, I pointed out why. I took the time to read the verses and pointed out why. It was for the purpose, Acts 11:15-19, of convincing the Jews that the Gentiles were ACCEPTED. In Acts 15 Peter said it was for the purpose of assuring the Gentiles that they had been ACCEPTED. Now that's an argument that he needs to consider. It shows WHY Cornelius received the Spirit.

Laying On Of Hands

The 12 Disciples Of John, Acts 19:1-5:

I want you to note that in these passages cited, they call attention to the fact that they laid hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit, Mr. Welch. Now, is that the way the people receive the Holy Spirit today? Is that what you're contending for? Through the laying on of the apostles hands. Let's just deal with his argument in regard to this laying on of hands. He comes to Acts 13 and he wants to know whether or not I think those people laid their hands on Paul for the purpose of imparting

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

spiritual gifts. I think no such thing. You see, Mr. Welch, that’s the way you argue. I don’t argue that way. Here’s the way Mr. Welch argues: that here is one instance where something is said to be a gift, here’s another instance where something is said to be a gift. That therefore, proves they are the same thing. One time a man is said to be full of the Spirit, another time one is said to be full of the Spirit; therefore, these expressions mean the same thing. Even though he just ignores the Spirit arguments I advanced at the outset of the speech. So now, he comes up and wants to take his rules of procedure and apply them to me because I pointed out that the Bible taught the Holy Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles’ hands, Acts 8:16 -17, Rom. 1:11. I didn’t manufacture it. That’s what the Book says. Now he finds an occasion where hands were laid on and he takes this idea, because, in one instance when hands were laid on the Spirit was given, and tries to force me to argue like he does and think that’s what was done there. You see, I don’t argue in that manner, I look at the context Mr. Welch. In Acts 13, as was the case not only here but in other times, for instance Gal. 2, the hands were laid on for the purpose other than giving of the Holy Spirit, not only in Acts 13 but also in 1Tim. 5:22, it sometimes meant only appointment, It sometimes meant endorsement or the right hand of fellowship, Gal. 2:9. So every time it occurs it doesn’t mean that it has to do with the Spirit, but whenever that’s what it says, Mr. Welch, I believe it. DO YOU? “When he saw that through the laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Spirit was given.” Acts 8:18. Now that passage tells us WHAT was given.

Saul’s Conversion In Acts 9

Now the answer to Acts 9, let’s look at it. He cites Acts 9 in the case of Saul’s conversion. Mr. Welch would have you believe that the purpose for Ananias laying his hands on him was to give the Spirit. Is that what you intended to convey? Let me answer your question first of all. I believe that Paul was baptized in the Holy Spirit. The occasion of his baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament. Now watch it if you will.

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

I just want to turn to Acts 9 and read. If you have your New Testament open it and let’s take a look at what actually transpired. The purpose of Ananias coming was twofold according to the statement of the Lord as well as Ananias. It was, number one, that Paul might receive his sight. And it was, number two, that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit. Now why did he lay his hands on him? Do you know, Mr. Welch? Do you know why Ananias laid his hands on Paul? Let me read it to you. In Acts 9:12 we read, “And he hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands on him, that he might receive his sight.” Laid his hands on him that he might receive his sight. Now, that passage tells you why Ananias laid his hands on him. That he might receive his sight. Do you believe that? I believe that because that is what the passage says. It doesn’t say anything about Ananias laying his hands on him to give him the Holy Spirit. But in Acts 8 it does. And in Rom. 1:11 it does, doesn’t, it Mr. Welch? Doesn’t it, Mr. Welch? All right now, let me get back to my notes.

The New Birth

Inducts One Into Christ?:

Then he said the new birth is to induct one into Christ. I want you to note this closely. The new birth inducts one into Christ, Mr. Welch says. Then he further affirms that in Acts 2:38, now I want to put this on the board, I want you to look at it. The new birth, according to Mr. Welch, involves water baptism and Spirit baptism. The two elements of the one birth and he says that it takes both of them to induct you into Christ. You’ve got water, you’ve got Spirit and then out here you have Christ. Now he says it takes both of those to induct you into Christ. Yet, he cites Acts 2:38 and he says that’s Spirit baptism. That’s your argument isn’t it, Mr. Welch? Now watch it. Acts 2:38 says repent, be baptized, remission of sins, then the Holy Spirit. Now look at it if you will. According to Mr. Welch a man couldn’t get into Christ until he got out here (pointing to the chart referring to water and spirit). That’s Mr. Welch’s argument. He didn’t get into Christ until he got out here but he had remission of sins here, (before the coming of the Holy Spirit). He had remission of sins

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

outside of Christ. When you come to the stand Mr. Welch, come to the blackboard and explain it to the audience. You said it takes water and Spirit both to put a man into Christ. Observe if you will. You say Acts 2:38 is talking about Spirit baptism. Now note if you will, remission of sins precedes the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38. According to Mr. Welch they were not in Christ until they got the Holy Spirit, yet, they had remission of sins. He has remission of sins outside of CHRIST, (Moderator: 10 minutes). Thank you.

Inspiration And That Which Is Perfect:

And then in regard to my chart, regarding inspiration and that which is perfect is come. He cited numerous passages that had to do with the resurrection of the dead and because in one instance the term perfect was used with respect to Paul’s desire concerning the resurrection of the dead, he followed his usual procedure.

Critique Of Welch’s Reasoning Procedure:

Mr. Welch’s procedure is this. Here is a gift, this is a gift and therefore they must be the same. If one thing is said to be perfect over here and something else is perfect over there it must be the same thing. He follows this procedure all the time, but now watch if you will. Mr. Welch, take this down and deal with it, will you please? In 1Cor. 13:13 Paul said, “now abideth faith, hope, and love.” Now that’s going to abide when that which is perfect is come. How do you think that they were going to continue to have hope after the resurrection of the dead? But that is what we hope for. Paul said in Rom. 8:24, “We don’t hope for that which we already possess.” He is talking about the perfectly revealed will and while you’re at it explain Paul’s illustration in 1Cor, 13 where he said, “When I was a child, I spake as a child and I thought as a child; when I became a man I put away childish things.” You mean when he became a man that means when he is coming back from the dead? While he was in the flesh he was doing childish things? This has to do with partial revelation. Whenever the completed revelation came that which was in part was

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

done away. I’ve already mentioned he has himself crossed on those Greek words. You see he uses the word paraclete in Jno. 14; and he says now that’s Holy Spirit baptism. He comes over to 1Cor. 13 and says that paraclete is talking about the same thing, but then he wants to make a little argument on gift, he has no argument on Rom. 8. He wants to make a distinction between that in Rom. 8 and that which is in 1Cor. 13. But you can’t do it now, Mr. Welch. One time it’s the same thing and the next time it isn’t! I suggest to you that you’d better stay in the English. “Be ye therefore perfect.” Never reach it. But do you believe that the Lord intends for us to try? The Lord give’s us a perfect standard. Can you imagine him giving us any less? And we are to reach for it. Then I’ve already dealt with the argument on 1Cor. 14 the matter of tongues and Rom. 8:26.

Mediator-Ship Of Christ

Now, Mr. Welch, don’t you remember the first part of this debate, you laughed at the idea that we have an intercessor when I called attention to the fact that Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us. Well you can’t laugh it off Mr. Welch. You remember you made the argument. Now you argue properly and deal with it! You remember that I suggested to you that he uses DOUBLE TALK and laughs, trying to answer an argument. But he laughed when I called attention to the fact that Christ ever liveth to make intercession for US. He just HOOTED at the IDEA. He cites Rom. 8:26 and says the Spirit maketh intercession. Then he tells us Christ and the Holy Spirit are the same thing, so Christ is making intercession! What’s your argument to that? He wasn’t the first two nights, but he is tonight. And I submit that you deal with the argument.

Being filled With The Spirit

Acts 6, that’s where he talked about being full of the Spirit and I’ve already pointed out that just because the Bible teaches that someone is said to be full of the Spirit that doesn’t mean Holy Spirit baptism. That doesn’t mean, necessarily, that I have to give some passages for it. I cited five passages, Mr. Welch, in advance to show you that that didn’t

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

necessarily follow. Why didn’t you take them up and show that they were false arguments? Zacharias was filled with the Spirit. Does that mean he had Holy Spirit baptism? Did he? Elizabeth was filled with the Spirit. Did she have Holy Spirit baptism?

Laying On Of Hands

In Acts 13:1-5, in the matter of the laying on of hands and I’ve already called attention to that. And as I pointed out to you, Mr. Welch, simply endeavors to take his kind of reasoning and apply it to me. He’ll reason in a certain fashion; he’ll take his kind of reasoning and try to apply it to me. Because full in one passage means one thing it must be the same thing in the next passage. Because gift means one thing in one passage it must mean it in the next passage. Then he tries to take that kind of reasoning and apply it to me. I know this is so, because; I pointed out in one passage the laying on of hands imparted spiritual gifts, he then took other passages and tried to make it appear that I was arguing that they also said that. You see I don’t reason that. That’s your kind of arguing.

Then he asked me the question, “Did those men by the laying on of hands give the Holy Spirit?” Acts 13:1-5 and I’ve already answered it with an emphatic no. Then Acts 9:10-17, in regard to the matter of Saul having hands laid on him. I called your attention to verse 12, the record tells us WHY Ananias laid his hands on him. And would I say that Paul had Holy Spirit baptism? And I said that he did. And that answers the gentlemen’s speech item by item, statement by statement, and passage by passage. How much time do I have left now? (Moderator: 4 minutes).

Summary Of Speech

I want now to call your attention to the argument advanced in connection with this chart. And I submit to you that Mr. Welch hasn’t touched top, side, or bottom of this. And ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you to just stop and reason with me for a moment.

Chart On Acts 1:8

Holy Spirit To Give Power:

1. Revealed Divine Truth
2. Validate Message By Signs
3. Impart Special Gifts By Laying On Of Hands
4. Acts 8:18

Purpose For Sending The Holy Spirit:

Whenever the Lord walked and talked on the face of this earth with the apostles, with his ambassadors, he simply said to them, “I’m going to leave but I’ll not expect you to depend upon your own intelligence and you own ability to reveal my will.” Don’t you see that? It was necessary then that the Lord enable them to reveal to us his will ACCURATELY. And therefore, the record tells us that the word was in men, inspired men, (2Cor. 4:7). Why didn’t you take up the argument as I presented it and endeavor to answer it? Before I leave this, Observe if you will the chart over on this side. The Holy Spirit gave the apostles power, Acts 1:8.

Only The Apostles Could Impart Gifts Of The Spirit:

I want you once again to observe this and to impress upon your mind that the Bible teaches, for instance in Acts 8 that Philip went down to Samaria and he COULD perform signs and wonders; but, when it came to the matter of imparting Spiritual gifts he couldn’t do that. The apostles came down and imparted Spiritual gifts. Now Mr. Welch says there’s no difference. I want you to see that there is OBVIOUSLY a difference here. And then I want you to remember also that in Rom. 8, “But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is not his.” All of the Romans had the spirit. But observe if you will, Paul said, “I desire to come unto you that I might impart some spiritual gift,” Rom. 1:11.

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

So, even though they all had the Spirit, yet, they didn’t have the spiritual gifts! Now let him deal with these arguments. The apostles had the power to reveal divine truth, to perform signs and wonders and impart spiritual gifts; and as I pointed out regarding the prophets, a moment ago, prophecy was one of the spiritual gifts and prophets could reveal divine truth. Eph. 3:1-5. But now note if you will.

The Word Was Not Always Recorded:

As this passage clearly contends there was a time that some of the word was oral and some of it was written. And I submit to you that so long as the word was oral in men it was necessary that these things exist. And that’s why the apostle affirmed in Eph. 4:13 that they were to last TILL.

Duration Of Gifts:

What did he have to say about that marking duration? They were to last TILL. That means they were to cease WHEN! That’s why the apostle affirmed they would cease when that which is perfect is come. I want to put this back on the board. I erased it a moment ago, but let me put it back again because Mr. Welch will certainly pay attention to it this time. One of my major arguments was the duration. In fact of the matter, that’s what the entire proposition has to do with, the duration. You didn’t say a word about my argument, Mr. Welch. Why? Is it that you don’t know you’re suppose to? Observe if you will. The argument that I advanced is this. That when it comes to the matter of baptism, the Bible teaches that MEN can administer water baptism, Mt. 28:18-20. That is the baptism that’s to last to the end of the world. Observe if you will. In Acts 2 there were two baptisms. In Acts 10 there were two baptisms. In Eph. 4 there was one. One had ceased. Now which one ceased? Now when he gets up and talks about two elements in one birth, you remember the argument that I made on John’s baptism. About there being an element and about there being a design, and there being an action. And watch him take the argument up and deal with it. But observe

Friday – Moore’s Second Affirmative

if you will. The baptism men could administer was to last to the end of the world and that is water baptism. Holy Spirit baptism, observe if you will, Jesus Christ was the one that could baptize men in the Holy Spirit and for a purpose. Paul wrote to the church at Ephesus and he said, “There is one baptism.” I think you folks know full well that water baptism is water baptism and Holy Spirit baptism is Holy Spirit baptism. When you have one baptism and one baptism you have two. And incidentally, that’s when he said, that I could see three in one but I couldn’t see two in one. Well there’s a great deal of difference between the two, Mr. Welch. Now you see he laughed before I ever made the argument. And, Mr. Welch is doing the very thing that I told you he was doing. That’s an evasion of the law of rationality. He knows that it is, it doesn’t answer the argument. NOW SUPPOSE YOU GET UP AND ANSWER THE ARGUMENT, Mr. Welch, you laughed at that before I made it! IT WASN’T FUNNY! It was rude, absolutely rude. I want to make the argument. In regard to the matter of there being three persons in deity there is the same element; same element! When it comes to the matter of Holy Spirit baptism and water baptism, you have two elements two elements, you have H₂O and you have the matter of Spirit or deity. That’s why I can’t get the second one, thank you Now Mr. Welch.

The End of Speech

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Two-B

I can speak this last thirty minutes just as quick as anyone. I am immensely enjoying this debate. I like to talk about the Lord and his Word.

Cessation of Holy Spirit Baptism

Now I want to take up the argument again of my opponent about the ceasing of the baptism of the Holy Spirit which I deny. Just as much as I did 32 years ago and probably will be doing if I live to be 100 years old. Unless a lot stronger argument can be put up against it than anything that Mr. Moore or anybody else has ever done that I’ve listened to. It is the same thing the same argument and yet it does not Biblically pan out right.

Johns Baptism:

Now in the 3rd chapter of St. Matthew, where Jesus said, John the Baptist said, “I baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire.” I quoted that God was a consuming fire and when you receive the Holy Ghost, God comes to you, even on the day of Pentecost. God is a spirit. John 4:24 said, “God is a spirit; they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth.” The spirit without the truth is not enough. And the truth without the spirit is not enough. It takes the spirit and the truth to worship God and in his kingdom that was to be established, John the Baptist was a friend of the bridegroom. He came preaching and baptizing people. Yet he taught that Jesus in the setting of his kingdom would teach and give to us his spirit into our hearts. At the establishment of his kingdom and John, to be sure you have it right, used the terminology baptize. Now Mr. Moore, I don’t think would argue against the fact that baptism in water is a birth. I think he would say that. And John the Baptist knew, whether he knows it or not, that baptism in Spirit was a part of this birth entrance into God’s everlasting kingdom. Jesus confirmed that in John 3:5 and said to Nicodemus, “Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom

of God.” Then of course this Jewish ruler wanted to know how he could be. Jesus said to him, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,” There is a Spirit and the water, if Christ told the truth and I believe he did, in the entrance into the kingdom of God.

The Comforter Promised:

Now on the day of Pentecost the kingdom was established. In the 14th chapter of St. John, as I pointed out to you in my last speech, Christ said, “I’ll pray the Father.” The first part of his talk there, “He’ll give you another Comforter,” paraclete the Greek word, which means Advocate, “and he shall abide with you forever. Even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him but you know him: for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.” And in the next verse he said. “I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you.” And that’s why I answered his question like I did. In the baptismal entrance into Christ, water and Spirit and the Spirit was Christ in his Spirit, giving to his people, in Spirit he fills the universe. Never have I argued and never will; Mr. Moore makes you believe that I’ve argued that at any time when you receive the spirit of Christ that you receive the person of Christ. You may remember how I illustrated in the Godhead argument like a light up here and illustrated the bulb the Son, and the power in the bulb would illustrate the Father in Christ the person was Christ and the Holy Spirit illustrated by the rays that came from him to us. You remember that. You haven’t forgotten that the other night. That’s right. So when Christ set his kingdom up on the day of Pentecost we find that in the first chapter of Acts, the Scripture here Mr. Moore tried to misconstrue and he said that nobody but the apostles could receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost. These men asked Christ the question, “Will you at this time restore the kingdom again to Israel?” And he said to them, “It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But you shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: you shall be witness to me in Judea,

in Samaria, in Jerusalem, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.” He had reference to the establishment of his church and the work of his Spirit in his church.

Describing Events On Day Of Pentecost

And on the day of Pentecost it happened. These men returned, the Bible said, when in an upper room in the first chapter of Acts where there were about 120 gathered together. Mary the mother of Jesus was there. I want you to get the setting now. I know that Mr. Moore tried to argue that nobody but the twelve apostles received the Holy Ghost here at Pentecost but he’s wrong. First place, in that number of disciples, there were about 120 the Bible said and Mary the mother of Jesus was there. They chose one of the number to be an apostle and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. He was an apostle. There was twelve apostles there in the group; about 120 with the twelve apostles were there. And on the day of Pentecost, the Bible said, “suddenly there came a sound from heaven, like a rushing mighty wind, filling all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were ALL filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. When this was noised abroad, they came together, and were confounded, because they heard them speak and glorify God in these different tongues and dialect as the Holy Spirit spoke through them.” That’s right.

No One Understood Them Because They Spoke In Unknown Tongues?: And mind you at the same time they spoke in the unknown tongue but no man understood and I’m saying that tonight because the Bible confirms that. Listen! They came together and said these men are drunk. “Peter said these men are not drunk as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that.” What? A fulfillment of a Scripture that was spoken by the prophet Joel. That scripture is being fulfilled.

Prophecy Of Joel Fulfilled?:

And he said this is that spoken by the prophet Joel; “it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and daughters shall prophesy. And upon my handmaidens will I pour out;” Mary was in that number. That’s right. And if the Scripture was fulfilled I want to say that there was somebody there besides the twelve apostles. Then one of them was a woman. That’s right.

Moore Charged To Figure It Out:

That’s your part to figure out, Mr. Moore, when you come back tomorrow night. Of course you won’t get a chance at it tonight but you can chew it up and get ready for it tomorrow night. That’s right. All right!

The Kingdom Is Set Up:

Now his kingdom starts on its way. That’s right. It sat up there and it came into existence with the baptism, which in the terminology of this day and age is that element of that birth, the same as water baptism, that places one into the kingdom of God. And Jesus said that. He told Nicodemus that and said, “Except a man is born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God.” And that day his kingdom was set up, starts on its journey. Began to preach, the apostles did, his kingdom is come. And men wanted to get into it. “They said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said to them. Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you,” What were they waiting for at Pentecost? Jesus said, “Behold, I’ll send the promise of my Father upon you.” What was the promise of the Father? It was the Comforter. What was the Comforter? The advocate. When did it happen? It came at Pentecost, they received it there. It was the Comforter. How long was it to continue? With the church forever. Peter said be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. I knew it was going to pen Mr. Moore when I asked him, because I’ve asked him before. And I asked him this question here in one of my questions: Could anyone receive the gift of the Holy Ghost before they were baptized in water, at the time they were baptized, or after they were baptized? He said, “After.” But mind you of the 10th chapter of Acts. I’m going to show you the error of his teaching. I did it before and I am gonna try to drive it into his heart if I can.

Miscellaneous Thoughts:

In the 10th chapter of Acts when the door of faith was opened unto the Gentiles world, we find that Peter preaches to those Gentiles. I know he has a lot to say about showing these folks how to get into the kingdom of God and they had. Well I could say the same thing about the 8th chapter; why the apostles went down there. That’s another bunch getting into the kingdom of God. That’s right. Yes sir: an old ship in time of storm for Mr. Moore. But in the 8th chapter why the apostles went down there, it was another group there, a mixed group getting in the church. And in the 10th chapter he said that because the Gentiles got in. But mind you. Listen. He, the paraclete, spoke these words. The Bible said the Holy Spirit fell on all of them that heard the word. What happened on the day of Pentecost? They received the Holy Ghost. What happened during the 10th chapter of Acts? They received the Holy Ghost. The reason I referred to that Greek word dorea awhile ago is because the gift, being the word gift. And this Comforter comes from the Greek word paraclete. Of course the word Comforter and the gift, the eternal life is a gift, the Holy Spirit gives us life, and this word dorea here is showing that same thing, receiving the gift, in Acts 2 as Acts 10 which is receiving. He said the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That’s the reason I produced that Greek word dorea. I knew he’d have to say it. And in the 10th chapter of Acts he said, “While Peter yet spoke words, the Holy Ghost fell on them that heard the word.” These Gentiles were entering the kingdom of heaven. How were they going to get in? Be born of Spirit and water, of water and spirit. That’s how they got in. How he’ll get in if he ever gets in. That’s

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

right. Listen, “While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on them that heard the word.” The six Jews that went down there with him, “were astonished, as many as came with Peter, BECAUSE that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Now he says that’s baptism there; but over here in Acts 2:38 where it said the gift, that’s not baptism there. That’s right.

Cornelius Was Baptized By Holy Spirit

He said that’s baptism there in the 10th chapter and do you know why he said it? In the 11th chapter when Peter comes back and when he’s called in question he tells them that God gave them the same like gift. The 8th chapter here I cited it to him and you too awhile ago in the 8th chapter of Acts when Simon was trying to buy this power, “Peter said, your money perish with you because you thought that” the dorea, “the gift of God could be purchased with MONEY.” That’s the same Greek word that was used in Acts 10:4-5 where they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost. It’s the same thing, there’s no difference in it. It’s the entrance into the kingdom of God. And that was the opening of the door of faith unto the Gentiles. That’s right.

The Door Of Faith Opened To The Gentiles

Now in Acts 14:27, the Bible said they were called in question. Barnabus and Paul I think it was, “And they rehearsed ALL that God had done and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.” Every New Testament church had received the Holy Ghost. There was only one way to receive it. In Acts the 8th chapter, in Acts the 1st and 2nd chapter when they were baptized with it, they received it. In Acts the 10th chapter they were baptized with it; they received it. In Acts the 8th chapter they were baptized with it; they received it. And in Acts the fifth chapter when they were baptized with it; they received it. They didn’t have the Holy Ghost until then. The 8th chapter of Acts here when these people were already baptized. I’m going to show you what a conflict it put Mr. Moore in. It put him there. And it puts him in a dilemma.

The Samariatians: A Dilemma For Moore

The 8th chapter of Acts:

Only Philosophy of theology would prompt you to say something like this. Now they were baptized in water by the man Philip. They were to receive the Holy Ghost, as Peter said in Acts 2:38; yet he says that’s different to what happened when the men prayed for them. They already had it. But they came all the way down from Jerusalem, and how far it was I don’t know, to pray for these people that they might receive the Holy Ghost. That’s right. And don’t try to tell me, at least try to make me believe it, that they did received the Holy Ghost before that time. The 8th chapter of Acts here that he’s got on this board. That same Greek word is used; used in Acts 2:38 and used in Acts 10:45. It’s the identical same thing. The gift of God is eternal life and the Spirit giveth life. The Bible said this life is in the Son. And in 1John 4:13 says, “Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.” They didn’t receive it until they did receive it. Now his doctrine would make you think no doubt. I don’t know whether he’d say it or not I’m not going to accuse Mr. Moore because I know that they are just like we are. The Pentecostal people some of them teach one thing and then another. I’m not going to accuse him of teaching what the others teach; I don’t know what he teaches along that line and I don’t want to misrepresent him. But most of the men of his faith that I teach and debate with believes in the 8th chapter when Simon the sorcerer was baptized that he was saved, that he received what they call an ordinary measure of the Holy Spirit. Most of them believe that. Now whether he does or not I don’t know. But I know that other members of his congregation of church preachers that I’ve agreed to debate with agree to that. And I want to show you the inconsistency of that argument.

More Miscellaneous Statements:

These men had already received the word of God. They’d been baptized in water but they had not received the Holy Ghost and when Paul came, I mean when the apostles came down there and laid their hands on them

and prayed for them and they received the Holy Ghost. That’s what they were receiving. Well, in Acts the 2nd chapter they received the Holy Ghost. They were baptized with it in Acts the 2nd; and they were baptized with it in the 8th chapter of Acts; and they were baptized with it in the 10th chapter of Acts; and it was a gift of the Holy Ghost, the same thing. It’s eternal life and there is not life outside of Christ. You must have his spirit to get into him if 1John 4:13 is correct.

The 12 Disciples Of John

Now, I’m going back to the 19th chapter of Acts. Here’s another establishment of entrance of people into this kingdom that Jesus said, “Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he could not enter.” Paul comes down there and he finds these people. They had been converted, by Apollos no doubt; the preceding chapter tells who in all probability was a convert of John the Baptist. And this fellow Apollos had left this town and Paul comes to it. “And finding certain disciples,” believers as far as they knew, “He said unto them, have you received the Holy Ghost?” What was his message? What was he talking about? He was talking about receiving the Holy Ghost. What did Peter say in the 10th chapter of Acts about what he was talking about when they received the gift of the Holy Ghost there? He said, “who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which received the Holy Ghost” What did he ask these people? “Have you received the Holy Ghost?” Now in the 10th chapter this gentleman said “that’s baptism” but in the 19th chapter, “oh, no, that’s something else.” It isn’t something else, it’s the same thing! And he might argue if he tried to, to live long enough as I said the other night to make Methuselah look like a schoolboy, if he could live that long; and he could never prove different to what it is. “And Paul said to them, have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed? And they said to him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.” or as another translation puts it, “whether the Holy Ghost be given.” “And he said to them, unto what then was thou baptized? And they said, unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

repentance, saying unto the people, they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus.” Now to show you in the Scriptures that this gentleman introduced in the 8th chapter of Acts that the Holy Spirit and they had, I told you the Holy Ghost was the paraclete. He didn’t argue too much against that. In the 8th chapter of Romans the apostle said these words, “You are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” Now Paul said in the 6th chapter of First Corinthians “that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost.” And in the 8th chapter of Acts the apostle said to these Romans, “But know you not that you’re... I mean he said, “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his and if Christ be in you.”

What did Jesus say when he promised the Comforter, what did he say about that? Paraclete when he was promised the promise of the Father. He said these words, “I give you another Comforter.” He said, “I’ll pray the Father and he will give you the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you.” “I will not leave you comfortless;” The marginal reading, the original Greek reading says offerings. That is right. “I will come to you.” Now when did he come, in the sense of Bible teaching, the Father of the church? He couldn’t have come until there was a church. That church came into existence on the day of Pentecost. Christ came in. He came into you. In that day ye shall know that I am in you. In 1John 4:13 he said these words, “Hereby do we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.” That’s why I’m contending tonight that you cannot, there’s no way to get in Christ, there’s no way to be born of God without the baptism of the Holy Ghost. There’s no way to be. Now he goes on and says these words, “Ye have not received,” in the 8th chapter of Romans, “the spirit of bondage again to fear: but you have received the spirit of adoption,” What does the word adoption mean? “Whereby we cry, Abba, Father. His spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we ARE the sons of God.” And here is the reason why you cannot. There’s no way to argue the way

the Bible is teaching and no man can do it. The last thing that will happen unto his church is the eternal Spirit that dwells in his church, that dwells in his body which is his church, in the resurrection day, changing these mortal bodies into immortal bodies. Because he said in the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you. He shall also quicken a change in your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. There’s going to be that day when the church receives its perfection as I argued a while ago. Matthew 5:25 when I went to this chart.

That Which Is Perfect

That which is perfect is come. He wasn’t talking about the New Testament wasn’t completed. It was a complete book till I think sometimes along the third century. That’s right. And of course according to what this man says here, they didn’t have a perfect book anyhow until it was complete. That’s right. And what happened when the last man, that the apostles laid their hands on, died? That’s his dilemma to get out of. That’s right. I wasn’t talking about that. The end of time comes. Paul said, “This shall I see I shall know as I am known.” That’s right. Talking about the completion and return of this church, resurrection of the dead, and continues he said. Paul said in the 3rd chapter of Galatians, “They received the Holy Ghost by faith and performed miracles by faith. Your faith continues and miracles continue.

Church Elders:

I’d like to quote you a Scripture, Mr. Moore, about the elders in your church. You have elder, in your church and I’ve never learned yet exactly what they can do. I say that through courtesy. I’ve said it one time. The Bible said this in James the 5th chapter and verse 14, “If there be any sick among you.” Now he says they continue. Paul said in the 3rd Chapter of Galatians that miracles were performed by faith. Works miracles because of faith. Then of course he claims that elders continue. He’s got elders in his church. That’s right. The Bible said, “If there be any sick among you let them call the elders of the church; let them pray over

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

them, anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith will save the sick.” Now if there’s no use in them doing that, then you folks just strike that part, at least that part of your elderism out of your church. I say that to Mr. Moore. But that’s a vital instruction and he said let faith continue.

(Talking toward the chart. Not understandable.)

Moore’s Blackboard Argument:

Now I want to notice the blackboard. He has not helped himself one bit. He has remission of sins here and Baptism of the Holy Ghost here. By the same token in the 10th chapter of Acts he’s got Holy Spirit baptism on this side of baptism. I’ll ask him by the same token if men over there had the baptism of the Holy Spirit. You see without remission of Sins? That’s the same thing, Mr. Moore. That’s right. It’s as broad as it is long, hallelujah, amen.

Church And Kingdom Are Synonymous

Now listen. Here it is! In this New Testament doctrine and the church of the Lord, the church and kingdom are synonymous. It’s the same thing.

Two Parts Of Birth

And I want to impress on you that in the existence of his church when it was established and always was those two parts of this birth. It never did happen at the same time. It never did. In the 2nd chapter of Acts, in all probability, those people were baptized in Jesus’ name and then were baptized by the Holy Ghost. In the 8th chapter of Acts they were baptized in Jesus’ name first and then baptized in the Holy Ghost. That’s right. That’s not nearly right that is right. All right. Then in the 10th chapter of Acts they were baptized with the Holy Ghost first and then baptized with water. Those two elements always appeared in the entrance into the church of our Lord but never at the same time. And in the 19th chapter of Acts when they appeared again there was the two elements that inducts

one, that one baptismal birth, the two Jesus said, “Except a man be born of water and Spirit.” And, Mr. Moore, I believe I’m not, I don’t want to misquote him I don’t want to do that. I think a lot of Mr. Moore. I think that he and I get along. That’s right. And I appreciate him. Don’t want to misstate you. But I think that he believes water baptism, to be baptized in water, is being born again. I don’t want to misquote him. I misquote you, Mr. Moore, on that you can come back and correct me tomorrow night on it, But I do assume that from his argument that he believes that water baptism has something to do with the birth. And I want to say that again before I sit down, the reason why that the terminology baptize is used in this age in receiving the Holy Ghost was because it has a part to do with the birth. Now, I could say something about those people he talked about filled with the Holy Ghost. Of course Mr. Moore might have been busy and might not have thought about it but I know what I said about these people filled with the Holy Spirit before.

Holy Spirit In Those Before Pentecost

I say this of the people before the time of the establishment of the New Testament church who had the Holy Ghost. You take the prophets of the Old Testament had it, many of them had it, but they didn’t have it as a birth. You see what I’m talking about. Now in this age you have it as a birth. Its terminology is baptism. Baptized! And since we’re baptized into Christ, and since you have to be born of Spirit and water; that’s why that the terminology was used, baptized of the Holy Ghost. And that’s exactly why. And I’ve contended tonight that as long as there’s a kingdom in this world, and as long as there’s a church in this world that belongs to Jesus Christ; that there’ll be a baptism of the Holy Ghost will be taking place in this world, whenever you are born of the Spirit, it’s the same thing; and there cannot be a church without the birth of water and spirit. There cannot be a kingdom. And as long as that church is in this world, that same way of entering that church will be here. And Mr. Moore cannot argue that away and nobody else can. And I’m happy tonight. I want to say again that he asked me about this. I know what I said about the

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

people, about the baptism of the Holy Ghost I don't say that he twisted what I said. He probably just misquoted, put it that way. He asked me the question "If Assemblies of God and people like that could have the Holy Ghost?" I've I told him that it was possible to have the Holy Ghost and not be taught fully. I believe that. I believe that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the same, wherever it is. I have baptized many of those people. And they were like the people over there in Paul's time. They had went as far as they had. And those people that have the baptism of the Holy Ghost It's possible I said that before when I was up here. Okay.

The End Of Speech

Friday – Welch’s Second Negative

This ends Mr. Moore’s proposition that Holy Spirit Baptism has ceased. The next and last section deals with Mr. Welch’s proposition that:

1. The Scriptures teach that men are being baptized in the Holy Spirit as were the apostles on the day of Pentecost.

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Three-A

Mr. Moderators, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Moore. It is with deep appreciation in my heart tonight that I come before you here in this auditorium again. That I want to thank you for your kindness and the way you've listened to this discussion. And I also want to thank the people of Orange and in radio land for the opportunity I have here of coming to you with what I believe to be the truth concerning these Bible propositions we're discussing. And I appreciate the opportunity of reaching you through the means of radio here each night. I also want to thank the church here in Orange for their splendid support of this discussion and to be with them and all the churches of our faith and also my good friend, brother Gamblin. And also I want to say that I appreciate Mr. Moore. This has been a good debate. We've had a nice time. And his people. I think this has been a discussion that anybody could attend and enjoy, go away feeling good at everybody. That's the way that I hope they all will continue.

The Proposition

And now to the proposition before me. The Scriptures teach that people of this age are to be baptized in the Holy Ghost as were the apostles on the day of Pentecost. I mean by that that the apostles were some of the first who were admitted into the kingdom of God. They were admitted when they were baptized with the Holy Ghost. And that being the truth and that is the truth, I am affirming tonight that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the same wherever found, whether at Pentecost or whether the 8th chapter of Acts, or the 10th chapter, or the 19th chapter which I believe all to be baptism of the Holy Spirit. And I mean further by that that to be baptized by the Holy Spirit is to be born of the Spirit. And I mean by that that the Spirit of God Almighty must come upon you, and enter you, and apart from the word of God, a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. That's what I believe and that's what I'm affirming. That's what I teach.

Answers To Moore's Questions

Now the questions that Mr. Moore has asked me. I'll get to them first:

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

- 1) Jesus said he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Was he talking about Water baptism?

He was talking about Spirit and water, Mr. Moore. It's in St. John 3:5. Water and Spirit, it takes them both to make a birth. Baptism is synonymous with birth and therefore it takes the two elements of this baptism to put you in Christ.

- 2) Did the Samaritans in Acts 8:12-17 and the Ephesians in Acts 19:1-6 receive the Holy Spirit just as the apostles did?

They were baptized with it. On the day of Pentecost the apostles were baptized with it and to be baptized with the Holy Spirit is to be baptized with it.

- 3) Does Romans 6:3 have reference to water baptism?

It has reference again to the birth. Baptism and birth are synonymous and to enter into Christ, into his kingdom, you must be born of water and spirit.

- 4) Is the gift referred to in 1Cor. 1:7 the Holy Spirit?

The gift in 1Cor. 1:7 comes from the Greek word charisma and it doesn't come from the Greek word dorea. Therefore, it is an operation of the Holy Spirit that the Holy Spirit blesses people after they receive the Holy Spirit. It is not the same as receiving the Holy Spirit. It's an operation of the Holy Spirit upon an individual; that is, the blessings of the Holy Spirit. But it is not the same as dorea in Acts 8th chapter. I referred to that last evening.

- 5) What's the antecedent of the pronoun "they" in Acts 2:1?

In 2:1 they had to be the apostles, they come back from the mount where the trans—the mount of ascension they went into an upper room, the first chapter of Acts said where there abode women about 120 disciples. And from that number of about 120 disciples they chose twelve apostles and Matthias was numbered with the apostles. On the day of Pentecost the twelve apostles were there but the overall teaching of that chapter shows that the rest of that 120 were there too and the Holy Ghost baptism was poured out.

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

Welch's Questions To Moore

Now to my subject tonight. I've asked Mr. Moore some questions and I might as well get into that now:

- 1) When was the kingdom set up on earth that was mentioned in John 3:5?
- 2) Were the apostles in the kingdom of God before the day of Pentecost?
- 3) Does water baptism alone induct a believer into the kingdom of God?
- 4) Was the Comforter that was mentioned by Jesus in John 14:26 to abide with the church forever?
- 5) In St. John 3:5 when Jesus said to be born of water and of the spirit did he mean there would be a direct operation of the Spirit in the birth or did he mean to be baptized in water by the instructions of the word of God?

Baptize And Born Is Synonymous

Now tonight in affirming my proposition I want to emphasize, to begin with, that the word baptize and the word born are synonymous. That's right. It's the same thing. In St. John 3:5 when Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he could not enter the kingdom of God", is a birth there. You enter the kingdom by birth, and the two elements of this birth are spoken of as water and Spirit. Now in Mark the 9th chapter and verse 1 we find that Christ said these words, "That there be some of you standing here, that will not taste death, until you have seen the kingdom of God come with power." This kingdom had to come in their lifetime. It could not have been some future kingdom. It meant this kingdom was coming in their lifetime. Now in Matthew the 3rd chapter and verse 11 John the Baptist came preaching as a forerunner of Christ and he was preaching of the time when Jesus would set up this kingdom on earth. And he, being the forerunner of that Christ, said in Matthew 3:11 these words, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

am not worthy to bear: he will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire.” Now, in the prophecies of Christ, John the Baptist showing this kingdom is come. Now I want to emphasize tonight in my affirmation that to receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost and to be born of the Spirit and to be baptized and to receive the Holy Ghost as spoken of here gives life is the same thing. In John the 20th chapter and verse 23 it is likened here to life. And Christ said to his followers, “That whosoever sins ye remit; he first breathed upon them and said, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” In John 3 the Bible said, “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that’s born of the spirit.” Now in John 20, as I just quoted to you, in the 20th chapter of John and verse 23 he breathed upon the apostles and said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Now they did not receive the Holy Ghost until the day of Pentecost, but this is showing that the Spirit of God gives life. That’s what he did there. Now in Romans the 14th chapter and verse 17 the Bible said, “And the kingdom of God is not meat and drink but is peace, joy, and righteousness in the Holy Ghost.”

Now where the Holy Ghost is not, there can not be no kingdom. For in the first place the kingdom did not come until the Holy Ghost came. Then where there is no Holy Spirit in a direct operating form, there can be no kingdom of God. I want to emphasize that. Where there in no Holy Spirit, in a direct operating form, there cannot be no kingdom of God. Because it started that way and it will always be that way.

Holy Spirit Promised

Now coming to the promise of the setting up of the kingdom and in Christ this setting up Christ promises the Holy Ghost. In St. John the 14th chapter and verses 15 and 18 on down Jesus said, “If ye love me, keep my commandments. I’ll pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but you know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

you.”

Two Ways Things Can Be Sent

Now in sending, there are two ways things can be sent. In the first place a king can send a manager I mean a messenger or a tree can send forth buds. Now if a tree sends forth buds of course it means that the tree is still there; it doesn't go anywhere, but it sends forth buds. Christ is talking here of praying the Father, and giving another Comforter that might abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth. Now Jesus Christ is the truth. In John 14:6 he said I am the way, the truth, and the life.”

Christ Came As the Comforter

Now in the 14th chapter going into it again, he comes on down and says, “I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.” Now when the Holy Ghost came, it was Christ coming in his omnipotence. It was Christ coming into them, the Spirit of Christ. Now there's no way to be saved without Christ, you cannot be saved without him, there's no way to be saved without him. I want to emphasize that. Now in St. John 14:26 he said, “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost,” Now Col. the first chapter and in the 26th&28th verses the apostle said these words, “The mystery that has been hid from ages, which they made manifest, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.” This mystery that had been hid from ages but now the time is coming that the paraclete, the Spirit of Christ is come back in its omnipresence. That's right. Not his person, but the Spirit of his person. And it's Christ in you, the Holy Spirit, the hope of glory; and it's a mystery that's been hid before the foundation of the world. Now we come to the setting now of his kingdom. And I might add here before I take this next Scripture in Acts the first chapter. In 1John 4:13 the Bible says, “Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.”

The Establishment Of The Kingdom

Now the establishment of his kingdom on Pentecost in Acts the first

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

chapter and the 4th to 8th verse. His followers asked him this question. They said, "Will you at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said, "it is not for you to know the time and seasons, which the Father put in his own power. But you'll receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: you'll be witnesses of me in Judea, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth." Now going back to the Old Testament in Ezekiel the 38th chapter and the 20th and 27th verses tells of the time that God would put his Spirit in people. Jeremiah 31:32 and 34 tells of the time that he'd put his Spirit in people. Now I want to show you that in Christ, the Holy Spirit when he comes into a person. In 1Sam. the 10th chapter and the 6th and 9th verses in this chapter here is a record of God and when Saul was accepted as king of Israel, and Samuel met him and told him he said, "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon you, and you shall be turned into another man." He turned to go from Samuel and "God gave him another heart."

Now in Romans 5:6 the Bible said, "Hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost." I'm going to contend all through this argument tonight and I want this to go down in the book, that there is a difference in operation of God's Spirit in receiving the Spirit of God's Spirit from receiving the word of God. I do not in any way discredit the word of God. I believe in the Bible. I do not underestimate the authenticity of God's eternal word. But the Bible said in John 4:24 that God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The 120 In An Upper Room:

Now as you come on down, in Luke 24:45, the promise of the Father. In Acts 1:12 and 15 tells of that, and when they left there they came to this room, these disciples did. Went into the room and there abode. In the company, including some women, were about 120 in all. And they selected from this company, one man to take Judas' place and he was

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

numbered with the twelve apostles.

On Pentecost

Now on the day of Pentecost “when the day of Pentecost was fully come,” the 2nd chapter of Acts said. “They was all in one place, in one accord. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon of them. They were all filled.” They received the Holy Ghost that day. He breathed on them previous to this time but this day they received the promise of the Father. That day they received the Comforter. That day the kingdom was set up on earth, that day. Now of course on down the chapter of Acts, the first chapter, they were acting under the influence of a direct operation of the Holy Spirit to the extent that people thought they were drunk. And Peter said, “These are not drunken, as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that.” I want to emphasize “this 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: and your sons and daughter shall prophesy, And upon my servants and upon my handmaidens in those days will I pour out of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.” Now he said that was a fulfillment of that Scripture there in Joel 2:28 and if it was, there had to be some women there that got the Holy Ghost that day. It was fulfilled that way. All right.

Kingdom Is Set UP:

Now the kingdom is set up. And I asked Mr. Moore this question. I'm sure he'll take careful consideration about it. Were the apostles in the kingdom of God before the day of Pentecost? If they were not then it's evidence that it takes the baptism of the Holy Spirit as same as the baptism of water to place you in the kingdom of God. There're two elements, that one birth or that one baptism. Now after the kingdom was set up when Peter preached that day they asked him, “Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved? And Peter said to them, repent,

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you." What did they receive that day? What did they wait for? The promise of the Father. What did they obtain? The promise of the Father. And he said, "The promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

More On The 120 In An Upper Room:

Now I'm going to take another Scripture now, and I'm going to prove tonight. And I'd like to watch Mr. Moore unravel this one. He'll have a chance to do it. In Acts the 10th chapter I'm contending that there's no difference in Acts the 2nd chapter, in the gift of the Holy Ghost and in the 10th chapter. In the 10th chapter Mr. Moore will admit it was Holy Ghost baptism. In the 10th chapter it's called the gift of the Holy Ghost. In the 2nd chapter he will not admit when Peter said, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Those words come from the same Greek word dorea. Acts 10:45 and Acts 2:38, it's the same identical thing. In the establishment of the kingdom, when it was inaugurated, they were baptized and they received the gift of the Holy Ghost. It's a free gift, the gift, dorea. That's why it's called a gift. You cannot have life without it. Life is given, it's a free gift. And the Holy Ghost is that gift, it is Christ himself in you, in omnipresent operation. Now the 10th chapter of Acts and verse 43 the Bible said, speaking of Jesus, "that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. And while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. And as many as came with Peter were astonished, because that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift." That word dorea again. The gift, it's Christ, eternal life. The life's in the Son. The only part of him you can receive is his Spirit, "the gift of the Holy Ghost." And then Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost the same as we"; Now notice there what he says here, they received it at Pentecost. What was the Holy Spirit, the

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

Comforter, the paraclete? That's right. The Spirit of eternal Christ, Christ coming into you in direct operation. Your body becomes his temple. Come in and be spiritualist. That's exactly what happens. They receive him.

Water And Spirit:

Now in the 8th chapter of Acts the Samaritans as they were inducted into the kingdom. I want you to notice here now in the 8th chapter they got the water before they got the Spirit, but they got both. In the 10th chapter they got the Spirit before they got the water, but they got both. In the 8th chapter of Acts the Bible tells us that Philip goes down to Samaria where he preaches Christ to them. They believed him and they were baptized. Then the 14th, 10th verse says, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then they prayed for them, laid their hands on them, and they got the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostle's hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, give me this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he will receive the Holy Ghost. And Peter said to him, thy money perish with thee, because you have thought that the gift." The gift of God is eternal life. You can't have life without having the Son. The only part of the Son you could have is his Spirit. "Because you have thought that the gift of God might be purchased with money."

The 12 Disciples Of John:

In Acts the 19th chapter here's another entrance into the kingdom. We notice there the terms of the birth. Acts 19:1~6, "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed up the coast came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, He said to them, have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said, we have

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

not so much as heard whether the Holy Ghost be given. He said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And Paul laid his hands on them, and the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spoke with tongues, and prophesied." Now I'm showing tonight entrances into the kingdom of God. I'm showing you how they got in. That's right. And that's exactly what happened.

Miscellaneous Statements:

Now I want to, if I have time, and I think I'll have probably enough time. How much time have I got? All right. In St. John the 4th chapter, I want to deal with this gift now, and verse 14. St. John the 10th chapter there in the 10th verse and the 14th verse he said to this woman "If you knew who it was that talked to you and the gift of God, you would have asked him and he would have given living water." He brings that gift of God there in again. In the 4th chapter of St. John he said to this woman, "If you knew who it was that talked to you and the gift of God. And she said, why this water here then and he said the water that I shall give him shall be in him." Now he first said there when he first addressed her, "If you knew what and the gift of God." He said that which is the gift of God is eternal life, and the life of Christ is our life, and you cannot have life without having him and the only part of him you can have is his Spirit. Now, in John the 7th chapter now is the water and water proves to be the Holy Ghost and it's for everybody. And it emphasizes there with the gift, that's what he's talking about. It's eternal life. John 7:37-31, "And Jesus stood," the Bible said, "the last day of the feast and cried and said, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. As the scripture said, out of his inward parts shall flow rivers of living water. (This spake he of the Spirit, that they believe on him.)" And he emphasized that it was the gift of God, eternal life. And it is the spirit because without the Spirit of Christ

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

you are none of his. Roman the 8th chapter we are told him verse 9-11, and he said, "Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." And that living water he spoke of there is the Spirit, his Spirit that he gives us. And he told this woman "The water that I shall give him shall be IN him, A well of water SPRINGING UP INTO EVERLASTING LIFE." It's the gift of God. It's that Spirit that comes in that's Christ's. His Spirit and the only part of Christ you can have.

The Spirit And The Church

All right. The operation now, the Spirit and the church. Apart from the word. 1Cor. 6:19, "Our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost." Now Mr. Moore will have to teach that when the word dwells in you the Holy Ghost dwells in you and that's it. When the words of the Holy Ghost there's no direct operation. 2Cor. the 6th chapter 16th verse said. "Temple of the living God," Now Paul said in Eph. 4:4 "There's one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in you all." Now in Gal 3:27 the Bible says "Received by faith" He asks a question here, "Receive ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" That's right. Luke the 9th chapter and verse 9 down the Lord said, "Seek, and you'll find, knock and it shall be opened. Every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth." And he said, to the Jews, "If you being evil," the people of that time, "and know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" That brings in the asking, the praying, laying on hands and praying. The main thing is you must receive the Holy Ghost. That's the main thing. That's right. There were different ways the Holy Ghost came. That is some it fell on and others were praying for them, laying their hands on them. But all the time they received the Holy Ghost. It's the same thing, receiving it. All right. Hebrews 11:6 and the Bible said these words, "That without faith it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is and that he is a

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

rewarder of them that diligently seek him." That's right. Now that brings in the seeking of the Lord. That brings in asking. That brings in praying.

And now the direct operations again. In Eph. 4th chapter and verse 30 the Bible said, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby you are sealed until the day of redemption." Now I don't know whether Mr. Moore can bring that out to mean to believe the word of God, but in the establishment of this Ephesian church they received the direct operation. The Spirit of God came upon them, and they spoke in tongues when that church was established. We find out over here that Paul writes back to that same church that it had two baptisms and that's the church he writes back to and says there's one baptism. However that may be, in the operation of God's truth and the entrance into his kingdom that one birth is two elements, Spirit and water, and you cannot enter the kingdom of God without that and baptism is synonymous. It's the same thing. Now in 1Thes. the 5th chapter and verse 9 it says, "Quench not the Spirit." Now if there is no operation apart from the word of God, that means that there's nothing you would have or know anything about God, other than what somebody told you about the Bible. That's all. But he was showing that these New Testament churches had a direct operation as well as the truth because they were worshipping God in Spirit and in truth.

Speaking In An Unknown Tongue:

Now in 1Cor. the 14th chapter and verse 2 the Bible said, "He that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understands him; howbeit in the Spirit he speaketh mysteries." And he further said, "That if he spoke in an unknown tongue he edifieth himself." In the 14th and 15th verse there he said these words, "What is it then? I will pray with the spirit. If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit." That was a direct operation of the Spirit of God upon the body, a body of a human being. A direct operation And Paul further said, "Covet to prophesy, and forbid not to

Saturday - Welch's First Affirmative

“speak with tongues.” He said that. Now that shows that there is a direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon people apart from the word of God!

The End Of Speech

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Three-B

Gentlemen Moderators, ladies and gentlemen here and in the radio audience, Mr. Welch. I'm happy to be before you again to reply to the speech to which you've listened. I want to, in the very outset of the speech, commend the effort of Mr. Welch in his previous 30 minutes. I appreciate the way that he got down to business and at least endeavored to sustain his proposition.

Reply To Welch's Questions

I want to now, before I do anything further, reply to his questions. Then I want to present a brief summary of the debate thus far and I'll give him a copy of it in a minute but I want first of all to answer his questions.

- (1) "When was the kingdom of God set up on earth that was mentioned in Jno. 3:5

In Acts 2.

- (2) "Were the apostles in the kingdom of God before the day of Pentecost?"

Well, how could they have been in it before the day of Pentecost? It wasn't established till then. When you deal with that you might tell us: "When were the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus?" Will you accommodate us with that? When were the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus?

- (3) "Does water baptism alone induct a believer into the kingdom of God?"

No. Water baptism alone won't do anything. It must be preceded by faith, repentance, and confession.

- (4) "Was the Comforter, that was mentioned by Jesus in John 14:26, to abide with the church forever?"

Now observe closely and as I say again, I've written this down so that I can make it just as clear as I know how. He would do so BY the truth revealed to the apostles.

- (5) "In Jno. 3:5 when Jesus said to be born of water and Spirit did he mean there would be a direct operation of the Spirit in birth or, did

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

he mean to be baptized in water by the instruction of the word?" Of course, he gives me an either or and I prefer to give my own explanation of it. I suggest to you that the latter part of the statement comes close and I cite you Eph. 5:26, where the Apostle Paul talks about, "cleansing the church by washing of water by the word." In the process of my speech I'll be explaining the new birth and we'll just pass it, till that time.

Summary Of debate Thus Far

Now, I want to do this in the first part of the speech this evening and I do this for two purposes:

(1) As you know, from all indications, the debate WILL go into print. And I want to present what I believe to be a summary of the debate thus far so that it'll be beneficial to those who read the debate.

(2) I also want to present some blunders and absurdities of a man who claims to be spirit-filled. Now, I want to do that in this speech so that if Mr. Welch cares to reply to it, he can do it in his last speech. Mr. Gamblin, would you please hand this to Mr. Welch?

Definition Of Person:

I want first of all to suggest to you what has been accomplished thus far in the Moore - Welch debate. In the first place, regarding the DEFINITION OF PERSON. Mr. Welch took the position that person necessitated a fleshly body form. Hence, according to Welch there could have been no person in the Godhead until Bethlehem. So, every Old Testament reference he introduced was not even germane according to him.

Secondly, the Bible teaches that Jesus is no longer in the days of his flesh, Heb. 5:7, so according to his definition of person there is no person in the Godhead now.

Thirdly, his definition of person forces him to the conclusion that there

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

was a person in the Godhead only during the 33 years Jesus lived in the flesh.

One God Argument:

Then regarding his ARGUMENT ON ONE GOD, Mr. Welch admitted that one may mean two or three, yet dogmatically argued that one God necessitates one person even though he admitted that one humanity did not necessitate one person. He was as silent as the tomb concerning my explanation as to how the Father and Son were one according to Jno. 17:20, as Christians are one. On his argument on Jno. 14:9, to see his fleshly body was to see the Father. This was completely exploded. I pointed out, and he never attempted to show where I was wrong in my argument, that the word see had to do with mental perception and not visual. Further, I pointed out that the refusal to accept a plurality of persons in the Godhead would reduce the Bible to an absurdity. And that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were so described in the Bible as to demand distinction.

On Water Baptism:

On the WATER BAPTISM question, Mr. Welch affirmed the absolute necessity of a formula in water baptism. Yet, formula is a prescribed form or rule and he refused in four speeches to tell us what the prescribed form or rule was. He emphatically denied that the formula could include TITLES then cited Bible passages in an effort to illustrate his formula idea that contained terms that he said were titles, such as Lord and Christ. In the third place he had defined the term "name" and one time contend that you had to say something and then turned around and say that it meant that you had to wear it. In the fourth place he admitted that baptism in the name of Jesus was the baptism authorized by Jesus, yet, at the same time, breathing out denials that the term name could mean authority. Now, in my discussion on the word "name", I pointed out by Bible definitions that the usage of the expression name meant reputation, character, authority, and designation and that the context would have to

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

determine how the word was being used. I established the fact that the scholarship of the world agreed with this definition and use of the word "name".

On the Baptism Of The Holy Spirit:

Now, on the BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT question thus far, Mr. Welch has argued that it took spirit and water baptism to put men into Christ. Yet, he said that Acts 2:38 referred to Holy Spirit baptism. If so, remission of sins PRECEDE the gift of this passage. He has remission of sins OUTSIDE of Christ. By this mode of argument and in view of what the Bible teaches about regeneration, reconciliation and becoming sons of God, and receiving the Holy Spirit he has actually been forced to the position that regeneration, reconciliation, salvation, and becoming a son of God all take place OUT of Christ.

I have shown that Holy Spirit baptism had a definite purpose. This purpose was to inspire men in the absence of an inspired book. The written word today is that which guides us in all of our activities.

Now, as I suggested to you, much of that was in the form of a summation, not in the manner of addressing an argument; and I did this for one purpose. In the numerous debate books that I have in my library, I've often wanted a summary of that kind. At least where I could take this and go back to a point and see whether or not the things that I've just said were so. And I hope that this will serve that purpose.

Ten Blunders And Absurdities

Now, I have ten statements that I call blunders, contradictions, and absurdities of a Spirit-filled-man. This relates to the proposition that's under discussion and the speeches that were made last night.

(1) Mr. Welch took the position and he has again this evening that Holy Spirit baptism was eternal life. Yet, eternal life is that which we receive in

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

the world to come, Mk. 10:30. So, according to him, we don't have Holy Spirit baptism now but will have it in the world to come. Also, the Apostle Paul said he hopes for eternal life, Tit. 1:2, and that we do not hope for what we already have, Rom. 9:24. If Mr. Welch is correct Paul didn't have Holy Spirit baptism. He was just looking forward to getting it.

(2) Because two things were said to be a gift he argued for their identity. Yet salvation is said to be a gift, Eph. 2:8-9 hence, according to him, salvation is Holy Spirit baptism. Yet, he was arguing that Holy Spirit baptism preceded salvation. He argued in such a way as to make Holy Spirit baptism one time salvation and the next time a prerequisite of salvation.

(3) He said that "the new birth was to induct one into the church." That's a verbatim statement. And that the new birth consisted of Spirit and water baptism. He then said that the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2:38 followed remission of sins. According to Welch they had remission of sins before getting into Christ. Hence, he argued remission of sins out of Christ.

(4) He argued the first two nights, (Now watch this closely), that Jesus is not interceding for us. Then took the position that Jesus and the Holy Spirit were the same. Last night he cited a passage where the Spirit was interceding for us. Hence, the first two nights we have no intercessor but now we do.

(5) He argued that there is no difference in the gift of the Spirit, yet attempts to make distinctions. I want you to note this. He argued there IS no differences and yet he attempts to make distinction by calling attention to the different Greek words that are used to refer to the gifts of the Spirit in Acts 2:10 and 1Cor. 12.

(6) He argued the gift in Acts 2:38 and 10:45 actually refer to the same

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

thing. And I want you to note this closely, now he's made a play on this little Greek word for gift. There's not a thing on earth in it for him and you watch him take this up and show you that it doesn't involve him in an absurdity. Note if you will, he argued that the gift in Acts 2:38 and 10:45 had to refer to the same thing. He made the argument tonight and this was because they were from the same Greek word "dorea", now observe: In Heb. 6:4 this same word is used. Listen to the language, the writer says, "and tasted of the heavenly gift," now watch it, and in addition to that, "were made partakers of the Holy Spirit." Observe in this passage then, the gift is one thing and the receiving of the Holy Spirit is something else. Yet, this is the same word, in the Greek, that he's been making a play on.

(7) He argued that because two things are said to be a promise, he did it again this evening, they must be the same thing. Yet, in Acts 23:21, men who had vowed to kill Paul were waiting for the promise from the chief captain. Did this mean they were waiting for Holy Spirit baptism, and that chief captain could give them Holy Spirit baptism? He finds the word promise and simply says, "If this is one thing promised, here's something else promised because, they're both promised, they must be the same thing.

Argument On Hope:

He ignored my argument on hope completely. I pointed out that Paul in 1Cor. 13 said, "Hope would continue after that which is perfect is come." And that hope would be replaced by reality when we're raised from the dead." He came back in his last speech and made reference to Gal. 3:5 about the working of miracles by faith. This passage is talking about the HEARING of faith which has reference to the Gospel. Paul was showing that he preached the Gospel, not the law; hence, miracles that he performed were not to be attributed to the law. And he ignored my argument completely on hope and I'll introduce it again in a moment.

(8) He said that he didn't indict the Assemblies of God as not having

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

Holy Spirit baptism, but he said that some might have Holy Spirit baptism and not yet have learned all the truth. This is just another time that he contradicted himself.

(9) He answered my question and said that Holy Spirit baptism doesn't lead his recipients to teach false doctrines. Yet, the Assemblies of God teach three persons in the Godhead and they don't believe in water baptism in the name of Jesus is essential, Mr. Welch. So if Welch says this is false then they're not Spirit led. And it's just another time of Welch verses Welch.

(10) Mr. Welch argued on the water baptism question and I want you to note this closely. He argued on the water baptism question that baptism in the name of Jesus was the equivalent of being baptized into Christ. Now on this Holy Spirit Baptism question he denies it! He said the Samaritans who had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus could not have been in Christ till the apostles laid their hands on them and imparted the Holy Spirit. He argued that it took Spirit and water baptism to induct men into Christ. How much time do I have? (Moderator: 20 Minutes). Let me have my pointer right quick.

Distinctions Regarding The Spirit

A lot of these things that I've said will have reference to the things that he said in his speech. I want to call your attention to the chart before you. Now, I introduced this argument last night and Mr. Welch has conveniently ignored it. I pointed out that there were distinctions regarding the Spirit. I called your attention to the chart before you. Now, I introduced this argument last night and Mr. Welch has conveniently ignored it. I showed there were distinctions regarding the Spirit. I called your attention to the fact that all of the Romans, for instance, had the Spirit and he called your attention to that same fact tonight. Then I suggested to you in Rom. 1:11, that Paul said, "I desire to come unto you that I may impart some spiritual gifts." They all had the Spirit but they did

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

not all have spiritual gifts. I showed you the difference between the two. I called your attention to the fact that in Acts 8, whenever Phillip went down to Samaria he was able to perform signs and wonders and yet he was not able to impart spiritual gifts. It was imparted through the laying on of the APOSTLES hands. Now, Mr. Welch last night simply said, in connection with this, how'd I know that the apostles didn't go down there for the same reason they went down to the household of Cornelius in Acts 10:" The difference is, in Acts 10 I'm told. In Acts 8 you guessed at it. That is the big difference between the two.

Welch Versus God

Now observe if you will. Welch versus God. Mr. Welch has taken a position that one must have Holy Spirit baptism to become sons of God. His argument is that it takes Spirit and water baptism to induct man into Christ and man becomes a son of God in turn. But that's diametrically opposed to what God said. In Gal. 4:6 (I have 5 on the chart. That's verse 6), God said, "BECAUSE you ARE sons of God, God poured forth his Spirit into your heart." Now Mr. Welch said, it's to become sons" but God said, it's because you are already sons. Now note again, Mr. Welch said Holy Spirit baptism THEN you get salvation but that isn't what Acts 2:38 said.

I called your attention to an argument on the board and he pointed toward it last night and said, "That was ridiculous." And it was his argument. It wasn't MINE. It was his argument. The point is this and it's still on the board and I call your attention to it again, water and Spirit both put me into Christ. He cites Acts 2:38 and said, the gift of Acts 2:38 is Holy Spirit baptism." But that passage says that they were baptized, had the remission of sins, and THEN received the Spirit.

And I showed you that by this man's argument he has them with the remission of sins and salvation out of Christ. So he says Holy Spirit baptism then salvation but God said salvation and then Holy Spirit. Now

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

Mr. Welch thinks it's Holy Spirit baptism but I don't think that. That's his argument.

Mr. Welch says that Holy Spirit baptism is necessary to obey the instructions concerning the New Birth. But that isn't what God said. God says in Acts 5:32 that he gives the Spirit to them that obey him. Mr. Welch said, "nope, you get the Spirit to obey him. But that isn't what God said. God said, I give you the Spirit because you have obeyed me.

Mr. Welch's position is, first Holy Spirit baptism and then you're regenerated. But that isn't what God said. God said in Tit. 3:5, "By the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Another case of Welch versus God.

Mr. Welch said, "Holy Spirit baptism and then you're reconciled in Christ." But that isn't what the Bible teaches. Now watch it. In 1Cor. 12:13 Paul said, "For by one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, and we are all made to drink of one Spirit." In Eph. 2:16 Paul said, "we're reconciled in one body." Now watch it if you will. They are baptized into the body and then made to drink of the Spirit. They were reconciled and then received the Spirit. Mr. Welch said, "Nope! You receive the Spirit to be reconciled." And I submit to you that that's Welch versus the God of heaven.

I want now to take up his speech and the first thing that he talked about is Acts 2,8,10 and 19 and this will come up again later on in the discussion and we'll consider it at that time.

Baptism And "To Be Born" Are Synonymous

He said that "baptism" and "to be born" are synonymous. I DENY IT! You assumed it. You assumed it. Did it mean when Jesus was born he was BAPTIZED? Is that what is meant. When he was baptized he was born? He just assumed something. He said that to be baptized and to be born

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

again is one and the same thing. You're not in the assuming business. You're in the proving business.

Then of course this is where he came to my questions, let's take a look at them.

Answers To Moore's Questions

(1) My question number one had to do with when Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," But was he talking about water baptism? Mr. Welch said he was talking about water baptism and Spirit baptism. In other words, he's talking about water and spirit. I need a piece of chalk, if you can find one for me hurriedly. Now observe if you will. These same statements in Acts 8:12 where the record said "many of the Samaritans hearing, believed and were baptized." Now he said, "No, that instance was not Spirit. It didn't happen till later on." In other Words, you come to Mk. 16:16, where Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized". He said the baptism there is both Spirit and water. But, in Acts 8:12 when the Samaritans hearing, believed, and were baptized he said, "That wasn't water and Spirit. That was only water." In Acts 18:8, "and many of the Corinthians, hearing believed, and were baptized." He said, "that wasn't Spirit, that was just water." In other words He takes a verse and makes it mean anything that he wants it to mean, without any effort to prove it.

(2) Did the Samaritans, Acts 8:12, and the Ephesians, Acts 19:1-6, receive the Holy Spirit just like the apostles did? He said, "Baptized with it, yes." But I want you to note that they received it through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Is that the way the apostles RECEIVED IT? Now his proposition says that he's baptized with the Holy Spirit as were the apostles. Now watch it. He says that the Samaritans received it like the apostles did. The Samaritans received it through the laying on of the apostles' hands. He'd make the apostles receive it through the laying on of the apostles' hands and that's the predicament he gets himself into in this proposition.

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

(3) Does Rom. 6:3 have reference to water baptism? He said baptism and birth are synonymous and he assumes that this has to do with water and Spirit both. And now Mr. Welch, that passage indicates the man comes up out of the element that he goes down into, doesn't it? Rom. 6:3-4 says, "We're buried with him through baptism into death: That like as Christ was raised up." Now you've got that passage to show that baptism is a burial, and a resurrection, don't you? So the element of that passage is that they've gone out of. He says, "It's the Holy Spirit".

(4). Is the gift referred to in 1Cor. 1:7 the Holy Spirit? He says, "Operation of the spirit and not the same." Well now Mr. Welch, that's the thing that I called your attention to last night. And I want you folks to notice what he's admitted. Now he's admitted that just because there's a mention of the Holy Spirit that it's not Holy Spirit baptism. I didn't think that I'd get him to admit that, but he did. He admits now that just because you have mention of a gift and because you have mention of Holy Spirit that doesn't necessarily mean that's Holy Spirit baptism does it, Mr. Welch? It has to be labeled such and that's the very first argument that I advanced and that's what he admitted in answer to this question. Of course he had to take that position because he'd made a little play of the word gift.

(5) Then what is the antecedent of the pronoun they? And he didn't tell me. He didn't TELL me! He hasn't yet and he won't tell me before this debate comes to a close. What is the antecedent to the "they" in Acts 2:1. He thinks he can just simply ignore all of the rules of language, all of the rules of words, all the rules of definitions, all the rules of exegesis. That he can just go pick anything that he wants. And he can find two things that are said to be a gift and he can make them mean the same thing when he wants to and when he doesn't want them to then they're not the same. He can find anywhere the folks are said to be filled with something and here they're filled again and therefore it's the same thing.

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

He takes the liberty of arguing anyway that he wants to without considering any rules. In Acts 2:1 the record said, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, THEY were all together."

Handmaidens of Joel 2:

And incidentally he wants to know about the handmaidens of Joel 2. Do you think that was completely fulfilled on that occasion, Mr. Welch? Was that all of it, Mr. Welch, the end of it? Is that what you implied? Certainly I believe there were women that prophesied, Acts 21:9. There's not a thing on earth in that passage to imply complete fulfillment. Now he's implied, by that statement, that he thinks that the prophecy of Joel 2:28 was fulfilled and completely done away with on that occasion. Is that the end of it? Why are you affirming this proposition then? That was the implication of the argument he made.

Then in Acts 2:1:

"The day of Pentecost THEY were all together," The antecedent of "they" is the apostles in the preceding chapter, v. 26, as I pointed out last night and he conveniently over looked. That's once again where he said baptism and being born are synonymous. Now I challenge him to prove that this is so. The two terms do not mean the same thing. He just assumed they are.

Nicodemis And The New Birth

Then he cites Jno. 3:3-5, Mk. 9:1, and the kingdom was to come in their lifetime and that's right, Now in Jno.3 Jesus simply said to Nicodemis, who was a Pharisee, who naturally thought that he'd gain entrance to the kingdom because he was a Pharisee, And the Lord said to this man, He uses the figure of a birth in that passage, not for the purpose of trying to confuse anybody, but for the purpose of trying to get Nicodemis to understand that even though he was a Pharisee the fact that he could look back to his ancestors would not gain him entrance to the kingdom. He had to become a citizen of the kingdom, just like anyone else. Now

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

observe if you will. There is a rule that needs to be applied and that is, YOU ALWAYS GO FROM THE OBSCURE TO THE CLEAR. In Mt. 7:21 Jesus said to get into the kingdom was the result of doing the will of the Father, didn't he? In that passage when Jesus said, "Except a man be born of the water and the Spirit," that passage simply indicates, and as I pointed out last night by this chart on inspiration, the fact that the Lord said to the apostles I will send you into the world; I will inspire you; You will make my message known. And then men will have to pay attention to that message and that's the only way on earth that they can be saved. The Holy Spirit revealed the will of Christ. The word is said to be the sword of the Spirit, Eph. 6:17. In Eph. 5:23 where Paul talks about the washing of water with the word. Over in 1Pet. 1:22-23 the Apostle Peter said they were born again by the incorruptible seed, which is the word of God.

Baptism Of Holy Spirit And Fire

Mat. 3:11, and he still assumes without considering my argument on the passage, that the promise of Mt. 3:11 was a GENERAL PROMISE to everyone that was there on that occasion. If so, it included a generation of vipers in verse 7. And yet, as I pointed out to you last night, now these folks remember this, I called your attention to the fact that in Acts 1:5 when Jesus referred to this instance he said nothing whatsoever about fire when he was talking to the apostles. (Moderator: 9 minutes) I called your attention to the fact that in Acts 10 at the household of Cornelius, the Bible said, "It fell on them as on US at the BEGINNING. Mr. Welch, why not deal with the argument?"

Holy Spirit Baptism And Receiving Holy Spirit

Then he argues that "to receive baptism of the Holy Spirit and to receive the Holy Spirit is the same thing." He's already admitted that isn't so. He's already admitted that isn't so. It's so when it's convenient but it's not so when it's inconvenient. But he wants to make an argument on the word gift, and I've already pointed out that he has ADMITTED that just because there's a mention of the Spirit that doesn't mean that it is Holy

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

Spirit baptism. Yet, he turns around and says it's the same thing. So he says that Jno. 20:23; Jno. 3:8, when he talked about breeze, and breath and wind, and ties them together. He didn't actually make an argument on this. I think I know the argument that he intended to make and didn't. Now if this is not the argument, Mr. Welch, you correct me when you come up here. I want to refer to it now so that you can have a chance to reply. You know I try to be ethical in a debate. I'm not going to save everything in reply till the last speech like he does. Observe if you will. He ties the idea of breath and wind together in this particular passage and then in reference to Jno. 3:8 indicates that the wind of that passage had some connection. The wind in Jno. 3:8 is illustrating man. Take issue with it if you will.

Joy In The Holy Spirit - No Issue:

Then Rom. 14, "Joy in the Holy Spirit." And as I pointed out last night there's no issue here, whatsoever. Let him prove that that's Holy Spirit Baptism. Just to cite a passage does not prove that it is Holy Spirit Baptism.

Direct Operation Of Holy Spirit:

"If no direct operation, no kingdom started that way". You see Mr. Welch's trouble is that he thinks that everything that started in a certain way is perpetuated in the same way. Do you think man is perpetuated now the way that he started? Everything, ladies and gentlemen, came into existence with a miracle. God created man out of the dust of the earth, but that isn't the way that man comes into existence today. The kingdom of heaven came into existence with a miracle, but it's perpetuated by divine law.

Unrelated and Disconnected Statements – No Comment:

Rom. 8:1-3. Then Jno. 14:16-17 and I didn't get the argument that he was making. He was talking about a messenger, and tree buds, and Jesus is the truth, and I will come to you, and you cannot be saved without him.

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

Metonymy - "Christ In You":

Then Jno. 14:26; Col. 1:26-28, "Christ in you." Now he just makes these Statements without making an argument on it. And I submit to you that the expression that you referred to, "Christ in you", is a figure of speech known as metonymy. You doubt that? Where the expression has a term with Christ in you it refers to his law. Just like I was talking about someone reading Shakespeare, or like preaching Jesus unto them, or whether they read Moses unto them.

Indwelling Of The Spirit:

Then 1Jno. 4:13, "The Spirit dwells in us as in him." And he assumes this is Holy Spirit baptism and I want to know, Mr. Welch, you say that's the reason why JESUS was DEITY. Would that make you deity if God dwells in YOU? You remember the first two nights? I didn't forget what you said.

Comments About Acts 1:6.:

Let's take a look at Acts 1:6, "They asked him at this time, doest thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? And he said, it's not for you to know." I made an argument on this last night. It hasn't been touched yet. That you need to consider who's being addressed, and verse 3 said that the Lord was assembled with the apostles. "And, being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father." He said, "ye heard how that John indeed baptized with water: but YE shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." I appeal to you. Open your New Testament and read that passage and see the antecedent of all of these pronouns that it's talking about the apostles.

Then in verses 7 and 8, and this is where he ties the promise of Acts 1:8 in with the promise of Acts 2:39. In Acts 1:8 the Lord makes a promise to the apostles that the Holy Spirit would come to give them power. Mr. Welch ties that in where he finds a promise in 2:39. He says it's the

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

same promise without any consideration as to whether it really is. I deny that it's the same promise, it's the promise of the remission of sins. (Moderator: 5 minutes) Thank you.

Worship In Spirit

Here then is my point in brief. The Spirit would come into them. 1Sam. 10 says that it would be another man, Rom. 5:5. But, Mr. Welch, you didn't prove that was Holy Spirit baptism did you? That's what the proposition calls upon you to do. Jno. 4:24, and I explained this last night, "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship IN SPIRIT." Now do you think that the expression in Spirit there has something to do with the Holy Spirit? Is that what you think about that? Jot it down, Mr. Welch, and tell me when you get up here. Let's find out just what he knows about that passage. That passage is describing the object of men's worship, the law involved, and the manner.

Luke 24 And The 120 Of Acts 1

Then in Lk. 24:46-49 and he ties this in with the 120. I don't think he meant that. I think you had reference to Acts the 1st chapter. But as I pointed out last night, and I suggest to you again, and I DESPAIR of getting this man to deal with my arguments. Now I made an ARGUMENT on that, that Lk. 24:46-49 is a parallel account of Mk. 16:14 and he was with the Eleven: Why don't you deal with my ARGUMENT? He wasn't with the 120. Mr. Welch says that he was, but he wasn't!

Audience Disturbance:

You can tell when an argument hurt, some of these fellows on the front row by the way they laugh. Mk. 16:14. Hold my time. Hold my time. I believe these are serious matters, and just because I read a passage from the word of God I don't think that's funny. I read that from the word of God. And you laughed at it. Start my time.

In Mk. 16:14, the record says that afterward he appeared unto the eleven

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

as they sat at meat, and this is a parallel to the statement in Lk. 24:46-49. In Acts 2:14, and I've already pointed out to you that the antecedent of the "they" in verse 1 is the apostles of verse 26. And I made an argument last night and he has completely ignored it till this good minute, about the fact that all that were baptized in the Holy Spirit spoke, but only twelve spoke; therefore, only twelve were baptized in the Holy Spirit. And I've already dealt with his argument on Joel 2:28, Acts 2:38 and I've already made answer on that.

The Word "Gift"

Then once again he talks about the idea of gifts. The same identical thing and it's the word in Eph. 2:8-9 and Acts 8, got the water before Spirit and Acts 10 that's the very point. But I submit to you that Cornelius got the Spirit before he ever BELIEVED. Acts 11:4 records the events in order, and verse 15 says, "As I began to speak." I pointed out that the Bible teaches in Acts 11:18 and Acts 15:8, the purpose for the Holy Spirit falling upon Cornelius and he has not yet considered it.

Rom. 8:20, "The gift of God is eternal life." And he's in trouble on that already and we'll see what he does with it. Acts 19:1-6, this was through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Is that the way that you received it?

Then he cited Jno. 4:10, Jno. 7:37-39, Rom. 8:9, and he said this was Holy Spirit baptism. Now I defy him to prove it. 1Cor. 6:9, 1Cor. 3:19, "The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit." There's no issue there, Then Gal. 3:5 and I presented an argument on that a moment ago. Seek and find, and therefore he said that means that the Lord will give you Holy Spirit baptism, He finds the Holy Spirit and thinks it's the Holy Spirit baptism. Heb. 11:6, "They shall be rewarded", and he thinks that's Holy Spirit baptism, whatever he sees. Then Eph 4:30, "grieve not the Spirit." Does this indicate a personality of the Spirit, Mr. Welch? This simply means that they were sealed. They were accepted, the Gentiles were, in Acts 10 as the passage teaches.

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

Then 1 Thess. 5:9. You meant verse 19 didn't you? Where it talks about, "quench not the Spirit" and the passage simply indicates one should not act in such a way as to cause the Spirit to be of non-effect. "Set not at naught prophesying;" that is, "despise not prophesying". Do not set them at naught, but the very next verse says, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

Unknown Tongues

1Cor. 14:2,14,15 where it talks about the matter of unknown tongues. And this passage also deals with not only unknown tongues but, how they're to be regulated, and 1Cor. 13:8 tells us that these tongues would cease. And that has to do with the gentlemen's speech, item by item, statement by statement, and passage by passage. How much time do I have now? (Moderator: 2.minutes)

Purpose Of Holy Spirit Baptism

All right, I want at this time to call your attention to these two charts that I presented last night and ask Mr. Welch to come up to them and deal with them. That the Bible teaches, and I noted down the passages, that had reference to Holy Spirit baptism and were so labeled, and every last one of them were passages that were addressed to the apostles. And it came for the purpose of giving them power that they might be able to impart spiritual gifts. As they did in Acts 8, as they did in Acts 19, and as Paul said he desired to go to Rome that he might be able to impart some spiritual gift. Ladies and gentlemen, I called your attention to this fact last night, that in the first century they did not have this book. And you made a statement last night, you said this wasn't completed for about 200 years. Where'd you get that idea? Where on EARTH did you GET that idea? I challenge that. Now observe if you will, and in the words of my good friend, if he lived long enough to make Methuselah look like a schoolboy he'll never prove that. In regarding the matter of Holy Spirit baptism, it has to do with the matter of inspiration. There was a time when all the word was oral, 2Cor. 4:7 "We have this treasure in earthen

Saturday - Moore's First Negative

vessels," There was a time when some of it was oral and some of it was written. During the time that the Word WAS IN INSPIRED MEN, IF YOU PLEASE, ladies and gentlemen, the Bible affirms that there would be these signs and wonders, and they would last TILL the unity of the faith.

And I have asked you, Mr. Welch, and I ask you again to tell me if the word T-I-L-L marks duration. Will you please sir? Deal with the arguments! Last TILL the unity OF THE FAITH, until the faith becomes a unit. Here's some that was oral, some of it was written. He said these signs and wonders would last till the faith became a unit. Now whenever that happened they would cease. 1Cor. 13:8-10, TONGUES WILL CEASE HE SAID. And let him deal with that when he comes to the stand. And I thank you very kindly.

The End Of Speech

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Four-A

Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Moore. I come before you tonight to make my last speech in this debate. It affords me great pleasure to come back and address you again. I want to say again as much as this'll be the last time I'll be here; I want to thank you again for your kindness; I want to thank the radio audience also for letting us come to you this way.

Refutation That Holy Spirit Ceased

Now in this debate it has bore down to the difference actually between what I affirm and what the Bible teaches; and what Mr. Moore imagines. That's right. Now he's got an idea in his head that when the New Testament was complete in writing that did away with all the operation of the Holy Ghost other than the word of God. And I've proven, will prove, and have already proven that that is not true. In his hand that when the New Testament was compiled in writing that did away with the operation of the Holy Ghost. And I'd just like to say this though, if it is, if Mr. Moore believes that he doesn't believe in any inspiration and operation of the Holy Spirit other than just the word of God. And the Bible was written by the Spirit of God.

The Word Not Easily Understood:

And men who wrote the Bible proclaimed it to be a book not too easily understood. The Scriptures said that Jesus would speak in dark sayings and parables. And we find that the Bible, speaking of things that Paul wrote, said that they are hard to be understood. They that are unlearned and unstable will wrest as they do the other Scriptures to their own destruction.

Word, Water And The New Birth

And from where I stand tonight my concept of Mr. Moore and his theology is that he doesn't believe there's anything at all but just the word and water. That's what he believes. I believe that. And I brought him out on it. Now the reason I asked him that question in St. John 3:5 where Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of Spirit he could

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

not enter the kingdom of God." And Mr. Moore takes the position there that that actually is word and water. That's what he believes about it. But the Bible doesn't teach that. I want you to understand that. Because the scripture said, "Except a man be born of water and of Spirit he could not enter the kingdom of God." Now he got up here and said that he didn't say that birth - baptism was a birth. Well, he's got one of two things then. He's either got a man in Christ without being born, or got him in there and he's not born, or he's- how would he figure that out?

He said that baptism inducted one into Christ. Well, does he mean by that, that the baptism does not put him in, he's either in or when he gets in he's yet got to be born yet after he gets in? Is that what he means? That's what I'm asking him. You see his theology doesn't make reason. He teaches you how to be baptized into Christ. Then he teaches that he didn't say baptism was a birth. Well baptism is a birth. It inducts you into Christ. You're born of water and Spirit. To be born means to become a son, and I've taken that position that it is a birth. That's right. Because the Bible teaches that by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink of the one Spirit, 1Cor. 12:13. And Mr. Moore would have that to be that you're baptized by the directions of the word and I don't know where he'd get the drink at. That's right. He asked me if Romans the 6th chapter and verse 3 had reference to water baptism, "Baptized into Christ." I told him it had reference to water baptism and Spirit baptism. Now, when the Israelites left Egypt, they were baptized of Moses in the cloud and in the Red Sea. They had a baptism from up above and one from down here but it is all called one baptism. That's right. That's the way with entering Christ, into this one baptism. And it PROVES that. Not only does it but every place and instance of conversion in the New Testament PROVES that.

Greek Words Meaning Gift

Now he asked me a question about the word gift in 1Cor. and I introduced some words last night. The Greek word paraclete means

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

advocate in the 14th chapter of St. John; call to one's aid; pleads the cause of another; and I introduced a scripture in Romans where it said, "We know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings." And then the Greek word charisma is used for the gifts like in the 12th chapter of 1Cor. and in Romans where it said "Impart some gift." And it means grace, favor, kindness, help. The Greek word dorea that comes from Acts 2:38, and Acts 8:10, and Acts 18- I mean in Acts the 8th chapter all means the free gift, the receiving of the Holy Ghost, the gifts of God, which is the Holy Ghost.

After you receive the Holy Ghost, then there's works of the Spirit that's given to the body. In other words there's people and the Holy Spirit searches out the mind and uses people for certain things. It's not a measure of the Holy Ghost, by any means.

Now, in Acts the 2nd chapter when Peter said, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now, in the early church they laid hands on people and prayed for them. They didn't give the Holy Ghost, there's no such thing as man giving you the Holy Ghost. John the Baptist said Jesus would do that. And the Holy Ghost does his own work. In the 12th chapter of 1Cor. Paul said, "the Holy Ghost, dividing to every man severally as he will." There's no such thing as no man giving you the Holy Ghost, no part of it; he could never prove that until judgment day. That's right. Now that being true, and that is true, I want to deal again with the difference in being inducted into Christ by just word and water.

Difference In "Induction Into Christ" And Just Word And Water:

I want to show you how it's wrong. Now in the 8th chapter of Acts. I'm going to take his argument here and he'll have a hard time undoing this one. In Acts the 8th chapter Philip went down to Samaria and preached the word to them. When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

baptized both men and women. Now they didn't receive the Holy Ghost. Now according to his argument they received what he calls the, course he didn't measure it last night and he's got the inference of his argument was it is measured in this tonight here. But anyway impart what they usually call the ordinary measure and there's no direct operation. I've been arguing with them for years and I've never yet understood just exactly what they mean about it unless it is this. That they mean that when you're baptized in water you're entitled to receive the word of God which is the sword of the spirit. That's right. I think that, I won't assume that. I won't take that position but it seems that's the way they teach it. All right. Now in the 8th chapter of Acts I'm going to show you where they are wrong.

They had received the word of God. They had been baptized, and they had not received the Holy Ghost. And these men came down from Jerusalem, the Bible said, "And prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost." Now when they got down there, when this man saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given; (the apostles didn't give him the Holy Ghost. Jesus Christ does that. John the Baptist said he would.) Now when they came down there and when this man Simon saw, (now according to Mr. Moore's argument here, when Simon was baptized. And I don't know whether he'll take the position, I don't believe he'll back off from it. But I've had them to say that when Simon was baptized that he received what you call an ordinary measure, and the others did.) Now I want you to notice what the Bible says. Now they came down and laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost. A direct operation apart from the word of God. Now there's them two elements again there is a confession in the establishment of a New Testament church. There's nowhere, I don't think he'll ever find where there's anything, any place, any where near of anything that favors a church being established; a bunch of people getting saved like he teaches they get inducted into Christ. It certainly wasn't here. That's right. They had been baptized, they had received the

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

word of God. And these men here, and this man offered them money. He said give me this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, that he might receive the Holy Ghost. And Peter said to him, notice now, this same Greek word dorea and not charisma. NO! Dorea! "And Peter said to him thy money perish with thee, because you have thought that the gift of God" that is God's Spirit coming in to make you a child of God and brings eternal life to your soul, "might be purchased with money."

You know, with Mr. Moore, one place it is and the other place it isn't. Now here it isn't, in Acts 10 it is. I want to show it to you. In the 10th chapter of Acts when the Gentiles came into the kingdom and the Bible said that Peter went down there and he preached Christ to them. Words, his message unto them concerned these words and whosoever believeth the -- witness that whosoever believeth in him should receive remission unto his name, receive remission of sins. And the Bible said. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word."

He said, when he was up here before, he said they hadn't heard it. The Bible says "They had heard." That's right, Mr. Moore, you can chew that one up when you come back. Yes sir. And the Bible said, "The Holy Ghost fell on ALL of them that had heard the word." Mr. Moore said, when he was up here before, they hadn't heard it. Well then he's got up here and said something about remission of some over here and having a man baptized and not for the remission of sins and not receiving the Holy Ghost, I mean, not having the -- not being fully born.

Water And Spirit Never Did Come At The Same Time:

Now these here had the Spirit element first and then the water. In the 8th chapter they got the water first and then the Spirit. IT NEVER DID COME AT THE SAME TIME. That's right. And the Bible said. "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." I never shall forget (Mr. Welch chuckling) when me and Mr. Moore

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

debated that in Panama City. We tangled on that too, Mr. Moore, I mean Mr. Woods, Guy Woods. And we tangled on that one, Mr. Moore. There, but they had HEARD the word, the word was what they had. "And then said Peter, can any one forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them." I want to show you here again. There's the two elements of that one birth. This was the opening of the door of faith for the Gentiles. In Acts the 10th chapter, I mean the 14th chapter and verse 27, it said, "it was the opening of the door of faith unto the Gentiles.

And if that door was opened that way, it simply meant this; that these Gentiles entered the kingdom of God just exactly like when he talked about it in St. John 8:5. He said that that fellow was a Jew. And the Lord is trying to tell him, he just didn't say that fellow. Mr. Moore, he didn't say just that fellow. He said if a man wasn't born again he couldn't enter the kingdom or God, and he said if he was not born of water and Spirit (a man, he didn't say just that man, any man) he could not enter the kingdom of God.

Cornelius – No Laying On Of Hands

Now here is the Gentiles entering. Now he said this here was Holy Ghost baptism. Comes from the Greek word dorea the gift of the Holy Ghost fell upon them. That's right. There was no laying on of hands on them when that happened. And it was the same thing in the 8th chapter of Acts, right here, from the same word, identical same word. Simply means the same thing right here in the 8th chapter of Acts with these men as the 10th chapter of Acts, and he admits in the 10th chapter or Acts it's Holy Ghost baptism. It comes from the identical same word. That's right. Now that shows the weakness of his position, when he tries to say that you're just baptized in water alone and there's no working of the Spirit. There WAS a working of the Spirit. They heard them people speak with tongues and that's how they knew they had the Holy Ghost.

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

Disciples Of John:

Now, we move on to the 19th chapter. And in the 19th chapter of Acts, as I showed before, I'm showing the two elements. And he can't tear it down, he hasn't done that and he won't do it; He won't do it in his last 30 minute speech; He hasn't done it last night, and the first part of tonight, and he won't do it tonight. This is showing the two elements of the new birth, water and Spirit never came at the same time. It was always either before or after but both elements were always there. And the 19th chapter of Acts, these people here, Paul said to them, "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed? And they said, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were you baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism." That's right. "Then Paul said, John did verily baptize with the baptism of repentance, saying to the people, they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. And when they HEARD this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul laid his hands upon them, the..."

What did he ask them that he found? What did he ask them? "Have you received the Holy Ghost?" What happened? In Acts 2 they received the Holy Ghost. What happened? He said, "That's baptism." Now over here to receive it is not baptism. You folks see that.

Now you people out on the left, to that side of me, can see that. (Mr. Welch chuckles) Bless your heart.

Receiving The Holy Ghost

That's right. All right, listen. Now in the 10th chapter, now he said, "that's baptism". It's called the gift of the Holy Ghost. Baptism, they received it. How did they know it? "For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." And over here in the 19th chapter he asked if they had received the Holy Ghost, that's what he's talking about. That's the thing under consideration. "Have you received the Holy Ghost?" That's right.

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

Now of course they did. They were baptized in Jesus' name, that's the water. Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." They were baptized in Jesus' name and for the remission of sins. They received the Holy Ghost as Christ came into them. There they were born of water and Spirit and their bodies became the temple of the living God: there was a direct operation upon their bodies when the living God came in. Now we move on from that one back to the 2nd chapter. In Acts 2:38 and 39, "Peter said, repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive "(the dorea again, that Greek word dorea the gift of God) that is, the Holy Ghost is coming into you. It's Christ in you, the hope of glory. It's Christ in omnipresent operation; it's the Spirit of Christ in you. Like he said, "I'll not leave you comfortless," when the promise was given, "I'll come to you." The Scripture I introduced in Colossians the first chapter 26th and 27th verses said, "The mystery that's been hid for ages but is now revealed which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.

Baptism Of Holy Spirit Will Never Cease

Now as long as there is a kingdom, as long as there's a church, as long as there's a new birth there will be the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That's not nearly right that is right. Now on his chart over here in the 13th chapter of 1Corinthians he said the book's written by inspiration, inspired men, inspired book. All written in 2Tim. 3:16; Eph. 4:13; 2Cor. 4:7, 1Cor. 13:8-10.

All Scripture By Inspiration:

All scripture is given by inspiration. Not just the New Testament. If you want to show how long they were compiling the New Testament into accepted cannon books, go down here to the library in this town right here in Orange, Texas, and turn to the Encyclopedia Britannica and get your information. That's right. You go down here and turn to the Encyclopedia Britannica in your town here and find out how long it was

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

they were compiling and making what we call the New Testament now into cannon of books. Go down there and look at it. He challenged that statement I made last night and I challenge him and indict him. Go down and take the history of the Bible, how long they were compiling the New Testament as an accepted book like we know it today. And I don't say that, with any disrespect to the New Testament. I believe every word of it. That's right. And the Old Testament, too. But ALL Scripture, notice here on his chart where he said, "All Scripture", (1Tim. 3:16). Now in 1Tim. 3, in 1Tim. 5 and I mean in the 15th verse 1Tim. 15th verse, Paul said to Timothy, "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures." Now all Scripture, the Old Testament, the New Testament, all of it was given by inspiration, all through the Spirit of God. And in the verse preceding this one he said, "From a child you've known the Holy Scriptures." Jesus said, "Search the scriptures." What was he talking about? "For in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they that testify of me." All right. Now again we read that the—In the New Testament what they did, they searched the scriptures and they searched the scriptures in Romans, we find the comfort of the scriptures. Paul went into the synagogue and preached from the scriptures, the Old Testament. That's right. In Acts 17:2 Paul preached from the Old Testament scriptures. They divided and in the 8th chapter of Acts Philip preached from the Old Testament scripture. That's right. ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God. Every bit of it, not just the New Testament, it's ALL, every bit of it. That's right. Here he said to him, "From a child you've known the Holy Scriptures." The scripture was our school master, points out about Christ. They preached out of the Old Testament scripture in their lifetime. ALL Scripture is given of the inspiration of God, every bit of it. That's right. Not just part of it but all of it. I'll take all of that. Now, how much time do I have? (Moderator: 8 minutes)

That Which Is Perfect, 1Cor. 13

Now, the 13th chapter of 1Cor. "When that Which is perfect is come." "There remains faith, hope, and charity," he says. Well it remains and

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

they received the Holy Ghost by faith; they performed miracles by faith. And I'll say again, he couldn't prove in a thousand years in the 13th chapter of 1Cor. that that has reference to the completion of the New Testament. He couldn't do it, he hasn't done it and he won't do it. That's right. He's speaking there of the helps in Christian life and of the gifts of the Spirit in the 12th chapter; comes to the 13th chapter and shows that the charity there, which is the love of God; and, as he's already stated, people that had the gifts of the Spirit had to be taught. Moves on down to the 14th chapter, out of the 13th chapter after he says there, "When that which is perfect is come." And I argued last night and I'll argue again tonight that that means the perfection of the church, the end of the age is coming by being obedient to God, and the hope of it, and hope remains, faith remains and hope. That's right. He talks about hope and faith remains till then. That's right. And they received the Holy Ghost by faith. That's not nearly right that is right. And it means, as Paul said in Philippians, "Not as though I had attained the resurrection of the dead," was already perfect but he looked forward to that time. And these helps in the church was given to profit and help; such as, tongues, interpretation of tongues, and prophecy, and these things, and praying in the Holy Ghost. And the scripture in Jude said, "Building up your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost." Always to continue in his church, and always will be.

Must Be Baptized In Water And Spirit

And as I conclude tonight, I want YOU to remember this. To be born of God you must be baptized in water and you must be be baptized of the Holy Spirit. And Isaiah said that scripture in – I mean in Galatians 5:4, "Because ye are sons." There's another that goes with that and that's Romans the 8th chapter and 15th verse says this, "But you have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father. His Spirit bears witness of our spirit, that." That's right, And that spirit must come into acknowledgment that you have God in your heart and there is that if you

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

don't have the Spirit of Christ you are none of His.

But he says you can get it and not belong to him. That's the inference of his argument with Galatians. Paul turns right around and says, "If any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he's none of his. And that's right too. So, ladies and gentlemen, it is happy for me to be here tonight. And he says something about all the mistakes that I've made. Well, Mr. Moore, the tape will talk all about that. But time is about up tonight and I won't have time to wipe out all the mistakes that you and I've made. But since you admitted that people that had Spiritual gifts would have to be taught, well I guess that will go along with what I'm preaching just the same. And I might say this to you too. Speak about the Spiritual gifts, that is, an apostle reprov'd another apostle. That's right. The Apostle Peter was reprov'd by the Apostle Paul. He was as you're thinking. And that goes to show you that there is instruction, the ministerial gifts in the church are still here. That's right. There's pastors and evangelist and they're still in the church. They are given by the Spirit of God.

Ordination And Recognition

NOW getting to the ordination and recognition of them and I think that I'll have time to deal with that just a little bit before I sit down. The 8th chapter—in the eighth chapter of Acts we find the ordination procedure like it was in the 13th chapter, like he admitted, I believe it was last night in particular. He may not have used the word ordination because they don't any of them, I think, do that. But in the 8th chapter of Acts. (I don't think they ordain preachers, I may be a little ahead of myself there. But he can straighten me out one way or the other.) In the 8th chapter of Acts when these men came that they were going to pray for. And I want you to notice something here. There is a difference in the ordination of people who already have the Holy Ghost. That's what I'm talking about. It's not to give them the Holy Ghost. These people already had the Holy Ghost. In the 6th chapter of Acts here they looked out these seven men. And when they looked them out, here's what they said to them. "Look

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

you out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost.”

Now what happened on the day of Pentecost? They were filled with the Holy Ghost. These men here had already been filled with the Holy Ghost. They'd already been baptized with the Holy Ghost. Well you might say though, why were they laid hands upon? Well why did they lay hands on Paul? He, I think Mr. Moore would admit that he was baptized with the Holy Ghost. Why would they, when Ananias in the 9th chapter of Acts. (And I still contend, Mr. Moore, and don't forget that. I want you to remember that. That in the 9th chapter of Acts) whenever Ananias laid his hands on Paul there and prayed for him; it was when he laid his hands on him, that is when Paul got the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Ananias came in there and said, “Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that sent me unto thee, that hath appeared unto thee, hath sent me, that you might receive your sight, AND be filled with the Holy Ghost.” That you might receive your sight AND be filled with the Holy Ghost. That you might receive your sight AND be filled with the Holy Ghost. “And he laid his hands upon him and the scales fell from his eyes.” And Paul was filled with the Holy Ghost at the same time he was baptized with it. And these people here were filled with it at the same time they were baptized with it. And when they went to look out these men to lay their hands on them and pray for these men, it was men that was already full of the Holy Ghost. The Bible says it was. I want to read it again. “And they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.” Now he'd have you to believe here in the 8th chapter of Acts when they received the Holy Ghost, these apostles laid hands on them and they just got it, the apostles give it to them. Now they laid hands on these fellows here, but they didn't give them the Holy Ghost. They already had it. They was already full of it. They laid their hands on them and when they did that, they went into special work for the church, but they were already filled with the Holy Ghost.

Praying In An Unknown Tongue

Saturday - Welch's Second Affirmative

Now coming back to the praying and the Spirit again and the direct operation. I think I'll have time to move in there just a little bit before my time is up here. And in the 14th chapter of 1Cor. And Mr. Moore he made a pretty shallow argument about this. Paul said, "If I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth," He said, "What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit." And that was when he was worshiping God in spirit. He's talking about John 4 and 24. He was praying in the spirit, he was singing in the spirit, and that's in John, in Romans 8:26 when the Holy Spirit. Not another person making intercession to another person in heaven. No. There's no person involved in this. It's the Spirit of a person, and the way the help is here, "that we know what we should pray for we ought, but the Spirit itself helpeth our infirmities and maketh intercession for us." And that's when Paul was praying in the unknown tongue, edifying himself!

The End of Speech

Holy Spirit Baptism Debate: Part Four-B

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Welch. I would like, before getting into this speech, to say just a word about the very fine cooperation I have been privileged to enjoy with my brethren in this area. I've never had a debate where I thought the brethren made the preparation as capably, or showed the acts of hospitality toward me as they have here. And I want to make that public; and of course, I express brother Bruce's sentiments along that line. And it too has been a genuine pleasure to have met in a discussion with Mr. Welch. I looked forward to this with quite a bit of anticipation knowing that Mr. Welch was reputed to be a man capable of defending the position he espoused. And even though I've pressed him as hard as I can, and I will do so in the next 30 minutes; I do not dislike him. I do this because I think I'm RIGHT. I believe the position I hold is the truth, just like he thinks his position is true. And I give him credit for believing that and I think that he does me. Because we press one another doesn't mean that we're enemies at all. And as I say, I will continue to press him for the next 30 minutes with every ounce of my being.

Ananias Laying Hands On Paul

I want to begin, at least briefly, at the back part of his speech and take a look at something he said. Then I'll go back to the first part of it. All that has to do with the matter of Simon. Now I dealt with this or, I mean, the matter of Paul having Ananias' hands laid on him. I just want to take my New Testament and read you something. Now Mr. Welch contends that whenever Ananias laid his hands upon Paul that he was baptized with the Holy Spirit right then and there and that he was also healed. You remember I called your attention to the fact last night that the expression, laying on of hands, was not always used with reference to a medium through which the Holy Spirit was given. That, sometimes, it simply means the right hand of fellowship or appointment as it did in Acts 13 and Gal. 2:9. He completely left it alone. And I called your attention to the fact, last night, that Acts 9 tells you why Ananias was to lay his hands on

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Paul. Mr. Welch didn't pay any attention to it at all. Verse 12 tells us why Ananias laid his hands on Paul.

The Reason For Laying Hands On Paul:

Listen, "And he hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands on him, that he might receive his sight." And it's very significant, now watch this, it's very significant. When you read, when this transpired, here is what you have, "And Ananias departed, and entered into the house, and laying his hands on him said, Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit." Now listen to the next verse, "And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight, and he arose and was baptized." Now verse 12 says that he was to lay his hands on him to heal him and verse 18 says that he did. It didn't say anything about him giving him the Holy Spirit, Mr. Welch, not a thing on earth. Now that's what the passage says about the matter. I wanted to deal with that while it was fresh on your mind.

Speaking In Tongues:

And also about the matter of Cor. 14, and he said that was a pretty shallow argument. Now I've endeavored, Mr. Welch, in these two nights, to discuss this subject of Holy Spirit baptism. I have no fear of discussing the matter of tongues, and I called your attention to the fact that tongues, the writer said, would cease, 1Cor. 13:8. Now I'll deal with that more fully in a moment. But in 1Cor. 14, the entire chapter, if you'll just look and read it, you'll see that the writer starts out by showing the impropriety of speaking so as not to be understood. And he illustrates it. Paul illustrates it and I'll use the passage that he uses. He uses an illustration of singing and praying to show that it would be improper to speak in such a way as to be misunderstood. And that's all on earth that the passage has to do with.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Moore's Imagination Read From The Book

And now I want to go back to the first of his speech. He said, "It's boiled down to the difference between what the Bible teaches and what I imagine." And yet, I've been reading my imagination out of the book. You know I have. I've taken passage after passage and I've read them. Just like over here. Now this is just my imagination. This argument has been advanced through four speeches. That whenever at the household of Cornelius, whenever the apostle Peter was referring to that back in Jerusalem, he said, "It fell on them even as on us at the BEGINNING." And I asked him to tell me WHY Peter had to go all the way back to the BEGINNING to find another case like this, if all through the time it was happening as he said it was? Yet I imagined that. That was my imagination; yet, I read it out of the book, as you know that I did.

Conversion Of Cornelious:

And then about Cornelius. Mr. Welch, are you not mindful of the fact in the 11th chapter, I called your attention to this a moment ago. Now he cites Acts the 10th chapter and he chides me and said, "just come up here and chew on that." Just come up and chew on this. He says, in Acts 10, "Why the record indicates that this man had heard the gospel when the Holy Spirit fell upon him." And I suggested to you a moment ago that in the 11th chapter, whenever this matter was given, that it was given in the order in which it occurred. Now in the 11th chapter of the book of Acts you have a record of this same thing. And verse 4 says that it is given in order, that simply means the order in which it occurred. And I'm constrained to believe that whenever Mr. Welch debates the Baptist that he makes the same argument with them on this passage that I'm making right now. I'd like to hear one of his debates with the Baptist on it. But now watch it, in Acts 11:4 the Bible says he "began and rehearsed the matter in order." Look at your Bible and see if it doesn't. Luke in the 10th chapter does not give the order in which the events occur. How do I know that? Because the 11th chapter says that these are in order. That's why I said a moment ago in Acts 11:4, "These are given in order". Peter

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

recounts the incident on the housetop, the miracle that caused him to go down to this man's house. And Mr. Welch presents an argument that's mine. He talks about the opening the door of the Gentiles. Mr. Welch, that's the point that I made last night. That this was an EXCEPTUAL case, the opening of the door to the Gentiles. And that's not your argument. That's mine! That's the one that I advanced on it. Now watch it. Peter recounts what transpired while he was up on the housetop and saw the vision that caused him to go to the man's house. In Acts 11:15, after he got there, the record says, "AS I BEGAN TO SPEAK." Look at it and see if it doesn't. And the expression simply means scarcely had I uttered a word. Scarcely had I uttered a word. As I BEGAN to speak I was interrupted.

The Purpose:

What interrupted you Peter? "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning." That was the purpose of it, to convince him to preach the gospel to them. That's what he used it for when he got back to Jerusalem. Now Mr. Welch said, "Come up and chew on that." And, ladies and gentlemen, I just ask you, when you get home, would you kindly open your New Testament to the 11th chapter of the book of Acts and just read this and see what I'm telling you? Now he said I'm just imagining this; and yet the 11th chapter says this is in order. This is the way these things occurred, one, two, three, four, and down the line. Peter said, "As I began to speak I was interrupted." What happened? "The Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning." Why'd he have to go all the way back to the Pentecost?

Full Of The Holy Spirit (Acts 6)

And he cited Acts 6 a moment ago about, "Look ye out among you men who are full of the Holy Spirit." Yet if ALL of them were full of it, why'd he have to look out some that were? Just pick out any of them they want to pick! A suggestion unwarranted and you see that it is.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

The Bible Written By The Holy Spirit

The Bible written by the Spirit of God, and of course there's no issue here. I've never denied that; do you see anything on this chart that would indicate that I thought that the Old Testament wasn't inspired? I think the Old Testament's inspired. I believe that the Old Testament's prophets were inspired also. I believe that the New Testament writers were inspired and that's the purpose of this chart. That Jesus, as I suggested to you, while in the accompany of these man said to them, "Now you'll be responsible for making my message known, but I will see to it that you'll not have to depend upon your own intelligence for I'll see to it that you are INSPIRED." And I have pleaded with him to deal with the argument that I've made. And to come up here and talk about the Old Testament being inspired doesn't touch top, side, nor bottom of my argument; and no one knows it better than my good friend, Mr. Welch.

Born Of Water And Spirit

John 3:3-5 and he says I'll never prove that and yet I cited these two passages to him. Why didn't he deal with them? I explained the verse. I called his attention to Eph. 5 where Paul said, "by the washing of water with the word."

I called attention to 1Pet. 1:22-23 where he talks about being born again or begotten of the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. And I didn't say that that was only for Nicademis' sake, Mr. Welch. You thought I said that. You misunderstood what I said. I said that he used that figure of speech because of who he was talking to. He used a figurative expression there because he was talking to a man who thought his natural birth would gain him entrance into the kingdom. And he didn't deal with my argument on Eph. 5 and 1Pet.1:22-23. And then said I said baptism wasn't a birth. Mr. Welch, HERE'S what I said, you see? Now you may not know what SYNONYMOUS means, I don't know. But you said, "They're synonymous terms." I challenge that. Do you know what a synonym is? You'll get up here and you'll say they're synonymous.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

That's what I challenge.

Then 1Cor. 12:13. Where did I get the drink.? In Acts 2:38, I just gave it on the board. Observe it if you will, ladies and gentlemen. Here's where I got it. Now this debate, tonight and last night, was not over the question of IF or HOW I might today have the Holy Spirit. We're debating Holy Spirit baptism. That's exactly the thing that we've been arguing. Now observe if you will. He wants to know how. Here's exactly how, Acts 2:38. Now 1Cor 12:13 says, "For by one Spirit were you all baptized in one body, and made to drink of one Spirit." That's precisely, the argument I have on my chart and he conveniently overlooked it. I've presented that argument all the way through this debate, that is as far as God is concerned it's a matter of SALVATION. Mr. Welch says Holy Spirit before as far as he's concerned. It's a matter of salvation and then the Holy Spirit. It's a matter of the Holy Spirit "because you are sons of God", Gal. 4:6. Regeneration and then the Holy Spirit, Tit. 3:5. Reconciliation and then the Holy Spirit, and I'll just add 1Cor. 12:13 to it. "Baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit." That's how Mr. Welch. It was on the chart all the time.

Moses And The Israelites

Now you know our Baptist friends cite this to prove that no one got wet, therefore, you don't have to get in the water. The Methodist use it to prove infant baptism. And now, Lo, and behold, Mr. Welch has found two of them in the passage. There's two baptisms there he thinks.

The Greek Words For Gift:

Then the PARACLETE and the DOREA and the CHARISMA. He talks about these words and yet he never attempted to get himself out of the difficulty as in the passage I cited a moment ago. Vine's Dictionary of the Greek-English words. And why didn't he deal with the argument where I pointed out that he was in a difficulty on Eph. 2:8-9? It's that same word that says that salvation is a gift. And it's the word in Mt. 2:11 that's talking about what they brought to Jesus, the Christ child. Now was that Holy

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Spirit baptism back there? There's not a thing on EARTH to that little play that he's making on those words. Not a thing, he just makes it. It doesn't mean a thing on earth. They get him into trouble. That's the word that was used to describe what they brought to the Lord when he was born. Now he simply calls that word in Acts 2 and Acts 10, that's Holy Spirit baptism. So the wise men brought Holy Spirit baptism to Jesus when he was born, according to this man's argument on the word that he obviously doesn't know a thing on earth.

Measuring The Holy Spirit:

Not a measure. Undoubtedly he came down here to discuss this idea of measure, and so far as I'm able to tell, the only time I've mentioned it has been in reference to when he said it. I didn't say a thing on earth about it.

Giving The Holy Spirit:

And then he said the apostles didn't give anybody the Holy Spirit. Now if I left that impression I didn't intend to. I read Rom. 1:11. Paul said, "I desire to come to thee, that I may impart, some spiritual gift. And my argument was that they were a medium through which it was done. I didn't mean that they themselves did it.

The Samaritans:

Then Acts 8:5-12 concerning the Samaritans. And let's just take a look at this. In Acts the 8th chapter Philip went down to Samaria and he preached unto them Christ. Now Jesus said, "Go preach the Gospel, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now I believe that. I believe that when Philip went down to Samaria and he preached the gospel to them, when the record said many of the Samaritans hearing believed and were baptized; I believe they were saved.

Jesus said they would be. Now he thinks they were half saved. But I think they were saved. They weren't saved until the apostles came down and laid their hands on them according to this man. And yet Jesus said,

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now I believe the Lord meant what he said.

And as I've called your attention to the fact over on the chart concerning Acts 2:38, and concerning the fact of Philip down in Samaria, as I've pointed out the distinction in these gifts. I've done this so many times. Because the Samaritans heard, believed, were baptized, I believe they received the gift of the Holy Spirit of Acts 2:38. Now he says, "Why that's ridiculous to imagine that they did because later on the apostles laid their hands on them and gave them the Holy Spirit." And yet, that's PRECISELY, Mr. Welch, what you said about Romans 1:11 ISN'T IT Mr. Welch? You see Paul said that the Romans all had the Spirit. Mr. Welch introduced the argument and I believe it. And yet he said, "I desire to come unto you that I may impart some spiritual gift. Now there's the Romans, they had the Spirit and Paul said that he would impart the Spirit. Mr. Welch can't see that in Acts 8. Did you ever see such? You folks can see the difficulty that he's in on this.

Then about the Spirit and the word. and Simon baptized and the matter of the ordinary measures, and of course, like I say that's his terminology not mine.

Here's once again the matter of DOREA and still the Bible says that SALVATION is a gift and it's that same word, Eph. 2:8-9, "For by grace have you been saved through faith and that not of yourselves, it's the GIFT OF GOD." And that's your word DOREA. And you say, "Oh, he admits that it is." But now he thinks that Holy Spirit baptism and water baptism are necessary to get that gift. He argues that Holy Spirit baptism is there one time and the next time it's to get there. (Moderator: 15 minutes) Thank you.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Cornelius' Conversion

Acts 10:43 and he said, " You just chew that one up when you come back." And he ignored my argument on the order. Let me present it to you again. Let's turn to Acts 11. I hope you have a New Testament, and let's read some of my imagination that Mr. Welch talked about. Let's just turn and read. I have no fear of reading any passage, I can harmonize any passage on the Holy Spirit with my position. This man cannot as you can see that he can't. But now let's just read Acts 11. Verse 14 says that "Peter began and expounded the matter unto them in order, saying", then he explains. He talks about the vision that he had; He talks about the men who came, and the fact that the Spirit said go with them, nothing doubting. It took a vision on the housetop and the fact that the Spirit told him to go, to even get him to go down there. And as I pointed out last night, you know the attitude that the Jews had toward the Gentiles. And my good friend admits that this was the opening of the door to the Gentiles. Don't you see that, Mr. Welch? This was an EXCEPTIONAL case, and that's the thing that I argued last night. Now watch it. Whenever the apostle Peter got back to Jerusalem the Jews contended with him. That's what the first three verses say in Acts 11. They put him on the carpet saying, why did you do it? Why did you go down to Gentiles, the uncircumcised, and eat with them and so on. And Peter explained why he did it. He told them the reason why he went was because of the vision and because the Spirit told him to go, nothing doubting. This explained to them why he preached to them and why he baptized them. Now listen to him, Acts 11:15, "And as I began to speak." And I invite you or anyone that's capable of checking out the particular tense of the verb here described in this expression; I invite your attention to do that very thing, because it simply means scarcely had I uttered a word when I was interrupted. "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the BEGGINING." Why did he have to go all the way back to the beginning? And I've asked that question repeatedly; "And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit. If then

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

God gave unto them the like gift as he did unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus, who was I, that I could withstand God?" Peter said, "I couldn't withstand God because I saw that God gave to them what he did to us at the beginning." The very next verse said that they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, "That unto the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life."

Why not let the passage tell you why it fell upon them? Don't you see that it fell upon this man before he had heard the gospel? It fell upon him for the purpose of convincing this man, who was a Jew, that he ought to preach to him. And that's why and the way that Peter used it. Then in the 15th chapter verses 7 and 8 the same man, the Apostle Peter, said, "Brethren, ye know that a good while ago that God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles would hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God, who knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us." In other words, to assure the Gentiles that they had been accepted and to convince the Jews. As Mr. Welch says, "The opening of the door to the Gentiles." And I thought for a moment that Mr. Welch was Going to deal with the argument of Acts 2:38. He pointed toward the board but he never did get around to dealing with it. Now, Mr. Welch, this debate will close and you never will have extricated yourself from this difficulty. You say that the gift or Spirit in Act 2:38 is Holy Spirit baptism. You then say that it takes Holy Spirit baptism and water baptism to induct a man into Christ. That passage says, repent, be baptized for the remission of sins, then the Holy Spirit. The remission of sins came before the Holy Spirit. Now Mr. Welch says that it took the Holy Spirit to put them in Christ. You have a man with the remission or sins OUTSIDE of Christ and you've never tried to get yourself out or this difficulty. His position on all these passages is the reason why I called your attention to this chart, ladies and gentlemen, to get you to see the contradiction that he finds himself in on this. Observe if you will, he has a man with salvation outside or Christ; he has a man with regeneration outside of Christ; he has a man reconciled unto God

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

outside of Christ; he has a man with remission or sins outside of Christ by his argument on this. Then once again, it's when he pointed to the chart when he said, "two elements of birth open the door of faith." Like I say, I thought he was going to deal with it, but he didn't. And that's my argument about opening the door of faith to the GENTILES. And as I pointed out last night that's why he explains later on in the chapter that the Gentiles had received the gospel of Jesus Christ.

And the statement over in Amos concerning the residue of men, that which remained, was FULFILLED.

This is where he referred to the matter of the Pharisee, "It didn't just say that man." I didn't say that either. I simply called your attention to the fact that the Lord used a figurative expression, used BIRTH, and he did it for a purpose. He didn't do it to confuse anybody, not at all. And what did Mr. Welch have to say about this? Coming from the obscure to the clear, Mt. 7:21, by doing the will of the Father to get into the kingdom.

Two Elements Of Baptism:

Two elements of new birth never came at the same time. Is that not significant to you? Is that not significant to you, ladies and gentlemen? That admission that he admits ought to be significant to you. For instance, he cites Acts the 8th chapter. Philip went down to Samaria and those folks were baptized in the name of Jesus. And you know and I know that Mr. Welch has presented argument after argument to the effect that when they were baptized into Jesus that was baptism in the name of Jesus. Or that baptism in the name of Jesus was baptism into Jesus. That was his argument for two nights. Now that passage says they were baptized in the name of Jesus. Now he says, "No that didn't get them into Christ." But you see they were baptized in the name of Jesus, but they didn't have Holy Spirit baptism yet; therefore, they were not in the kingdom. What condition were they in? Were they just half born? What did he have to say about the apostles when I asked him

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

whether or not they were baptized in the name of Jesus? Not a single solitary word. Don't you see? Is that not significant? That in these passages you have that and the reason why you do, as I have pointed out repeatedly, is the fact that the Lord empowered these men, not only with the ability to reveal divine truth, but that they might be able to impart spiritual gifts. Through the medium of the apostles, spiritual gifts were imparted. And as I pointed out last night, these spiritual gifts were in the church to protect the church. They did not have this written word then. God didn't do these things indiscriminately. There was a purpose for it. They didn't have the written word as we now have the written word, and there were inspired men in the church to protect the church. That the church might not be carried about by every wind of doctrine and that's Paul's argument in Eph. 4. He cites Acts 9:1-7 and he pays no attention to the argument that I've made on all of these passages.

Proposition – Baptized As The Apostles Were:

Mr. Welch, sir, I called your attention to the fact that your proposition says that men are baptized today as were the apostles. You've said that the apostles were baptized, as were the Samaritans. But the Samaritans received it through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Don't you see the predicament that has put you in? You have the Samaritans receiving it through the laying on of an apostle's hands. And since you get it today like they got it, the only way you could get it according to your argument is through the laying on of the apostles' hands.

He wants to know what they asked him and said that you receive the Holy Spirit when you're baptized. And of course, I can just about make a draw with you on that passage, couldn't I, about Mt. 28:19-20? But I just submit to you that Acts 2:38 promised the gift of the Holy Spirit to everyone who's baptized in the name of Jesus. Promised the Holy Spirit.

Direct Operation Of The Spirit

Then he talks about a direct operation. Have I ever denied that Mr.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Welch? Have I ever DENIED that when the apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit that that was a direct operation of the Spirit? Did you ever hear me deny that? I'm denying that it's happening NOW; not back then. He says, "I'm going to prove it was a direct operation." So he goes back and proves that it was and I admitted it last night in my first speech. But that doesn't prove that it's perpetuated. What did Mr. Welch have to say about my argument on this? Everything started with a miracle but is perpetuated by law. Man for instance was created by a miracle but perpetuated by the law of procreation. The church came into existence as the result of a miracle. That's why he didn't come out on the apostles. I'd be just happy to have you come out on the idea of the apostles. I wish you had. He'd find out whether or not the apostles were baptized in the name of Jesus, or John's baptism, or just how they were baptized if you'd come out on it. Wouldn't we, Mr. Welch?

Figure Of Speech:

Next he cites, once again, Col. 1:26, "Christ in you." And he ignored my argument. I pointed out to you at that time that this was a figure of speech known as metonymy where the expression Christ in you is referring to the law of Christ. Now do you deny that that figure of speech is used? You remember I called your attention to the fact where it says, "He preached unto him Jesus." Well did he just say Jesus, Jesus, Jesus? Certainly not. That's a figure of speech where an author is used when his works are intended. And I illustrated it by calling your attention to the fact that we talk about reading Shakespeare. We mention Shakespeare when his works are intended. He just runs his argument back through again and ignores mine.

And then that's when he dealt with my chart on inspiration, and I'll save that. I want to cover everything that he said then go to my charts. How much time do I have left? (Moderator: 6 minutes) Thank you.

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

Compiling The New Testament

Compiling in accepted form. That's when he was talking about the matter of the New Testament. Now, Mr. Welch, do you think that had to do with completely revealed? Is that what you were trying to imply? He says you go down here and get the Encyclopedia and you read about whenever it was completely compiled, I was talking about INSPIRATION. He introduces this and made the argument, last night, that it didn't happen for about 300 years, now he talks about the compilation of it. Who does that book tell you compiled it, Mr. Welch?

Who does that book tell you compiled these books of the New Testament into this particular editing? Do you think that the apostate New Testament church, the Roman Catholic Church is responsible for the INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT? That's what he implied in that argument. Just because the books were compiled in this order that that's when they were inspired, revealed, completely written down.

Inspiration Of Scripture:

Then that's when he talked about from a child Timothy knew the Scriptures. Talked about the Old Testament being inspired. I believe that 2Pet. 1:20 affirms the inspiration of the Old Testament prophets. I never one time said a word to the contrary.

1Cor. 13:9-10. Let's take a look at this once again. My argument, Mr. Welch, that you still have not dealt with, sir. My argument is this, look at it. (Pointing To The Chart)

That argument says that whenever that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. Then he says now abideth faith, hope and love. Not only does the Bible teach that whenever (This is what he's talking about now.) that hope will become a reality that faith will become knowledge. Do you think that there will be a matter of faith and hope at the Second Coming of the Lord, that it will continue? Faith will

Saturday - Moore's Second Negative

become knowledge, hope will become a reality. That's why I said that it could not refer to what he had reference to. And I introduced an argument in Jas. 1:25 and Jas. 2:12 to show you that the perfect law of liberty has reference to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and it makes sense in connection with this. So that the apostle is simply saying to them that at the time whenever the perfectly and completely revealed will of God comes you'll not then need this which is in part, the spiritual gifts, for the purpose of protecting the church. This will do it (referring to the New Testament).

Sons Of God (Gal. 4:6):

That passage says, "It's because you are sons of God." And he cited Rom. 8:15-16 in an effort to contradict that passage. Not an effort to try to explain it but to contradict it. That passage is simply because you are sons of God. God poured forth his Spirit in your heart, whereby you cry, Abba, Father." Rom. 8:15-16 talks about the acknowledgment, as he freely admits, of the human spirit with the Holy Spirit. Now how does that acknowledgment take place, Mr. Welch? Is it not by what the Holy Spirit revealed? When the human spirit knows that he's doing that which the Holy Spirit has revealed there is that agreement or acknowledgment, and it doesn't touch top, side or bottom of the issue at hand. Then he said, regarding his contradictions, that I admitted that those who had spiritual gifts had to be taught. Yes, Mr. Welch, and they admitted it for Paul wrote back the second Corinthian letter and they had corrected their mistakes. And I trust, sir, that that will be the success of this effort.

Paul Rebuked Peter:

Did you think that Peter ceased to be inspired because in this matter that the Apostle Paul rebuked him? The matter of inspiration, ladies and gentlemen, so far as these men were concerned, did not mean that they had something particularly to help them in the matter of living the Christian life, their inspiration was inspiration related to the matter of revelation.

Appointment Of The 7 In Acts 6:3:

Then Acts 6:3 and I want you to think about that. He cites this, "Look ye out men full of the Holy Spirit." But he says all of these were full of the Holy Spirit. Why look out any particular one? All of them could work as good as any of them.

And Acts 9:12 and 9:17-18, that had to do with Ananias laying on his hands, and I've dealt with that in 1Cor. 14. I've dealt with that. And, ladies and gentlemen, that deals with the man's speech item by item, statement by statement, and passage by passage.

Closing Remarks

I want now, in the closing moments of my speech once again, to call your attention to the fact that there was a distinct purpose for Holy Spirit baptism. As I have pointed out repeatedly and as I have shown by the context, that this promise was made to men for the purpose of giving them power. And this power was for the purpose of revealing divine truth. Jesus simply said to them, you will not have to depend upon your own knowledge, but I'll inspire you till you make my will known." He enabled them also to confirm this word by signs and wonders that they were able to do. And the apostles, by the baptism of the Lord, were able also to deputize others by the impartation of spiritual gifts. This was for the purpose of protection of the church. Paul said, "That they be not tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine."

Eph. 4:8-13. Now once again I want to impress upon you the fact that, in the first century, they didn't have this book as we now have it. You're aware of that, aren't you? Didn't you realize that in the first century they did not have this printed New Testament revealed as we now have it? But the same word was in inspired men. That's why it was necessary that there be an element of inspiration. Now the New Testament affirms

that during the time that this word was in men, oral, that there would be signs and wonders. And it would last till, and my good friend has allowed this debate to come to an end and he's never said a word about this particular expression meaning duration "They will last TILL" Paul said, "The unity of the faith", until the faith becomes a unit. It was not a unit here. Some of it was oral and some of it was written, Paul said to the Thessalonians, (2Thes. 2:15). But now, he said, at the time that this word becomes a unit; then, he says, that will cease. 1Cor. 13:8-10.

And one other argument that I presented last night, I've erased it off the board, that I want to impress you with. How much time do I have? (Moderator: Time is up right now) I appreciate very kindly. Could I have the liberty of saying just a word before I sit down, Mr. Gamblin?

I want to say to you and especially during the last speech that I've never had better attention and I want you to know that I appreciate that from the depths of my heart. It's been a genuine pleasure to be associated with Mr. Gamblin and Mr. Welch. I've known Mr. Welch before, at least casually. I've met Mr. Gamblin for the first time and I appreciate him. And I want you to know that. And to my brethren here, in this area, that have been so gracious to us. I want to express my heart felt appreciation. Thank you.

The End Of The Debate

