

Watts
&
Brown
Debate

1986



Baptism



Radio Debate on Baptism

On September 12th and 13th, 1985, a debate on baptism was conducted over Louisville radio station WLLV. The participants were **David Watts**, minister with the Shively church of Christ, and **Eddy Brown**, minister with the Friendship Baptist Church. The debate sessions took place on two special one hour *Bible Answers* radio programs presented by the Shively

church of Christ. The debate was broadcast live as it occurred.

The following is a transcript of the actual speeches as they were delivered. Each speaker made minor grammatical corrections in his own speeches. Some scripture citations have been abbreviated, such as "Acts 2:38" in place of "Acts chapter two and verse 38."

The First Proposition

RESOLVED: "*The Scriptures teach that water baptism to the unregenerated penitent believer is for (in order to obtain) the remission of sins.*"

Affirms: David Watts
Denies: Eddy Brown

Watts' First Affirmative

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to Mr. Brown for his willingness to take part in this unusual Bible discussion. What I've agreed to prove in this

discussion is that the Bible teaches water baptism is a requirement for salvation just as repentance is a requirement for salvation.

Before I prove that from the Bible I want to clearly state three subjects which are not the issue in this discussion. The issue is not whether salvation is by faith. Both Mr. Brown and I believe that salvation is by faith. The issue is not whether salvation is by grace. Again, both Mr. Brown and I understand that it is by God's grace, and it cannot be

earned. And the issue is not whether salvation is by the blood of Christ. Both Mr. Brown and I believe salvation is by the blood of Christ.

What the issue in this discussion is is *when* salvation by faith, and by God's grace and through the blood of Christ, occurs. And what I will show from the Bible is that people must not only repent of their sins to be saved by faith and grace and Christ's blood, but that they must also be scripturally baptized in water.

My first proof that baptism is for, that is, in order to obtain, remission of sins, is Acts 2:38 which says baptism is for the remission of sins. Acts 2:38 says, "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Remember, this is the inspired apostle Peter's answer to convicted men who asked about what to do to be saved. And notice that the meaning of "for the remission of sins" is in order to obtain the remission of sins, because it describes both baptism and repentance. And so the Bible really does teach that baptism is for,

that is, in order to obtain, the remission of sins.

My second proof that baptism is necessary for salvation is Acts 22:16 which teaches baptism is a requirement to have sins washed away. Acts 22:16 says, "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Now these words were spoken by Ananias, the preacher Jesus personally sent to Saul of Tarsus. And remember, this was three days after Saul had believed on Jesus on the road to Damascus. And he still needed to have his sins washed away by the blood of Jesus. Now, what Acts 22:16 does is show that a person's sins are washed away in the blood of Jesus when that person who has believed and repented is baptized.

My third proof that baptism is necessary to be saved is 1 Pet. 3:21 which says baptism saves us. Peter said there, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Mr. Brown understands that it is his obligation to examine the Bible passages which I have presented as proof of this proposition. And so in the coming five minutes we'll be listening very closely to what he says.

Remember, Peter said, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Ananias said, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." (Time)

Brown's First Negative

To Mr. Watts, those who are associated with me in this meeting, first of all I would like to state that the only reason why I'm here is to stand up for what I believe. Secondly, not to talk against the Scriptures, for what the Scripture says it plainly means. But to talk against the interpretation given thereof, the scripture referred to in Acts 2:38. First of all we must realize that to interpret Scripture we must interpret it by its context, by word study, by the events that were happening during the day of the inspired writer.

Peter's sermon in Acts 2:38 was particularly addressed to the congregation of Israel which is proven by verses 14, 22, 29, and 38. Peter, in addressing these people, pointing out to them that the one whom they had crucified was the one God had sent into the world in order to remove sins. This man they had rejected. Peter calls their attention, after they said, what must we do. Peter tells them they must repent, which in that context would mean that they must now accept the one whom they had first rejected, be baptized, would be a sign of their repentance, in the name of Jesus washing away thy sins.

In Acts 22:16 Paul is referring to his conversion, but yet Paul writes many of our theological truths that we have received for today. And Paul never placed emphasis on water as being the way in which our sins are removed, but he states plainly that it's through the blood of Christ that our sins are removed.

The issue is then, is water the means by which our sin is removed.

Now, Paul in Eph. 1:7 says "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sin according to the richness of his grace." Peter, that's 1 Pet. 3:21, that scripture says, "Whereunto even the like figure baptism doth now save, not by the putting away of the filth of the flesh, (which is sin) but the answer of a good conscience and an answer toward God."

Now, Heb. 1:3 states that the blood of Jesus was able to remove moral sin. That word there in the Greek means an exipation of moral sin. The word *rupos* in 1 Pet. 3:21 means moral depravity. Now, Peter plainly stated that moral depravity was not moved by water, but through the blood of Christ. For Heb. 1:3 states, "That who being the brightness of his glory and express image of his person and withholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high." It said "by himself" which means he did not need any help, or any other thing he depended upon. To say that our sins are washed away by the blood of Christ there's nothing for water to remove.

Water baptism, then, is a sign of obedience to the commission God left, to the ordinance God left, for the church. For, he said, "Go ye therefore into all the world, preach and teach and baptize them in the name of the Father and the name of the Son and the name of the Holy Ghost." It is the sign of obedience when one accepts Jesus Christ in faith. God has forgiven him of his sins, then he must show publicly

CONCERN (USPS 610-900) is published monthly by the Shively church of Christ, 1916 Rockford Lane, Louisville, KY 40216.

Editor: David Watts

Second class postage paid at Louisville, KY. POSTMASTER: Send change of address form to 1916 Rockford Lane, Louisville, KY 40216.

what has happened within. That's only a public identification that our sins have been removed, and we identify ourselves with the community of the church here on earth through water baptism. It is not for, in order to obtain, the remission of sins, but in order to obtain entrance unto the local church body. Therefore, I state again, that water baptism is not for the remission of sins. (Time)

Watts' Second Affirmative

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to resume this discussion. And again I want to express my appreciation to Mr. Brown.

One of Mr. Brown's objections to what I have said, and one attempt to answer these Bible passages is to say that we're saved by the blood of Christ. Indeed, we are saved by the blood of Christ. But the issue is *when* are we saved by the blood of Christ. And I would like Mr. Brown to do more than merely say we're saved by the blood of Christ without baptism. I would like him to provide the evidence.

Now, I have shown that the Bible teaches baptism is part of what men and women must do to be saved. When I did that I thereby showed that baptism is part of what we must do to be saved by the blood of Christ. Now, I'm sure that Mr. Brown understands that it would be a mistake on my part if I said, "We're saved by the blood of Christ and therefore we do not have to believe." He would understand that that would be a mistake, because being saved by the blood of Christ does

not nullify what the Bible says in many places about believing in order to be saved. The same would be true if I said, "We're saved by the blood of Christ and therefore we do not have to repent." Mr. Brown would understand, and he would object — and he would be correct to object — if I said being saved by the blood of Christ means you do not have to repent. Now in a similar way, if Mr. Brown can understand that being saved by the blood of Christ does not exclude faith on the part of a person, and it does not exclude repentance on the part of a person, he ought to be able to understand that it does not exclude baptism in obedience to Christ.

A second thing Mr. Brown said is that the "filth of the flesh" has to do with moral depravity, and he provided no evidence of that. He merely said that "the filth of the flesh" refers to moral depravity. I am now calling upon Mr. Brown to prove that when Peter said, "Baptism doth now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," that the filth of the flesh does not refer to ordinary literal dirt. Now, Charles B. Williams in his translation translated it this way: "I do not mean the mere removal of physical stains." Weymouth translated it, "Not the washing off of material defilement." The Revised Standard Version says, "Not as a removal of dirt from the body." Now, Mr. Brown needs to do more than simply tell you that "the filth of the flesh" refers to moral depravity. Actually, that destroys the sense of the passage. The passage says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save

us." Now, baptism in some way saves us, then in parenthesis Peter explains he's not talking about the putting away of the filth of the flesh. That's not the purpose of baptism. Baptism is an appeal to God for a pure conscience.

Now remember, in Acts 22:16 Saul was told "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Now Ananias knew that sins are washed away in the blood of Christ. He was telling Saul how to have his sins washed away in the blood of Christ. Your sins are washed away in the blood of Christ when one believes the Gospel, repents of his sins, and is scripturally baptized.

Mr. Brown also made the statement that baptism is not for, in order to obtain, the remission of sins. But Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." And Peter tied together both repentance and baptism. (Time)

Brown's Second Negative

To Mr. Watts, first of all to affirm, or for me to prove that to the listeners of the audience that the filth of the flesh referred to moral depravity would be totally impossible, if no one who is listening is familiar with Greek. But those who happen to be familiar with Greek knows that the Greek word used in that context for "filth" is *rupos*, which means moral depravity. Now, in order to receive remission of sins, I again therefore state, that the blood of Christ was all sufficient, by itself.

If we by water depend upon the remission of our sins, then the death of Jesus Christ must not have been complete enough in order to fulfill the act to which mankind stood in need of, and that was to be saved from their sins. Jesus Christ even said himself that, "This is my blood shedded for the remission of sins, do this in remembrance of me," referring to the Lord's supper.

Eph. 1:13 Paul writes and said, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, in whom ye also after ye have believed ye was sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." Now, we know that the Holy Spirit is not given to sinners, but to repented, regenerated sinners, for we are all sinners, saved by the grace of God, those who are saved by His grace. Now in order for Paul to have written this to the Ephesians, without having it in the context of any sort of baptism, must then affirm that through belief of the Gospel which is preached in the name of Jesus Christ. For Paul to have written that must affirm that by belief one is able to receive remission of sins once they have accepted and confessed their hope and faith in Jesus Christ. In Romans Paul says, "If thou wilt confess, believe in thy heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and confession is made unto salvation." Now, that does not state anywhere that baptism is essential for salvation. Now, for Paul to have written something like that and leave out, according to Mr. Watts' affirmation, that answers an

importance of water baptism, which would leave some ignorant of the very fact that their sins are removed, not only by the blood of Christ, but by water. And that's what I'm here to stand up for today, is to prove that the blood of Christ was all-sufficient by itself, and it did not depend on any type of earthly thing for removal of sin.

If physical water can consummate a spiritual act, then we did not need a spiritual act in the first place, in order to have a spiritual job accomplished. All we needed to do, is to confess in Jesus Christ and then be baptized. His blood serves no purpose if water also aids in the removal of our sins. But the Bible plainly states that even the foundation of the Old Testament the atonement was through blood, not through water.

There's a ceremonial use of baptism in the New Testament, and there's a mechanical use of the baptism in the New Testament. John's was a ceremonial baptism. Which states that John's disciples, the ones who were baptized by John, baptism was not sufficient enough because Paul told them they must be baptized . . . (Time)

Watts' Third Affirmative

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for staying tuned to this interesting Bible discussion. I am happy to continue our discussion, and I was intrigued by something Mr. Brown said. He said that he could not prove what he had said about 1 Pet. 3:21 if you do not know Greek. Now that means, ladies and gentlemen, that your English translation is not suf-

ficient, according to Mr. Brown, for you to understand this important bible passage. But there is this comment that I would like to raise: Mr. Brown, when your time comes again to speak, would you tell us if Mr. Arndt and Gingrich, who wrote the rather well-known Arndt and Gingrich lexicon — Baur's Lexicon — did they know Greek? Now on page 745 they say that this term means the "removing of dirt from the body" and they give 1 Pet. 3:21 as an example. Now, they also denote a figurative use of the word "filth," but 1 Pet. 3:21, according to my records, is listed under the literal usage, and there is no good reason to make it mean a figurative usage except this: you're reluctant to accept the fact that the Bible says "baptism doth now save us."

Then Mr. Brown made an interesting comment. He referred to the Lord's Supper. In Matthew 26:28 the Scripture says that Jesus "took the cup and gave thanks saying drink ye all of it," and then said, "for this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." And I am assuming Mr. Brown knows that is exactly the same term, the same way, Jesus described the shedding of His blood as for the remission of sins is the way Peter described repentance and baptism. Now, I would like Mr. Brown to tell us: when Jesus said, "This is my blood shed for the remission of sins," did he mean in order to obtain the remission of sins? I would like Mr. Brown, if he will, to answer that.

He also pointed out that all you do is believe to receive the remission

of sins. Now, I tried to get Mr. Brown to sign a proposition about salvation by faith only, and he did not want to do that because he wanted to leave room for repentance. Now, Mr. Brown needs to decide: do we only have to believe or do we also have to repent?

He referred to Rom. 10:9-10 and said that it doesn't state anything about baptism. It speaks about believing and about confessing, and he said it doesn't state anything about baptism. And he said Paul left it out. Well now Mr. Brown, I would like you to turn in your Bible and read to this listening audience Romans 10:9 and let us know if repentance is mentioned in those verses. Is repentance specified in Rom. 10:9-10? Now, if you say, as would be correct, "repentance is not specified but Rom. 10:9-10 does not include everything men and women must do to be saved," then you have answered your own objection to the absence of baptism in a particular verse. But the Paul, who did not mention baptism in that verse, did tell about his conversion. After he believed, he was still in his sins. Now, Paul hadn't forgotten that we're saved by the blood of Christ. But Paul remembered that to be saved by the blood of Christ he had to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins. Now, that's not depending on the water. That's depending on Jesus to honor His promise to forgive those who believe and are baptized. And that is what Jesus promised before going back to heaven in Mark 16:16. Paul was not trusting in water. He was trusting in Jesus, and he was willing to do what Jesus

said to do in order to be saved. (Time)

Brown's Third Negative

Mr. Watts, you have done just as I also have done. You have presented the listening audience with various writers' views and interpretations and translations of the various words in the Scriptures to which you refer to as filth. Now, you are presenting the audience with your evidence, and you are expecting them to trust your word. You challenge me to prove, I told you it was the truth, in order for me to prove that the Greek word there is *rupos*, and it means moral depravity, one would have to know Greek. Now that came from the Strong's Hebrew-Greek Lexicon Concordance. You have used your various books to which your authors have interpreted and translated the meaning of words. And you force that upon me, to prove by the use of my book. The audience can only hear, they cannot see the evidence. Therefore, I'm expecting the audience to also accept my words. Now, there's no possible way you can show them without use of your author's book, that that word does not mean moral depravity. They can only go on your word. And that's all they can go on by me. But in Acts 16:30 it says "and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved. And they said believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house." Now, that was the answer to the question, what must I do to be saved. He said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Now, I'm aware that

in the following verses they were baptized. But if they needed to be baptized still in order to be saved, why is it a period there, and not a comma, signifying the continuing of the thought. He stopped at "believe in Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Now, you explain to me why he stopped there. If water baptism is essential for salvation, then he left out an important thought that was essential for their salvation.

Also there are many Scriptures in the Bible which I will bring my evidence tomorrow to prove. I'm here today to speak against water baptism as the means through which our sins are removed. Now, if the audience wants to listen tomorrow for my evidence to prove that water baptism is not essential for salvation, then I will do that tomorrow. Today I'm speaking against your interpretation of the Scriptures.

Acts 13:48, "And when the Gentiles heard this they were glad and glorified the Lord, and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Ordained to eternal life, believed. Now the word ordained carries with it the thought of predestination. These people were ordained to eternal life, and they believed, and by believing they were saved. You asked me to comment on Rom. 10, "That if thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with confession, with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture said whosoever believeth on him shall not be

ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon his name, for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him whom they have not believed." (Time)

Watts' Fourth Affirmative

Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Brown, I'm happy to continue the discussion and to defend the truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Now, Mr. Brown came back to the matter of translation, and he replied concerning Strong. It was not me, Mr. Brown, who introduced Greek into this discussion. I came prepared to prove my proposition from the English Bible, and it is you who said you could not prove what you felt needed to be proved without a knowledge of the Greek. I'm prepared to let that matter stand. I would say this though, to those who are listening and are acquainted with the Greek, they will understand that Arndt and Gingrich, in their great translation of Baur's Lexicon, far outweigh in scholarship Mr. Strong.

Now, concerning Acts 13:46, in reference to believing: I notice that you did not read about repentance in that verse. Does the fact that repentance is not mentioned in Acts 13:46 mean repentance is not required by God for the remission of sins? Now, that is the question that I asked you concerning Rom. 10:9-10. It speaks about believing and that's right, we must believe. It speaks about confessing, and that's

right, we must confess. You pointed out this particular section does not mention baptism, and concluded we do not need to be baptized. But the same two verses you argue against baptism from, do not mention repentance. And we're asking again, and I think the audience will be waiting to hear, does Romans 10:9-10 exclude repentance? And if not, then it does not exclude some other requirement that God, in the Scriptures, may give.

Mr. Brown also said that physical water can't accomplish a spiritual act. Well, what we do physically can affect our spirit. Sin is often physical. Eve physically ate physical fruit and it involved spiritual pollution. In fact, in Rom. 10:9-10 the Bible talks about confessing Christ with the physical mouth in order to have spiritual salvation. Now, you need to come back and explain why you were arguing that something physical could have no affect upon the spiritual. Confessing Christ with the mouth is a physical act and it is part of what is involved in obtaining spiritual salvation.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I want to come back to Acts 2:38. Remember, Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." And that's the same expression, same terminology, used in Matt. 26:28 where Jesus said he would shed His blood "for the remission of sins." I think I asked Mr. Brown if he would explain, or comment on, whether Jesus shed His blood to obtain the remission of sins. And I do not remember him commenting on that. But what Jesus said

about the shedding of His blood, it is "for the remission of sins."

Peter did not say, "Just be baptized for the remission of sins," but also "repent" for the remission of sins. As I think back, I do not remember Mr. Brown talking very much about repentance. I would like him to plainly tell us if people must repent in order to have their sins forgiven. I'll repeat that. Will Mr. Brown tell us: must people repent in order to have their sins forgiven?

Earlier, when we were agreeing on the subject to be discussed, he would not sign a proposition concerning faith only. And I believe the explanation he gave is that he did not want to rule out repentance. Is repentance required? If so, then passages which do not mention it do not exclude it. (Time)

Brown's Fourth Negative

Let me get something perfectly clear. Repentance and faith are inseparable. They are gifts given by God, and the Bible states that. That the goodness of God leadeth a man unto repentance. Now, for the issue of faith only, I refer to the Scripture that said, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. But that does not mean that I'm ruling out repentance, for in order for one to believe, he must repent.

Romans 9:10, and you said I referred to Acts 13 and something, which I didn't refer to Acts 13 at all. Romans 9:10 says, "If thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God has raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved." Confess means to believe. Believe means that you must have

some repentance. I'm not denying one needs not to repent. What I'm saying is that water baptism does not remove sin. And when I refer to water baptism as being a physical act, that's just what I meant. I didn't mean that with the mouth, for we can serve the Lord with our whole body. Paul said, "Yield not your members as servants unto sin, but servants unto righteousness."

But for one to say that a man must perform some physical act in order to receive salvation is to go against the teaching of the Bible. "For by grace are ye saved through faith that not of yourself, it is the gift of God, lest any man should boast, not of works," and water baptism requires a physical act, which is a work, in order for one to be baptized. That's what I'm speaking of. We are saved by grace. That's through faith. It's not a work, not no type of ritual or ceremony or performance we can do in order to receive salvation.

When we talk about a physical act messing up, or having something to do with a spiritual act, we must realize first of all sin came by disobedience, and that was the result of Adam and Eve. But righteousness has come through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Now, in order for one to receive remission of sins all they need is the blood of Jesus. The water doesn't have anything to do with removing sins. And I'm still going to argue that. I would not deny the blood of Christ for water.

Even the thief on the cross, which I know you already have your popular objection, was in a position where he could not be baptized.

Now, if water was essential for salvation, why is it Jesus said, "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise"? The thief on the cross received salvation. Show me somewhere in the Bible where Stephanus was baptized, yet Stephanus was saved.

You want to have people believe that the only way we can receive remission of sins is through water baptism. Yet, you agree to the fact that the blood of Christ removes sin. Therefore, one must be downplayed. Both of them can't be working for the remission of our sins. It's only one that can be the channel through which our sins are forgiven, and that's through the blood of Christ.

And you said, earlier at the broadcast, that this discussion does not concern three things. It does not concern — one you said was the blood of Christ. Now, you're familiar with the scripture that says our sins are removed by the blood of Christ. Then why are you emphasizing water removes sins? You try to place it together to where a person can't discern. You try to say through faith by going in the water our sins are removed by the blood of Christ. And that's not Biblically harmonizing with the truth in the revelation of the Bible. The Bible teaches that Jesus Christ, by Himself, once suffered outside the gate, and we have received eternal atonement for our sins. (Time)

Watts' Fifth Affirmative

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm happy to answer Mr. Brown, and continue affirming the proposition.

One thing Mr. Brown asked me is, "Why emphasize baptism if the

blood saves?" Well, because people are saved when they believe and repent, when they confess their faith, and are baptized for the remission of sins. I do not know why Mr. Brown should find that difficult. I might ask the question to Mr. Brown, "why emphasize faith if the blood of Christ saves?" Well, what would his answer be? Certainly he would say: to emphasize faith does not undermine the blood of Christ. He would say: people are saved by the blood of Christ when they believe. Well, I might ask Mr. Brown, "If you believe we're saved by the blood of Christ, why emphasize repentance?" There's no problem there. There's no problem in emphasizing repentance because repentance is one of the things God requires people to do in order to be saved. I don't understand why Mr. Brown, when it comes to baptism, which Peter said "doth now save us," and which Ananias said is involved in washing away our sins, and which Peter said is "for the remission of sins" — why does Mr. Brown seem to find some difficulty in that?

Now, he also said, show me where Stephanus was baptized. I think that's what he said. Mr. Brown, the answer to that is 1 Cor. 1:16. And I would like to hear your comment on that; I do not know the point that you were trying to make.

Then he said that he did not quote Acts 13:46, and I think he was right about that. I think it was verse 48. I think I got within two verses of it, Mr. Brown, and if you did not quote Acts 13:48, then I'll apologize, but if you did quote verse 48 I don't think you should have not recog-

nized it when I got within two verses of it.

Then Mr. Brown said, "Repentance and faith are inseparable." And he said Rom. 2:4 states that. No, Rom. 2:4 does not state that repentance and faith are inseparable. In fact, Mr. Brown, I would like you to look in your Bible to John 12:42-43. That tells about men who believed in Christ, but they would not confess Christ. Let me repeat that, ladies and gentlemen: they believed on Christ, but they would not confess Christ. And Mr. Brown says "faith and repentance are inseparable." Are you saying that those men, who believed and loved the praise of men more than the praise of God and would not confess Christ, repented? And when you get through with that you can look at Acts 2:36, 37 and 38, where men were convicted that Jesus was Christ, and Peter told them to repent. They had not already repented.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to come back and emphasize what we've been talking about so far. In Acts 2:38 the Scripture says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Peter knew we are saved by the blood of Christ, but he still told people to repent, and he still told people to be baptized. Ananias told Saul, in Acts 22:16, "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord." Now, that was the preacher Jesus sent to Saul. He knew that we're saved by the blood of Christ. He told Saul to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Peter

said, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us." I would like to hear Mr. Brown comment more on that.

Also I alluded to this: in Mark 16:16 Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, we can put that in a rather simplified form, and it involves this: belief plus baptism equals salvation. It is not: belief minus baptism equals salvation, but "believe and be baptized" and "shall be saved." (Time)

Brown's Fifth Negative

You said that my answer for Stephanus' baptism was in 1 Cor. 1:16. That scripture says "and I baptized also the household of Stephanus, besides I know not whether I baptized any other." It says the household of Stephanus. I want a single verse saying I baptized Stephanus, or Stephanus was baptized.

Now, first of all, the Bible only mentions one baptism. Now, which one is essential for salvation? The baptism of man or the baptism of the Holy Spirit? The Bible speaks of one. Eph. 4:5, "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." This baptism is performed by the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. 12:3, "For by one Spirit are we baptized into one body." And that body is Christ's, 1 Cor. 12:12. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." John 6:63 The word "quickeneth" means to make alive. Jesus told Nicodemus, "you must be born again." He referred to a

spiritual birth. To be born of the spirit means to be quickened by the Spirit. Born again means a new birth. "Quickeneth" means to make alive. Now, you can't make something alive that's already alive. It has to be dead. Eph. 2:1 says, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sin."

The Spirit comes from God, Luke 11:13. To be baptized of the Spirit means to receive the Spirit. He is given to those who believe. Eph. 1:13, "In whom after ye had believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His. I still emphasize, I do not say one does not need to be baptized. It is an act of obedience to God. It is an ordinance He left for the church. In order for one to be baptized he must repent and believe upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It's through His name we have remission of sins. Not through the water. To say that a baptism performed by man is essential for salvation is to speak against the Scriptures that I just read unto your hearing, because the Bible mentions one baptism.

John's baptism was the baptism unto repentance, not for the remission of sins, but unto repentance. Paul tells them in Acts 10:43, he asked John's disciples, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye have believed?" They said we have not even heard of such a thing as the Holy . . . Well then, what baptism were you baptized unto? He said the baptism of John." Paul said, "John verily baptized with water unto repentance, but you must be bap-

tized in the name of Jesus Christ in order to receive remission of sin. Now these people believed in Jesus Christ, but they had not received the Holy Spirit because they had not been baptized by the baptism of Christ, which is the Spiritual baptism. This is why you see illustrations of people receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost. Sometimes it's after they have been baptized in water, and sometimes it comes before. That I do not argue. What I'm saying, the Bible explicitly states that we are baptized by one spirit, and it refers to one baptism.

Now, which one are you going to depend on for your salvation, the baptism of man, or the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And I read again, in the time that I have left, "For we are baptized by one spirit into one body and that body is Christ," 1 Cor. 12:12. "One Lord, one faith, and one baptism," Eph. 4:5. This baptism is performed by the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit that quickeneth the flesh. To say that baptism is the way in which we are regenerated is to speak against this because Jesus said, "The flesh profiteth nothing."

He never placed any type of ceremony or sanctifying cleansing power upon the water. Note Matt. 24:25, 26 when he said "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye make clean the outside of the cup and platter but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee cleanse that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside may be cleansed also." Jesus referred to the ritual cleaning as the sign of purification which was good for nothing, but for

the outside. But that which needed to be cleansed within, was not even touched by the physical purification which was done by water.

Therefore, I rest my case that water baptism does not remove sin. It is not essential for salvation. It is the blood of Christ whereby we are received an eternal and everlasting atonement. It is He who once entered into the holy of holiness in heaven, and laid His blood out on the altar that we might receive remission of sins. John said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away (not the water) the sins of the world. Therefore, in order for one to be baptized by the Spirit is to be saved. In order for one to be baptized by water baptism is for entrance into the local church body. (Time)

Watts' Final Affirmative

I'm disappointed that we don't have more time. I have much to say and only a few moments. I'll remind the audience that this is my final speech and I cannot respond to what Mr. Brown says in his final speech until tomorrow.

In these closing moments I want to appeal to each person listening to this unusual Bible discussion to realize that this is not merely an intellectual contest, but a confrontation between truth and a popular denominational tradition. It is important for us to understand that we need to do more than merely know the truth but we need to apply it to our lives.

One reason it's so important that people understand that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and that repentance and baptism are "for the remission of

sins," is because many people have not been baptized. I'm happy to tell you that there are preachers in Louisville, in Jefferson County, in the state of Kentucky, across this land, and around the world, who are ready to baptize you by the authority of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins into the body of Christ. And contrary to what Mr. Brown said, and did not prove, that baptism is the baptism of 1 Corinthians chapter 1, the one that Paul told those people they had received.

I want to exhort you to make your desire to really obey Christ known to any faithful Gospel preacher of a real church of Christ with the assurance that he will help you in becoming truly born again. And if I can help you, please feel free to contact me at the Shively church of Christ, 1916 Rockford Lane in Louisville, and the office phone number is 447-3693. Thank you very much for listening. (Time)

Brown's Final Negative

First of all I would like to inform those that are listening, look at Eph. 4:5 again. I'm emphasizing there is only one baptism that is mentioned in the Bible, and that is also written by the pen of Paul. Now Ananias came in and said, "Arise and be thou baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." If this baptism which is performed by man was so important, why does Paul omit it and say "by one Spirit are we baptized into one body"?

Furthermore, 1 John 1:9 says, "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to

cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Then we have this scripture, 1 John 1:7 says, "But if we walk in the light we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus Christ His son cleanseth us from all sin."

1 Peter 1:18-19 says "forasmuch as we know that we are not redeemed by corruptible things." Now I ask you, is water pure and clean? Or was it also here when creation fell? Anything that was here at the fall of man has been corrupted by sin. Peter who says we're not redeemed by corruptible things, which water is also corrupt. But by incorrupt, which is the blood, which is incorruptible things, "we're not redeemed by corruptible things but by incorruptible, not as silver as gold, of the vain conversation received by tradition of your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot." To say that water is not corruptible is to speak against the Scripture. To say that water is not polluted is to speak against what you know true today. Water is full of chemicals. Water is full of dirt, and every other thing. Therefore, I contend it is baptism by the Spirit that a man is saved. (Time)

Editor's Note: The second proposition of this radio debate on baptism will be carried in the next issue of *Concern*.

**Show Concern
to a Friend**

Are You Sure That You Are A Christian?

In a religious survey conducted a few years ago, sixty-five per cent of the adults interviewed indicated that they were associated with some religious organization. Most of these people consider themselves to be Christians, and would be insulted if anyone should suggest that they might be mistaken.

Over a period of time, words have a tendency to lose their distinctive meaning. This has happened with the word "Christian." In New Testament usage, the word "signified an adherent of Jesus" (W. E. Vine, *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*). Thus, "Christians" were originally described as those "sticking fast, firmly attached" to Christ and His teaching. However, *Webster's New Word Dictionary* notes that the word is used today to refer to one "having qualities demonstrated and taught by Jesus Christ, as love, kindness etc. . . . a decent, respectable person."

A study of the New Testament will cause one to realize that the modern definition of "Christian" bears little resemblance to the original one. One may possess many good qualities and still not be a "Christian," according to the inspired usage of the word. Let us consider some of these characteristics which people often think constitutes Christianity.

One may be very religious and still not be a Christian. Most often today, if one is involved in any religious

endeavor with any degree of enthusiasm he is considered to be pleasing to the Lord, a Christian. I suppose that there are few people today who are so deeply religious as was the Roman centurion, Cornelius. God's word describes him as being "a devout man" (Acts 10:2). His religion was more than a "show." He had a deep reverence for God. He was a man who showed much benevolence to his fellow man. He was a man that prayed to God continually. Yet, with all of these good qualities, *he was not a Christian*. He had never been taught the gospel of Christ so that he might be obedient to it. The apostle Peter was sent by the Lord to tell him "words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved" (Acts 11:14). It was not until he had been instructed in the will of the Lord that he could become an "adherent of Christ" by submitting to the command of Christ to be baptized (cf. Acts 10:48).

Many feel that they are Christians because they are faithful members of some church that professes to be "Christian." Although being a Christian involves being a member of the church, (the church is the spiritual body of Christ, that over which He is the head, cf. Eph. 1:22, 23; 5:23), it does not necessarily mean that all who are members of religious bodies are Christians. Before any religious body has a right to call itself by the name of Christ it must demonstrate that it is of

Christ by *accepting His word as authority* for all that is practiced. Can one be "an adherent" of Christ and at the same time be a part of a religious body that rejects the authority of the Lord as it is revealed in His word?

Others consider themselves to be Christians because they have been "baptized." The New Testament declares that baptism is an act that the Lord requires of all in order to enter into Him (cf. Gal. 3:27). There are no Christians outside the body of Christ. If baptism is that which puts one into Christ, then we can see the relation of baptism to one's being a Christian. But not all that men call baptism is scriptural baptism. There are conditions which must be met before one is baptized into Christ. One must have faith in Jesus Christ as God's Son (cf. Mark 16:16). One must truly repent of sin (Acts 2:38). Only when these conditions are met can one have the assurance that he has entered into Christ. One who has failed to obey these com-

mands of the Lord cannot be said to be "an adherent" of Christ. He is not a Christian.

Then, there are those who have obeyed these teachings of Christ from the heart (cf. Rom. 6:17, 18). They are convinced that they are Christians. Yet, more is involved in being a Christian than just the obedience to the first principles of the gospel. When the Lord commissioned his apostles to go and make disciples of all nations, he concluded by saying, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you . . ." (Matt. 28:20). The same respect for the authority of Christ must characterize the life after one has been baptized into Him. If one fails to "adhere to His teachings," can he be considered a Christian?

Dear reader, examine your own life (cf. 2 Cor. 13:5). Are you sure that you are a Christian?

— Bennie Johns
Louisville, KY

CONCERN

USPS 610-900

1916 Rockford Lane

Louisville, KY 40216

Second-class postage paid at
Louisville, Kentucky

Virginia Truman
509-C Coleman C.T.
JAN 1986



Radio Debate on Baptism

The Second Proposition

RESOLVED: *"The Scriptures teach that water baptism is not essential for salvation."*

Affirms: Eddy Brown
Denies: David Watts

Brown's First Affirmative

To Mr. Watts and to those who are associated with me in this discussion, my proposition, as was heard, is to affirm that water baptism is not essential for salvation.

First of all, I'd like to comment on a statement that the first proposition was that I would prove, that the Scriptures affirm and teach that one can be saved by faith only, without any other works of obedience to God. The reason why I denied that was, first of all, because it was, to me, impossible to teach that the Scriptures affirm one can be saved by faith without any works of obedience to God. I draw my conclusions from James 2:17 that says, "Even so faith, if it has not works is dead being left alone." Before one can repent he

must first believe. Repentance is the work of faith. And water baptism is the sign of repentance.

Furthermore, I would like to comment on a thought that I made yesterday, I asked for Mr. Watts to show me in the Bible where Stephens was baptized. And he referred me to 1 Cor. 1:16 which says, "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas, besides I know not whether I baptized any." Now, chapter one of that same book, 1 Corinthians verse 1 reads, "Paul called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God and Sosthenes our brother," which affirms that Paul is the one who wrote 1 Corinthians. But I would like to call the listeners' attention to the seventh chapter of the book of Acts when Stephanas is being stoned. The eighth chapter of Acts reads, "And Saul was consented unto his death." At that time there was a persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem. Now, Paul being the

writer of First Corinthians, and Mr. Watts referred me to 1 Cor. 1:16 and told me that affirmed that Stephens was baptized, how could Paul have baptized Stephens when he was there watching Stephens being stoned? And Paul was at that time against the Christian faith.

First of all I would like to discuss my format in this manner: I would like to cover the areas of faith, conviction and repentance, for without faith one cannot be saved, without conviction of their sins one will not acknowledge Christ, and without repentance one cannot acknowledge their sins.

Now, how does one receive faith in Jesus Christ in his Gospel? Romans 10:14:15, 17 says before any can call on Jesus he must hear of him, and before one hears the Gospel the Bible says they do not believe. So, in order for one to believe there must be a preacher, and the preacher must be sent.

Then it is said how one receives faith in Jesus Christ, Rom. 10:17, "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Acts 10:44 says, "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost

fell on all them which heard." And what comes by hearing? Well, it was said faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

But, even though one hears the Gospel he does not have to believe the Gospel, for Rom. 10:16 says, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" This is where conviction must come in. A man is brought to conviction of his sins through the ministry of the Spirit. John 16:8 says, "When he is come he shall reprove the world of sin" and verse 9 says why, "Of sin because they believe on me not." When one believes he is a sinner, lost, he is convicted of his sins by the Holy Spirit and led unto repentance. This is done by the goodness of God, Rom. 2:4. (Time)

Watts' First Negative

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Brown, I am happy to resume this Bible discussion.

According to our agreement, in the final 9 minutes of our discussion time yesterday, Mr. Brown had seven minutes and I had only two minutes. This meant that much of what he presented in his final two speeches I had little opportunity to answer. And so before I proceed to answer as much as I can of his speech this afternoon, I want to deal with some unanswered arguments from yesterday and mention some other problems that Mr. Brown has gotten himself into.

He said people on Pentecost were told to be baptized as a sign of their repentance, but the Bible says they were told to repent and be baptized "for the remission of sins."

He defined "filth of the flesh" in a way that made Peter teach "baptism doth not save us," when Peter plainly said "baptism doth now save us."

He said that what the scriptures says it plainly means. Then he asserted water baptism is not for the remission of sins, when that is exactly what the scripture says in Acts 2:38.

He said because the blood of Christ is all-sufficient it excludes obedience in baptism, but he admits obedience in repentance is required to be saved by the all sufficient blood.

He argued that baptism wasn't for the remission of sins because it isn't mentioned in Rom. 10:9-10, and Acts 16:30, but he admits repentance is necessary, though he knows it also is not mentioned in either place.

He said repentance and faith are inseparable, but convicted sinners on Pentecost still needed to repent after they believed, according to Acts 2:36-38, and in John 12:42-43 people who believed still had not repented.

Mr. Brown said it is against the teaching of the Bible to say that a man must perform some physical act to receive salvation, yet he admitted confession of Christ with the mouth is necessary for salvation.

Mr. Brown argued that baptism is not necessary because of the thief on the cross, but he knows this occurred under the old law before Christ died.

Mr. Brown argued from the fact that the Bible doesn't say Stephanas was baptized, but neither does the Bible say Stephanas repented. Does

this prove Stephanas didn't repent?

As Mr. Brown stated, Eph. 4:5 declares there is only one baptism, but he tells people they need to receive two different baptisms.

Mr. Brown said, "You must be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ in order to receive remission of sins." Now, he thinks that's Spirit baptism. But Acts 10:47-48 identifies baptism in the name of Jesus as water baptism.

And he said that water had been corrupted by the fall of Adam and Eve, and he applied the Bible statement, "The flesh profiteth nothing," to obeying God's command to be baptized in water, but he requires people to go through the water in a baptism he implies "profiteth nothing" in order to get into the Baptist Church.

Now, Mr. Brown has made, in his first speech tonight, a terrible mistake. Mr. Brown has mistaken the Stephanas in 1 Cor. 1 with the Stephen in Acts 7, and, Mr. Brown, they are not the same. Stephen died before the conversion of Paul. Now, Stephanas was a man at Corinth. He was a different man. You need to come back and explain this to the audience.

Now, he also said that before one can repent he must first believe. That's not standard Baptist doctrine.

But there's one thing I want to close with, as I come to the end of my time. Did he prove baptism is not essential? What did he say to prove baptism is not essential? (Time)

CONCERN (USPS 610-900) is published monthly by the Shively church of Christ, 1916 Rockford Lane, Louisville, KY 40216.

Editor: David Watts

Second class postage paid at Louisville, KY. POSTMASTER: Send change of address form to 1916 Rockford Lane, Louisville, KY 40216.

Brown's Second Affirmative

First of all, if I had seven minutes yesterday and you had two, it is not my job to keep up with the time, that's the job of the moderator. And that's not to be a bad reflection on you.

What I discussed yesterday was against what you taught. I'm here today to discuss and approve what I believe is essential for salvation. When I said a physical act, I meant and I said, and I'll quote what I said yesterday, "as a ritual cleansing to receive salvation." Man cannot perform any type of work to receive salvation. Confession comes from repentance, repentance comes from belief, and belief is faith. Those two things are spoken of as a gift from God.

When I said, show me where Stephens was baptized yesterday, you referred me to First Corinthians. I didn't say that was Stephens. I said you have to show me a scripture that says Stephens was baptized. So it is not my mis-judgment of the Scripture, it was yours because you referred me to it. I asked you to show me in the Bible where was Stephens baptized, and everyone who is listening knows you said First Corinthians. I did not pick it out, you did. Because I proved that you showed me a wrong Scripture today, you're going to try to say that I interpreted it wrong and I showed you right there Stephens and no where in the Bible does it say Stephens was baptized. The only thing it says about Stephens is that he was full of the Holy Spirit when he first appeared in the Scriptures.

Now, I continue on from where I left off from yesterday. The Bible speaks of one essential baptism. This baptism is from the Spirit, Eph. 4:5. This is done by the Spirit, 1 Cor. 12:3. And it's given the moment one believes, Eph. 1:2, and it is by this baptism one is led to obeying the Truth, 1 Pet. 1:22.

Now, let us go back to the baptism of John the Baptist. John said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." But notice, he never used the term "in the name of Jesus." This term did not come to use until after the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Now the baptism in the name of Jesus identifies the one whom the baptism is from. John said, "He shall baptize with fire and the Holy Ghost." Now notice, John drew a distinction between his baptism and the baptism of Christ. Therefore, notice the construction of Acts 2:38 which we have heard repeated so often. It says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," identifying the one whom the baptism is from. And "for the remission of sins" is identifying the purpose of Jesus Christ's baptism, "and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost," identifying the third person of the Godhead received by the baptism of Jesus Christ.

Now, I therefore state that the baptism spoken of in Acts 2:38 is not referring to water. Three thousand souls were added to the church. You mean to tell me that literally three thousand people was baptized in water when it says that they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost and down in verse 41 it says, "They

that received was gladly baptized and the same day was added to the church about three thousand souls." Which is "about" is not an exact estimation, but he said about three thousand souls.

Now, the same thing occurred over in Acts 2:2-6, "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a rushing mighty wind and there filled all the house where they were sitting, and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as fire and sat upon each of them and they were filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now, the baptism of Jesus Christ, as I said, is distinguished from the baptism of man. The baptism of Jesus Christ, "in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost," identifies the person who is doing the baptism.

Paul said of John's baptism, when he met John's disciples, he said, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed?" They said, "We have not even so much heard of the Holy Spirit. What then, unto whose baptism were ye baptized?" They said, "Unto John." Which simply is saying we were baptized in the name of John's baptism. Paul said, "You verily, verily, John baptized to the baptism of repentance saying they should believe on him who was to come." After they heard this it was said that they were baptized in the name of Jesus, another baptism but the only one spoken of in the Bible. I did not say you need to be baptized twice. (Time)

Watts' Second Negative

The first thing that I want to say in regard to Mr. Brown's response is that he does require people to go through water in a baptism in order to get into the Baptist Church, and if he does not, then he's going to have some explaining to do when he gets home at the Friendship Baptist Church — and so he does teach two baptisms. And he probably claims to have experienced two baptisms.

Now what did he say, ladies and gentlemen, to prove to you that baptism is not essential to salvation? Remember, Saul was told, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Remember, Peter said, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Remember, Jesus said in Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Jesus did not say, "He that believeth and is not baptized shall be saved." Now, what did Mr. Brown say? What can you remember that he said to prove to you that baptism is not essential to salvation? What he tried to do was to tell you that the baptism mentioned in Acts 2:38 is Holy Spirit baptism. Finally, after an hour of discussion yesterday, we find out that Mr. Brown believes that the baptism mentioned in Acts 2:38 is not water baptism, but Holy Spirit baptism. There's a problem with that, Mr. Brown, and the problem is that the baptism in Acts 2:38 is identified as baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ," and when you turn to Acts 10:47-48 here's what you read: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well

as we?" Now, you've got here a baptism, after Holy Spirit baptism (this is real Spirit baptism, Mr. Brown), and then it says, "He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Now he said, "Can you stop me from baptizing these people in water in the name of the Lord." Now, while we're talking about that, Mr. Brown pointed out that there's one baptism. I'm insisting that he teaches two. In fact, yesterday he taught that water baptism was important and essential in order to get into what he believes to be the church body.

Now, the baptism in Eph. 4:5 is not Spirit baptism, and there's a very simple way we can understand this. That is by recognizing that the one baptism in Ephesians 4:5 is the baptism of the great commission. We know that because the baptism of the great commission was a permanent baptism. In Matt. 28:20 Jesus said, after charging them to administer that baptism, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, that baptism was not Spirit baptism because that baptism was administered by men, and Jesus alone can administer Holy Spirit baptism.

There's more that I want to say about that, but I need to come back to this matter of Stephanas.

Before I say that, I want to explain that when I mentioned Mr. Brown had seven minutes and I had two, in the closing minutes of the program, I was not complaining, Mr. Brown, I was explaining. Today I will have seven minutes and you'll have approximately two. I was not complaining, I was explaining why I did not

deal with all of your arguments. The moderator's doing a wonderful job.

Now concerning Stephanas, you did make a mistake. Whether you were asking me about Stephen, you pronounced "Stephanas" yesterday. I referred you to 1 Cor. 1:16 and your reply was "That's his household, that's not him." If you were talking about the Stephen who died years before that, you should have said so. Now, Stephanas was still around when Paul was at Corinth, so you did make a mistake in that.

Now, he said something about John's baptism. Yesterday, Mr. Brown said John's baptism was not for the remission of sins. He's nodding his head now. In Mark 1:4 here's what the scripture says: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Time)

Brown's Third Affirmative

First of all, I would like to say that I truly emphasized water baptism, but I did not say that water baptism was for the remission of sins. That's what I'm against. Now, I would like to say that anybody in their right mind knows that one must be baptized by water to get into the Baptist denomination. But, now, I don't know about the church of Christ. So, how do you accept one into your denominational faith? Do you baptize him, or do you sprinkle him, or what? No matter what, you have a formal procedure that you go through and that's what I was emphasizing.

Furthermore, back to the matter

of Stephanus. Since I pronounced the name wrong and you misjudged me, okay then, that's my apology, but still you cannot show me in the Bible where Stephens was baptized. Furthermore, you're supposed to be a man of intelligence and knowledge, you should have known that I referred to Stephens, although I mispronounced his name.

Now, the baptism that's mentioned in Acts 11 and Acts 10:46-47, and it says, 44, "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on them that heard the word." We go back to that same meaning, "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God," which means that in response to their belief they were given the Holy Spirit. Now, it says "And they that are of circumcision believed were astonished, as many as come to Peter because of the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." Then it says, "Can any man forbid water that such as these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as we commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord, then prayed they him to tarry certain days." Now the baptism of the Spirit, who knows when it comes? Jesus said it is like the wind, you can tell the sound thereof and you don't know when it comes or where it goes. It is a secret baptism. For a public confession of what has already happened secretly within you, this is what he's talking about. Be baptized and show forth public your salvation that it's already taken place by the receiving of the Holy Spirit of God who is given for the remission of sins.

John always said, "I baptize with water into repentance for the remission of sins," yet he draws a distinction between he and Christ. Even Jesus said John verily baptized unto repentance, Acts 11:16. "Then remembered I the word of the Lord how he said John indeed baptized with water." Now, Jesus is talking here, now if He is the one doing the speaking, why didn't He carry the thought through? "But ye should be baptized with the Holy Ghost," signifying the baptism which he should perform.

John 4:26, "But when He, the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name," now who is here in the absence of Jesus Christ representing him? The Scripture says the Holy Ghost will be sent to represent me while I'm away, the Holy Spirit. He is not here to take Jesus' place, nor to cause the world to forget about Jesus, therefore, Jesus said, in John 16:14, "He shall glorify me for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." In order for us to receive remission of sins we must be baptized by Jesus, and that is the Holy Spirit baptism which comes from Jesus Christ who is the Son of God. But through His name we have received remission of sins. Acts 10:43 says that, "To him gave all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him should receive remission of sins." Jesus said, "The Father's going to send the Spirit in my name." To be baptized in the name of Jesus means to be baptized with the baptism from on high.

The baptism spoken of in Eph. 4:5, Ephesians is a book that deals with the church, the body of Christ. Paul here is writing and emphasizing that one needs to be baptized by the baptism of the Holy Spirit in order to get into the body of Christ. That's where I draw my distinction from water baptism to spiritual baptism. I still state water does not, cannot, and will never remove spiritual sins.

You keep referring back to First Peter and the filth of the flesh and I told you yesterday my belief. I use my books, you use your books according to your denominational belief, and no other denomination will accept another denominational belief that doesn't agree with their own. (Time)

Watts' Third Negative

Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Brown, I'm enjoying this discussion and I think we're making progress all the time. One thing we have now determined is that Mr. Brown does not know any more about Spirit baptism than he does about water baptism. He said, for example, that baptism in the Spirit is something you can't tell when it comes. It's secret. Well Mr. Brown, in Acts 10:46 Peter and the brethren knew that it had come.

Now, he says concerning John's baptism, and he's the one that brought up John's baptism, he said yesterday that it was unto repentance but not for the remission of sins. I showed in Mark 1:4 that it is both. John's baptism was both "unto repentance" and "for the remission of sins." Now, Mr. Brown needs to

look at this Bible passage and then explain to this audience why he accepts the first part, the part that says it is "unto repentance," and denies the second part. And Mr. Brown, that is Mark 1:4.

Now, he said, "I do emphasize water baptism." But those of you who heard him yesterday heard him say there is only one baptism mentioned in the Bible, or at least he was implying that. And I pointed out that there are two baptisms that he teaches. Now, Mr. Brown, are you going to give up water baptism? You don't understand the fact that Holy Spirit baptism had a specific purpose. It was received by the men who needed it, and after being received by those who needed it, ceased to be experienced. And my proof for that is Eph. 4:5, which says there is "one baptism." At the time Ephesians was written Spirit baptism had ceased to be received.

Now back to Stephanas. Mr. Brown says that I'm intelligent and even though he said "Stephanas" I was supposed to know he meant "Stephen." Well, Mr. Brown, I'm not that intelligent. I suppose if you say "repentance" I'm supposed to know you mean something else. Or if you say "water" I'm supposed to know you mean something else. Now you said "Stephanas." When I gave you the passage where Stephanas is mentioned you objected that it didn't mention the man, only his household. Now you come back and criticize me for your mistake, and say I was supposed to know what you meant. You haven't dealt, though, with this case of Stephanas. Did he

repent? You said that it doesn't mention his baptism, and you concluded he wasn't baptized. I'm asking you if this man repented, and if so, where does the Bible say he repented.

Ladies and gentlemen, what did Mr. Brown say about the one baptism and the great commission? In Eph. 4:5 the Scripture says there is one baptism. Now, the baptism of the great commission is water baptism. We know it's water baptism because it was a baptism to be administered by men. Remember, Jesus told the disciples, "you go make disciples baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." Men would administer the baptism of the great commission. But that baptism, Mr. Brown, is a permanent baptism. And that's why you read in the very next verse, in verse 20, Jesus said, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, you think you're administering the baptism of the great commission, but that baptism, if that continues, and it does, then other baptisms ceased to be received by the time Ephesians was written.

Now, let's come back to this matter of Holy Spirit baptism. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, that Peter identifies baptism in the name of the Lord, as baptism in water. These men at Cornelius' household had already been baptized in the Spirit. But Peter said, "who can prevent water that these shouldn't be baptized" and he commanded them "to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Now, they were baptized in the name of the Lord

when they were baptized in water. Baptism in the Lord is baptism in water.

Now, let me come back to some statements here, as we bring this speech to a close. Remember that Paul said, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Now, Mr. Brown thinks that he can twist the next part of that verse, which says, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh" into a contradiction with the first part. The statement "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh" means that you're not baptized to get dirt off your body. Why are you baptized? Peter said "baptism doth now save us." (Time)

Brown's Fourth Affirmative

First of all, in response to the question when I said the Holy Spirit baptism, you could not tell when it comes. Okay. Now, you read Acts 10:46 and you see the reason why they could tell they received the Holy Spirit. It says that they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. This was the basic sign from the beginning of the early church that anyone who received the Holy Spirit mostly was followed by speaking in an unknown tongue. That's how they could tell that the Holy Spirit had fallen on them.

And I state again, you keep playing on the fact I'm saying "in the name of the Lord" you keep using for water baptism. The great commission was "baptize in the name of the Father, the name of the Son, name of the Holy Ghost." That was the great commission given in Matthew on the Mount of Olives. Now

we recognize that, and we do say that when we take one into the local church body. But, yet and still, there is a distinction between the baptism administered by men and that administered by God. Jesus himself still implied that the baptism of the Holy Spirit ye were to receive. He told them to tarry in Jerusalem until you are endowed with power from on high. And when the Holy Ghost is received you will receive power from on high. According to Mark 16:16, you read part of the Scripture, it said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now you show me where it says "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned. Now, two different Greek words used there to describe the ones believe, the word is PISTUO, which means a total committment of one's spiritual well-being to Christ. The other one is APISTOS, which means unbelief. The emphasis, therefore, is not placed on the baptism but upon the belief in the person.

You referred to Mark 1:1, "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for remission of sins." Baptism for repentance is repentance from your sins. "For remission of sins" is only received through Jesus Christ. Remission of sins did not come until Christ shed His blood. Hebrews says "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." Anybody who was baptized to John's baptism before the death, burial and resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ was only baptized unto repentance. It is therefore stated in Acts when

Paul met the disciples of John and told them you were only baptized to the baptism of repentance, but you need to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for remission of sins.

Now the Holy Spirit is given to those who believe, at the time they believe. You try to use a scripture that says in Cornelius the Holy Spirit baptism was given before water baptism. And you were perfectly right. It was given to them because they believed. Now, in Gal. 3:2 Paul asked the question, "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith?" Then in verse 3 it says, "Are ye so foolish having begun in the Spirit" which he states they already had the Spirit, but he asks them a question, which way did you receive it, by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith? 1 John 3:22-24 says, "And whatsoever we ask we receive of him because we keep his commandments," not ordinances, "And do those things that are pleasing in his sight." Verse 23, "And this is commandment that we should believe on the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and love one another." Verse 24 says, "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he in him and hereby we know that he abideth in us by the spirit which he had given us." Now, how did he say we know that the Spirit is in us. Because we keep His commandments, and what are His commandments? That we believe on His son and love the brethren. Therefore upon a person's belief he receives the Holy Spirit. Eph. 1:12 that "we should be to the praise of his glory for who in first

who first in Christ we believe in whom also after that ye believed, (not baptized with water) were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. And notice he did not emphasize baptize by water. (Time)

Watts' Fourth Negative

Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Brown, thank you for continuing on in this interesting Bible discussion. There is so much to say that I must hurry.

I remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that the apostle Peter, talking to men who were convicted of their sins, but had not repented or been saved, said to them: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now this was a command, and Spirit baptism is never described as a command. I hope to have more to say about that. Also remember that we have identified baptism "in the name of Jesus" as a baptism that involves water. Now, Mr. Brown went back to Acts 10:46 and he wanted to talk about tongues. But he doesn't say much that I can recall about the fact that Peter said, of people who had already had real spiritual baptism, "can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized," and "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Now, "baptism in the name of the Lord," preached by Peter in Acts 10, was a baptism in water, but the same apostle talking about the same baptism in Acts 2:38 said that baptism, just like repentance, is "for the remission of sins." Also, Mr. Brown

challenged Mark 1:4 about John's baptism being both unto repentance and for the remission of sins. That's what it says. It was "for the remission of sins."

And while we're talking about commandments and the fact that it is a commandment that men be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, Mr. Brown implied from 1 John that the only command was to believe and to love. But Acts 10:48 says Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Now, ladies and gentlemen, remember that Ananias told Saul, "Why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." What did Mr. Brown say to convince you that Ananias did not mean exactly what he said? In 1 Pet. 3:21 the apostle Peter said, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Mr. Brown's position is: baptism doth not save us.

Concerning Mark 16:16, Mr. Brown said that I didn't quote the full verse. Well Mr. Brown, I quoted it several times yesterday and, as far as I can remember, you said nothing about it. The verse says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, if you want to know what to do to be saved, look at the first part of the verse. There are two conditions: belief and baptism. You're telling this audience that there's only one condition: that is, belief without baptism. I believe I can help illustrate this by this comparison: suppose Jesus had said, "He that eateth and digesteth shall be nourished, he that eateth not shall

starve." Jesus would not need to say, "He that eateth not and digesteth not." Or again, try this illustration: suppose the Ford Motor Company said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall receive a new Ford, he that believeth not shall receive nothing." What would a man need to do to receive that Ford, Mr. Brown, if they said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall receive the new Ford"? Friends, Mr. Brown might be the first one in the water if Ford Motor Company made an offer like that.

In Gal. 3:26-27 the apostle Paul explains that those he was writing to were children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. That's what they were when Paul wrote to them. Verse 27 explains how they became children of God by faith: he says, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ did put on Christ," or "have put on Christ."

Now, what did Mr. Brown say about these that would convince you that they do not mean just what they say? He may come back and tell you, "Well, if you knew Greek you'd understand that they don't mean what they seem to say." You know, Mr. Brown, if you're such a Greek scholar we wonder why you haven't given the world a translation so people who do not have your scholarship can really understand all of the Bible. You pose, apparently, as some sort of Greek scholar for us. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, remember, Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ (that identifies it as water) for the remission of sins." (Time)

Brown's Fifth Affirmative

First of all, you said something that kind of shocked me. You said that Spiritual baptism had ceased. You mean to tell me God has ceased to give His Spirit unto His believers? Then I asked you a question, "How do you accept one into your church?" Well, I haven't heard you comment on that either.

Then you say I pose as some Greek scholar. No, I'm taking Greek now, and I know that in order to interpret the Bible you need to give study to everything: words, context, historical setting, the period of the time in which the writer was identified with. Now, Luke 8:7 and 44-50 but basically pick out these scriptures, is dealing with a lady who was washing Jesus' feet and administered to Him kisses. Now he said, "My head with oil thou didst not anoint, but this woman hath anointed my feet with oil, wherefore I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven for she loved much, but to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little. And he said unto her, thy sins are forgiven, and they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, who is this that forgiveth sins also. And he said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." You mean to tell me that Jesus did not mean that this lady was saved from her sins when he said that? Yet it doesn't say that she was baptized.

Now, I further state that I'm focusing on the one essential baptism that is essential for salvation and it's not water baptism. You want to make one baptism in the whole Bible valid, and that's your water

baptism. I'm upholding the baptism of the Spirit, not the baptism of man, but that which comes from God can only make a man perfect. "For every good and perfect gift cometh from the Father in whom there is no variableness, nor shadow of turning." Now, the gift of the Holy Spirit is still being given to believers today. But brother Watts, you have said definitely that the Spirit has ceased to be given unto people, the administration of the Spirit. That's what you said, has ceased. You said there's only baptism and I'm talking about the Spiritual baptism, you said that has ceased. So, how does one receive the Spirit of God now if he's not baptized? Baptized means to be submersed into.

When you said, over there in Galatians wherever you read, that you was baptized into the body of Christ, that is a mechanical use of the word "into" in the Greek it means EIS, the word, the Greek word for there is EIS, and it means to be baptized or placed into by another agency apart from man. Now, you tell me that the Spirit is not baptizing today. Now Paul, a man who was supposed to have his sins removed through water baptism, when he writes of baptism, refers only to one. Now I ask you, was Paul under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit when he wrote this letter? Of course he was. Now, would the Holy Spirit lead Paul to admit water baptism if it was truly the means whereby one receives access unto the blood of Christ? If the baptism of the Spirit is only for to place one into the body of Christ and the baptism of water was for one to attain remission of

sins, if that is the only way one can receive the blessings of the death of Christ, why didn't the Spirit lead Paul to write, "One Lord, one faith and two baptisms"? To say that the Spirit left something out that is essential for our salvation would be to blaspheme and I will not blaspheme. Therefore, I conclude that the Spirit inspired Paul and led him unto all truth leaving nothing out, therefore we only have one baptism mentioned in the Bible essential for salvation and that is the baptism of the Spirit.

Now, I further comment, people please listen, Jesus said you would be baptized with the fire and the Holy Ghost, but he has said that that baptism has ceased and the only one is administered now is water baptism. Jesus is being called a liar because he said he would baptize with fire and the Holy Ghost. And you mean to tell me that you would sit up here and believe that baptism had ceased and Jesus has been confirmed as a liar because He's the one who said it, and you know it.

"Go ye therefore into all the world, preach and teach baptizing." That's the commission given to man, but He told His disciples, "You would be baptized and furthermore they that needed it." I need the Spirit too. Everybody needs the Spirit. Paul said, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is not of his." So, if we don't receive the Spirit today we do not belong to Christ, Rom. 8:9. Jesus spoke the truth. He's baptizing with the Spirit today. (Time)

Watts' Fifth Negative

Ladies and gentlemen, we're having an exciting discussion here. I have to remind Mr. Brown, though, that pounding on the table does not make up for not having Bible proof. This audience knows the difference between lightning and thunder. Now, the scriptures are lightning but pounding on the table, that's mere empty thunder.

Mr. Brown came close, and maybe he went all the way, in claiming that I'm blaspheming. Ladies and gentlemen, there is a vast, vast difference between speaking against Baptist doctrine and speaking against the Bible. Next, let me say to you that the answer to the question, "Why didn't Paul write 'two baptisms' in Eph. 4:5?", is because there was only one. Spirit baptism had ceased to be received at the time Paul wrote Ephesians. Now, I said earlier, Mr. Brown has no better understanding of Spirit baptism than he does of water baptism. And he charged me with the idea of saying God has ceased giving His Spirit. He thinks that if people are not baptized in the Holy Spirit they cannot have God's Spirit. Mr. Brown, John the Baptist was filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb, but Holy Spirit baptism did not begin until the day of Pentecost. You can have the Spirit of God without being baptized in the Spirit. Now, you've misrepresented me when you implied that I'm saying people can't have the Spirit if they're not baptized in the Holy Spirit. It's not the Spirit that is no longer available. It is that particular means or method through which the Spirit was re-

ceived by the apostles and some others.

Let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Brown cannot give one verse, I want to repeat that, he cannot give one verse that teaches that baptism is not essential. I'm not merely saying that he can't find a verse that says those exact words. I'm saying he can't find a single verse that teaches that in any words. Why? Because Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Because Peter said, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of your sins." Because Ananias said, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Because Paul wrote to the Galatians that they had become children of God by being baptized into Christ and putting on Christ. And because Peter said in 1 Peter 3:21 that we're saved by baptism.

Now, concerning the woman in Luke 7, Mr. Brown knows this is a case of forgiveness before the death of Christ. Mark 2:10 says that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, and Jesus did save people in various ways. Now He saves people according to His last will and testament.

Now, I want to come to this matter of Spirit baptism, and I hope Mr. Brown will listen carefully because he's been asserting that certain instances are cases of Spirit baptism, and I want to make this point. I'm going to provide you with some means to determine if baptism is water baptism. And I'd like for Mr. Brown to respond. I identify baptism in the New Testament as water baptism by finding water mentioned in

the text or the context. For example in Acts 8 where the Ethiopian said "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized." Or by determining that it is to be administered by men, for Holy Spirit baptism is administered by Jesus, John 1:33. Or by determining that it is a commanded baptism. Holy Spirit baptism was promised but never commanded, and that's what we have in Acts 10:47-48. It's a command there. It's not Spirit baptism. Or by determining that it was baptism in Jesus' name. Now Mr. Brown, why don't you come back and tell this audience how you identify baptism as being Spirit baptism — besides more assertion.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are some interesting examples in the Scripture which help us to understand that people are blessed by faith when they do what God says to do. For example, in Hebrews 11:30 the Scripture says, "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down after they were compassed about seven days." The blessing occurred by faith, but it occurred after they did what God said to do. It is that way with baptism. (Time)

Brown's Final Affirmative

First of all, how I identify baptism, before one can repent he must believe. I showed you Scriptural proof. The reason Mr. Watts is mad is because I didn't pull out John 3:16. Those scriptures teach that one can be saved or have eternal life if they believe on His Son. He told me on the phone that if you was to use a scripture like that then I could say it doesn't teach water baptism is not

essential for salvation and anyone who reads it knows perfectly well baptism is not included in that. But it teaches if any man believes on the Son of God he shall have eternal life.

Furthermore, I still argue my point, that spiritual baptism did not cease. It is still being done. And if it has ceased, then how are we saved? Not by the water, it's by the blood. If Spiritual baptism was ceased, how are we saved? The Spirit was given to those and it's said it is your seal unto the day of redemption. He seals you with the Holy Spirit until the day of redemption. Now you mean to tell me that the Bible is localized in its context? The Bible speaks, and it addresses all areas in any historical period or setting of time. The word of God will abide forever. It reaches beyond the border of time. It is not limited to that context. When he said, "Sealed ye with the Holy Spirit until the day of redemption," redemption has not come yet. And that means I'm still sealed with the Spirit until that day. Now I don't have my baptism confused. I know perfectly well, water baptism is a sign of obedience and identifies one with the local church body. It associates one with the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. (Time)

Watts' Final Negative

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Brown has taken unfair advantage of me. This is not television and you cannot see me smile and he has given you the impression that I'm angry or mad, and in fact I am not. Mr. Brown, in 1 Tim. 1:3 the apostle Paul said to "charge some that they teach

no other doctrine." You don't have to be mad to do that, you just have to be convinced of the truth of the Gospel. And to show you I'm not mad, let me give you this cough drop. That'll get us back on friendly terms (laughter by all present). So, first of all ladies and gentlemen, I'm certainly not mad. I'm delighted that Mr. Brown came, and maybe we can continue to do this. I mentioned to Mr. Brown yesterday that I'd like to arrange some other discussions and he was a little reluctant at that time to agree to anything. We shall see what we shall see.

He had asked me "How do you receive the Spirit?" Well Mr. Brown, we've been talking about that for two days. You repent, you're baptized for the remission of your sins, and God has promised to give us His Spirit.

He asked, "How do you get into the church?" Well, if you're talking about the universal church, you do that when you're baptized at the direction of the Spirit in water into the body. If you're talking about the congregation, the congregation ac-

cepts Christians. We certainly don't require people to go through some sort of pollution as you seem to describe water baptism as being.

In the closing moments of my speech, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express appreciation, not only to Mr. Brown, but also to Mr. Gene Frost, our moderator, and Mr. Tom Moody, who has been of great assistance to me. This is, of course, serious business even though Mr. Brown and I are good friends and I hope we'll remain that way. It is a serious thing, and we must not be prejudiced to prevent ourselves from accepting the truth. I want to encourage you to contact faithful preachers from true churches of Christ. And if I can help you contact me at the Shively church of Christ. (Time)

Special appreciation is expressed to Betty Beck of the Shively church of Christ for transcribing, correcting and retyping this debate, thereby making its publication in **Concern** possible.

CONCERN

USPS 610-900

1916 Rockford Lane

Louisville, KY 40216

Second-class postage paid at
Louisville, Kentucky

