

Porter-Tingley Debate

Operation of the Holy Spirit in Conversion

Baptism for remission of sins

First Session: 7:30 P. M., February 24, 1947
Central Church of Christ-Birmingham, Alabama
Chairman: Emerson J. Estes-Birmingham, Alabama
Announcements and welcome to visitors: A. E. Emmons, Jr.,
Birmingham, Alabama
Singing directed by: H. A. Sikes-Birmingham, Alabama
Prayer: I. A. Douthitt-Hohenwald, Tennessee
Moderators: Gus Nichols, Jasper, Alabama, for Mr. Porter;
Millard Cairns, Decatur, Illinois, for Mr. Tingley

Proposition: "The Scriptures Teach that in the Conversion of Alien Sinners the Holy Spirit Operates Directly Upon Them as Well as Through the Word of Truth or Gospel of Christ."

Glenn V. Tingley, Affirms
W. Curtis Porter, Denies

TINGLEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE - FIRST NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very happy to be here in what I believe to be the clear defense of the truth of God. The question as stated should be carefully defined so there will not be misapprehension in the mind of any of us. "The Scriptures," that is the Word of God, the sixtysix books called the Bible. "Teach that in the conversion," that is the turning around of the sinner whereby he ceases to be a sinner and becomes a child of God. In the conversion there is included the justification, regeneration, the turning around, the new birth, the making new-the "conversion" of the sinner. Whereas he was a sinner away from God, now is a child of God in fellowship with his Lord. "The Scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit," the third Person of the Godhead, "operates directly," the question is not how He operates, the question is: does He operate in any way directly upon a sinner as well as the word of truth or the Gospel of Christ ?

The question briefly stated is does the Holy Spirit operate directly upon sinners? My opponent denies this. I affirm this.

I have never been interested nor would I hold a debate where any vote is taken because socalled winning is not the purpose of debates from my viewpoint. I want the truth. Years ago I broke with man's shibboleth's and forms, and ceremonies and sought and wanted the truth of God. And tonight we want the proof of God as it is found in the Word of God.

Now in order to understand whether the Holy Spirit does operate, there are three

things. First, who is the Holy Spirit? Second, can He operate? Third, Does He operate directly upon the sinner? My worthy opponent contends that an individual does not have any direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon him in the matter of conversion; that conversion is a mechanical matter like purchasing out of a gum vending machine a package of conversion. I contend that conversion is something infinitely more than a mechanical operation, that it is something infinitely more than accepting just a word or a receipt, that it has to be accomplished by divine power-a divine operation, every bit of the nature of the sinner whereby the sinner is born from above by direct operation of the Holy Spirit.

Who is the Holy Spirit? Well, the Holy Spirit was present in the Old Testament. The Holy Spirit was sent by the Father in Christ's name. John 14:26, "But the comforter which is the Holy Ghost which the Father will send in my name." The Holy Spirit was sent by Christ, John 16:7, "It is expedient for you that I go away for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you. If I depart I will send him unto you." John 15:26, "The Holy Spirit came from the Father, "When the comforter is come whom I will send from the Father." The Holy Spirit is of Christ, the Holy Spirit is of God, therefore a person, the third person of the Godhead, a personality operating in the world today. For instance, Romans 8:9, "Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you." "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ"-the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, a Person Himself, the Holy Spirit.

We are told in Matthew 3:6 that the Father spoke from heaven, Jesus was baptized and the Spirit descended-the Trinity. If the Holy Spirit is part of the Trinity, if He is God, if He is a Person, then He can-with God all things are possible-He can operate directly upon the sinner. The Holy Spirit is very God. Who is He? He is very God. Matthew 28:19, the name of the Holy Spirit is coupled in equality with the name of God and of

Christ in the apostolic commission. In the apostolic benediction in 2 Cor. 13:14, the Holy Spirit is coupled with Christ and God. He is the third Person in the Trinity. In 1 Cor. 12:416 there the Holy Spirit is coupled with God and Christ in administering the work of the church. If the Holy Spirit is God, how dare anyone deny that God can operate directly upon the sinner.

The Holy Spirit can be worshipped. He is not an influence, not an "it". In 2 Cor. 13:4, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." He can be worshipped. He can return communion directly to a worshipper. In 2 Cor. 3:17 and 18 we find He is called God and Lord. "Now the Lord is the Spirit and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." If He is Lord and God, He can operate directly upon man.

The Spirit is a person with names. He is called "the Spirit." In 1 Cor. 3:16, He is called the "Spirit of God." In Isa. 11:2, "the Spirit of Jehovah." 2 Cor. 3:3, "the Spirit of the living God." Rom. 8:9, "the Spirit of Christ." In Gal. 4:6, "The Spirit of His Son." In Phil. 1:19, "the Spirit of Jesus Christ." In Luke 11:13, He is "the Holy Spirit." Isa. 4:4, "the Spirit of burning." Rom. 1:4, "the Spirit of Holiness." In John 14:17, the "Spirit of truth." Rom. 8:2, "the Spirit of life." Heb. 10:29, "the Spirit of Grace." Heb. 9:14, He is the "eternal Spirit." In John 14:26, He is "the comforter." The Holy Spirit is: who He is-God, the third Person of the Trinity. If He is a Person He can operate directly upon the sinner.

The Holy Spirit is a Person, further, because personal pronouns are applied to Him. John 15:26, "When the comforter is come whom I will send from the Father, the Spirit of truth he shall testify." John 16:714, over and over "He," "Him." Since He is a Person of the Godhead then he who denies the ability of a person of the Godhead to operate directly

upon men limits God, denies God His divine prerogative, and abuses God Himself.

The Holy Spirit does things that only a person could do. Romans 8:26, He intercedes directly for men. In John 14:26, He teaches directly to men. In Acts 16:6, He guides directly for men. In 2 Cor. 13:14, He communes directly with men. In Acts 8:39, He works miracles directly upon man. He can be lied to. You can not lie to a book or to a word. You lie to a person. He is God-Person. In Acts 5:3, Ananias lied. You can not insult a word, a paragraph or a book. Yet, the Holy Spirit in Heb. 10:29 can be done despite to. He can be wrongfully treated, ill treated, personally insulted, done despite to-the Spirit of grace.

Divine works are ascribed to Him. In Job 33:4, the breath of Almighty God comes in life to men by the Spirit of God. He is life giving in Genesis 2:7 and in John 6:63, the Spirit quickeneth. Romans 8:3, "The Spirit of life." He is life giving. Yet my worthy opponent says: He can not operate directly upon an individual; He can not operate upon a sinner; there is no way for Him to operate upon a person, upon a poor lost sinner.

The Holy Spirit prophesies. 2 Samuel 23:23, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." Since He is a person and operates directly to, for, with and upon men, then my worthy opponent is attacking the third Person of the Godhead in denying Him His divine prerogative.

He has personality, He is God, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, eternal.

The Holy Spirit cries out. My worthy opponent contends the Holy Spirit can not operate directly upon you as a sinner, there id no contact. He has accepting words, yet, the Holy Spirit cries out. In Gal 4:6 and in other scriptures. In Heb. 9:14, He is eternal and in Isa. 63:10 He is vexed. In John 15:26 He gives testimony. Words can never be vexed. Acts 13:2, He commands men. He has a will. 1 Cor. 12:11. He has love. He has knowledge, He has grief. He searches and He speaks now. Who is He ? If He is God, then all things are possible. If He is man, then we are fools and the Bible is a lie. If the Holy Spirit is an influence, then the Godhead is untrue and there is no Spirit, there's an influence. He must be a Person. If He is the printed or spoken word then He is the letter that killeth, He is omnipresent. There are five thousand languages and dialects in this world. The Bible has only been translated into a little over one thousand. Yet the Bible plainly declares that the Holy Spirit is omnipresent in the world.

If He is the third person of the Trinity and if He is God's administrator in this age, then He blesses the Word, convicts the sinner, fills the church by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon men. Therefore, who is He? The third Person of the Godhead. Can He? With God all things are possible.

Now, does He? If I only had one scripture to read tonight, I would read to you 1 Corinthians the second chapter. That's enough. "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstrations of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world that come to naught, but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things that God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit, for the Spirit searches"

all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teaches; but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because"-why does not the natural man understand the word of God ? Why can he not grasp the truth of God? Why is it his ears are dull? Because they are spiritually discerned! Unless the Spirit operates directly upon the sinner, the sinner is helpless to understand the way of salvation and the thing of God. "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." Now, there can be no reception or understanding of the word of salvation except cooperative with and accompanied by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit must open the eyes of the sinner to receive the word. We have not received the Spirit of the natural man but the Spirit which is of God. Why? Why do men receive that? "That we might know the deep things of God!" Does the Holy Spirit operate directly upon the sinner ? He must before he can receive and understand the Word of God.

If I only had one scripture, Romans 8:9 would be adequate. "But ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you." If any man have not the Spirit, he is not converted, he is none of His. The Holy Spirit must operate directly or he can not be converted. If the Spirit did not operate directly upon him, you then are none of His.

If I only had one scripture, Romans 5:5 would be enough. "And hope maketh not ashamed because the love of God is abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Now what is conversion? Conversion is the turning a man around who loves the world. At conversion, in conversion, in the act of conversion the love of God is shed in his heart otherwise he never is converted, never can be. Converted means a complete turning around. Who sheds the love of God in the man's heart and causes him in the act of turning around to become a born again child of God ? The Holy Spirit sheds abroad the love of God in the sinner's heart.

God made us by direct operation. Christ redeemed us by direct operation, the Holy Spirit converts us by direct operation.

If I only had one scripture, Acts 7:51 is enough. "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye sinners. Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." How can men resist one who does not operate directly upon them ? "As your fathers did so do ye." The Holy Spirit pleads, convicts, entreats, He brings men to the word. He works with and in addition to the Word. How can you profess to believe the Word and resist the Holy Ghost? Those who take the position of my worthy opponent, as Jesus said to the Pharisees, "Ye search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, they are they that testify of me and ye will not come unto me that you might have life." Mark this. The scriptures over and over emphasize the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the sinner. Over and over, yet with all the searching He can not be found. My worthy opponent says He does not operate directly.

If I only had one scripture, John 16:711 is enough. It is said to the disciples, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the comforter which is the Holy Spirit will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will convict the world,"-the world of sinners, the world

of wicked men. The Holy Spirit will convict them by direct operation- "Of sin of righteousness and of judgment." What does the Holy Spirit convict the world of? Of sin! "Of sin because they believed not on me. Of righteousness because I go to my Father and ye see me no more, of judgment because the prince of this world is judged." The world is all flesh. He comes to reprove "the world." Operating directly upon all men, upon sinful men. The Word plainly declares it. My worthy opponent denies it. Men can never be convicted of sin without the Holy Spirit, said Jesus. The Word, said Jesus, is powerless unless accompanied by the Holy Spirit. The writing of John of the words from the lips of Jesus. In the Old Testament age the story was the same. In Genesis 6:3, the Lord said "My Spirit will not always strive with man." Repentance must be of God inspired by the Holy Spirit.

If I only had one scripture, John 3:18, is enough. "There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus. A ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night and said unto him, Rabbi we know that thou art a teacher come from God for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily verily I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born ? Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. 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 is born of the Spirit."

The birth of the Spirit is spoken of three times. There are two agents. The word and the Spirit direct from God to operate upon the sinner. The Word and the Spirit as well as the Word. The other day I was in the hospital where my oldest daughter had given birth to her first baby. That baby was born of my daughter. No one else was its mother. It was a matter of direct operation. The Word of God says that if a sinner is born again he is born of the Spirit. My worthy opponent says that He can not operate, does not operate, directly upon the sinner.

Now, I have proven the scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them as well as the word of truth or the gospel of Christ-because: the Holy Spirit was omnipresent in the Old Testament age; He has come from the Father in Christ's name; He is the third Person of the Trinity; He is deity and can not be limited; He is God and Lord and is a Person; He is a Person with personal names, and personal pronouns are used to describe Him. Therefore, if He is God, He can operate directly upon the sinner. The Holy Spirit does things only a person can do. He does divine works, gives life, prophesies, has all the attributes of personal deity. Therefore He can operate directly upon the sinner. The Holy Spirit invites the sinner to Christ. Man's sinful nature can be changed only by a divine miracle of the Holy Spirit. Man only receives the witness of salvation and is damned in rejecting the Holy Spirit, therefore the Holy Spirit does operate directly upon the sinner. The Holy Spirit is the One who convicts the sinner and alone produces repentance. The New Birth is wrought by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit does operate directly upon the sinner.

One can resist the pleading of the Holy Spirit. Ye become epistles of Christ by the Spirit and the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit. Therefore the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner.

If I only had one scripture I would give this one: Acts 10:44, "While Peter yet spake

these words, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word.” In the conversion of Cornelius he heard the Word and as well as the Word-which my opponent denies- and while the Word was preached, the Holy Ghost descended upon them, personally fell, and He can and does operate directly upon the sinner because of Cornelius’ household. Thank you.

PORTER’S FIRST NEGATIVE - FIRST NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am indeed glad for this privilege which I now have of coming before you at this time in the negative of the proposition which my friend, Mr. Tingley, has been affirming for the past thirty minutes. I appreciate also the confidence which my brethren placed in me in calling me to engage in this discussion with Mr. Tingley, on these propositions which will be studied during these six nights of the discussion.

I assure you of the fact, at the very beginning, I am seeking to get before you the truth; and it is not a matter of winning a victory but getting before you the truth of God Almighty. I shall endeavor to do that as best I can as the discussion goes on.

But before I reply to the speech that has just been made I have just a few questions that I want to present to my opponent. These questions are not presented for the purpose of diverting attention from the question before us, or turning aside your minds from the issue of the discussion; but for the purpose of focusing the issue and getting before you just the things that are involved in this discussion tonight and the position which my friend must occupy in order to sustain the position which he has maintained for the past thirty minutes. These questions are not given for the purpose of taking up time, but I simply want to get before you the truth of God Almighty upon these matters; and so these questions I shall expect my friend to answer.

First, Is it possible for the direct operation of the Holy Spirit to save a sinner without the preaching of the word?

2. Is it possible for a sinner to be saved by the influence exerted through the word without the direct operation of the Spirit ?

3. Does the direct operation of the Spirit precede or follow the preaching of the word?

4. What does the direct operation of the Spirit do for a sinner that can not be accomplished by the preaching of the gospel?

5. Is the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit the same as the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion?

6. Does the Holy Spirit in its direct operation on the sinner speak to the sinner?

7. If the Holy Spirit speaks to the sinner what does He say that He has not already said in the word of truth?

8. If the Holy Spirit does not speak to the sinner, then in what way does he exert power upon him?

9. How does the sinner know the Spirit is operating directly upon him?

10. What does the sinner do when he resists the direct operation of the Holy Spirit?

(Mr. Porter hands the questions to Mr. Tingley. Mr. Tingley: Thank you).

(Mr. Porter continues:)

I call your attention next to the definition which my opponent gave concerning the proposition. He mentioned the word “direct.” That’s the thing that’s concerned in this

question tonight. "The scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them as well as through the word of truth or gospel of Christ." Now the word "directly" simply means "immediately," and the two words may be used interchangeably. Those two words have to do either with time or method. If we use them with respect to time and say that a certain thing will occur directly or immediately, we mean without delay, that it will soon be accomplished. Certainly, that is not the meaning of the word as my opponent uses it in his proposition. In the second place, the words indicate without medium or with nothing intervening. When we are talking about a thing being done directly or immediately, we mean without means; there is no medium through which it works. It works directly, without means. That's the meaning of the term as used in this question tonight and which my opponent shall have to sustain as the discussion goes on.

Now, then, just briefly, before I notice his arguments, I want to introduce just a few counter arguments with a few negative thoughts; and then I shall take up his speech.

I am contending, of course, that the Holy Spirit operates upon the sinner through the word of truth. I call your attention to a statement made by Paul in 1 Cor. 1:21, in which it is said, "It pleased God to save them that believe through the foolishness of preaching." Now that, according to friend Tingley, can not be. Men can not be saved through foolishness of preaching. The thing that pleased God didn't please Elder Tingley at all. But it pleased God to save them that believe through the preaching of the gospel, the foolishness of preaching. The question arises, How do men believe? How does faith come about? How is faith produced? I call your attention to these thoughts upon that point. In John 17:20, Jesus prayed for them "That shall believe on me through their word," referring to the preaching of the apostles for whom he had just prayed. He prayed for those that believe on him through their word. He did not say "through a direct operation of the Holy Spirit" but for them that believe on me "through their word." In Romans 10:17, Paul said, "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Elder Tingley would have to say, "No, Paul, you are mistaken about that. Faith comes by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit away from the word of God." But Paul says, "Faith comes by hearing the word of God." Then in John 20:30-31, we are told that "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ; and that believing ye might have life through his name." That shows, again, that faith comes as a result of the things that are written. My opponent insists that the things that are written can not produce faith; that there must be a direct operation of the Spirit before the sinner can even know anything about it, much less believe anything about it.

Again, in Acts 4:4 we are told that "Many of them which heard the word believed," showing that their belief came as a result of hearing the word. In Acts 15:7, Peter said, "God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe," and that they should believe as a result of hearing the word.

In Romans 10:13-14 Paul declared, "How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" In Luke 8:12 we have a statement made which shows that even the devil knows that the word is able to save men. Referring to the seed that fell by the wayside, Jesus said, "The devil comes, catches the word away." He comes and removes the word, "lest they should believe and be saved." Of course, that could not be, according to friend Tingley; the word could stay there forever, and if there was not a direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon the person, he just would not be saved at all. So the devil was concerned about a thing that he needed not have been concerned about at all. He should have tried

some way to prevent a direct operation of the Holy Spirit instead of removing the word, because removing the word from his heart would have nothing to do with it. Just keep the Holy Spirit from operating directly, and that would get the job done, according to friend Tingley.

I call your attention now to what the gospel does. Romans 1:16. Paul said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." I know that God has power which is not exerted through the gospel. God has power as the Creator; God has power to do many things that are not involved in this question tonight. The power of God to save is exerted through the gospel, because Paul said the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. In 1 Cor. 4:15 he said, "I have begotten you through the gospel." Of course, Mr. Tingley would have to add, "No, not through the gospel but through a direct operation of the Holy Spirit."

Notice what the law of Christ does. In Romans 8:2, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death." The word law means "rule of action." Why, my friend introduced this passage awhile ago in connection with what the Spirit did. It tells us how the Spirit did it; that the Spirit did it through His law. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death," and Elder Tingley says, "That can not happen. The law of the Spirit can not do a thing of that kind." But Paul said it did. You may take your choice.

In Psalms 19:7, it is said, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." The word perfect often means complete. The law of the Lord is complete, converting the soul. No, it isn't complete, according to my friend; there must be something else.

In the fifth place, I call your attention to what the word is said to do. James 1:18. It is said to beget. James said we are begotten with the word of truth. In Psalms 119:50 it is said to quicken. In John 17:17 it is said to sanctify. In Psalms 119:9- it cleanses. In James 1:21-it is able to save. Acts 20:32-it is able to give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified.

In the sixth place, note what the truth does. 1 Pet. 1:22 says "purified your souls in obeying the truth." John 8:32 says, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

I give those as negative thoughts showing that God operates upon men-the Holy Spirit operates upon men-through the word, through the gospel of Jesus Christ; and that through that operation He is able to save the souls of men.

Now, then, to the speech which my opponent just made. About half of it was unnecessary and altogether wasted effort on the part of my friend. He wasted about half his time endeavoring to prove to you that the Holy Spirit is a person; that he is not simply an influence or something of that kind; but that He is a person. He gave a great number of scriptures along that line. He said, "Who is the Holy Spirit?" and gave John 14:27 - "The Father sent the comforter," and John 16:17, Christ said, "I will send him." John 15:26-He came from the Father. Rom. 8:1-the Spirit dwells in you. Matthew 3:16-the Spirit descended. He said all of this shows that He is operating directly. And Matthew 28:19, the three mentioned there in connection with baptism in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit being the third person in the Godhead. 2 Cor. 13:14 the Holy Spirit is coupled with God and with Christ. 1 Cor. 12:46-He is connected with God. And 2 Cor. 13:14-he can be worshiped. And, then, he said, "He is called the Lord." 2 Cor. 3:17, 18. He gave a list of scriptures to prove what the Spirit's names are. 2 Cor. 3:16; Isa. 11:2; 2 Cor. 3:3; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 6:6; Phil. 1:19; Luke 11:13 Isa. 4:4; Rom 1:4; John 14:17; Romans

8:2; Heb. 10:29; Heb. 9:14. All of these are referring to it as the Spirit of the Son and the Spirit of God and various other terms that are used describing the Spirit-all proving that the Spirit is a person.

He came on down to some other things in that connection -the personal pronouns used in referring to the Spirit. John 15:26-referred to as "he"-the personal pronoun. John 16:7- the personal pronoun "he" again being applied to him. And so he declares that this proves that He is a person.

The next argument he made was that he does what a person does. Rom. 8 :26-he intercedes. John 14 :26-he teaches. Acts 16:6-he guides. 2 Cor. 13:14 he communes.

Then he can be lied to as Ananias did in Acts 5:3. He can be despised. Heb. 10:29. All of this, he claims, proves that the Holy Spirit is a person. Then Gal. 4:6- cries out. Isa. 63:10- he is vexed. John 15:26-he gives testimony. 1 Cor. 12:11-he has a will. All of these things he introduced to prove that the Holy Spirit is a person, as though that were involved in his proposition tonight. I want to tell you, my friends, tonight, that not a single, solitary thing in this proposition gives any reason beneath the stars for the introduction of such arguments as that.

Mr. Tingley, I agree with you wholeheartedly, and I could have made that speech with all the sincerity of my soul that you made for the first fifteen minutes of it, endeavoring to prove that the Holy Spirit is a person. I believe that as well as you do; and I think you knew that I believed that He is a person. I just feel sure that that is right. And so you wasted half of your speech proving that the Holy Spirit is a person when there is no issue between us on that whatsoever. Certainly, I believe the Holy Spirit is a person. I can make every argument that you have made along that line, proving it to the audience just as you did. I can shake hands with you upon that, my friend Tingley, and just let that pass, because we both agree wholeheartedly upon that point. That's not the point involved in the discussion at all tonight.

The proposition does not say, "The Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit is a person." Friend Tingley, if you had written a proposition like that I would have affirmed it instead of denying it.

You said, "The question is not how does the Spirit operate ?" but "Does the Spirit operate?" No, that's not the question at all. There is no difference between my opponent and myself as to the operation of the Spirit-that is, as to whether the Spirit operates. I certainly believe that the Spirit operates. It is a question of how it operates and not whether it operates. And so you're sidestepping the issue. Come up and face the music and let's get going on this proposition-not whether the Spirit operates but how it operates. I am contending that the Holy Spirit operates through the word, through the preaching of the gospel. Friend Tingley says it operates directly-without means, without a medium, upon the alien sinner. So it is a question of "how" and not "whether."

Again, he said he was going to prove the Spirit could do so and so. He said there are three things involved: Who is the Spirit? Can he operate directly? And does He operate directly? He spent a great deal of his time endeavoring to prove that the Holy Spirit can operate directly. In fact, these arguments he made upon the personality of the Spirit were used to prove that the Spirit can operate directly. Friend Tingley, will you take this proposition and show me where there is anything there about whether the Spirit can operate directly? Is that what you are affirming? If you had written a proposition saying "The scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit can operate directly." I would have affirmed it, Elder Tingley, and not have denied it. I would have af-

firmed that instead of putting my name to the negative of it. Why, certainly, I believe the Holy Spirit can operate directly. It is not a matter of what the Holy Spirit can do. It's what the Holy Spirit does. That's the point. It's not whether he can do it but whether he is doing it.

Elder Tingley, God can feed you with bread direct from heaven, but he is not doing it, is He?

Mr. Tingley: Yes.

Mr. Porter: Getting manna down from heaven just like the Israelites did?

(Mr. Tingley nods his head for "Yes.")

Mr. Porter: Physical food? Physical food direct from heaven? You go out in the morning and gather it up just like the Israelites did?

Mr. Tingley: He gathers it for me.

Mr. Porter: And who feeds you? Mr. Tingley: His disciples.

Mr. Porter: And he puts it in your mouth? Well, that's going. Now, then, my friend says he does not have to work for food. He does not even have to gather it up. God sends it down directly from heaven. What does he send you-manna, fish or what ?

Mr. Tingley: All of it.

Mr. Porter: Do you get all of it the same day?

Mr. Tingley: No, I get it whenever I need it.

Mr. Porter: Whenever you need it? How do you know when you need it? Now, that's the position to which this thing has driven him this early in the debate. He has taken a position now that God sends him food directly from heaven-without any medium, without any means. He does not have to have anybody to plow the corn. It does not have to be reaped; it does not have to be threshed; it doesn't have to be taken to mill or anything else. He gets it direct from heaven; already baked; already cooked; ready to eat. I suspect God forces his mouth open and crams it down. Now, that's where it goes when he goes to a thing of that kind. God can do things that He is not doing. He is not feeding Elder Tingley direct from heaven with fish or any other kind of material food. If he gets his food, he will have to work for it like any other man gets it. It is not a question of what God can do, or what the Holy Spirit can do, but it is what the Holy Spirit does. He says if you say the Holy Spirit cannot do it, you limit the power of the Spirit. All right; if you say the Holy Spirit can not save a man through the word, you have limited the power of the Spirit. Can God save a man through the word without a direct operation? Can the Holy Spirit save a man without directly operating upon him ? Can he ? Tell me, Tingley, can he?

Mr. Tingley: I'll tell you.

Mr. Porter: He will tell me. All right; you wait and see whether or not he will tell me if the Holy Spirit can save a man through the word without the direct operation. If He cannot, then you limit the power of the Spirit. If you say He can, you give up your proposition. Now just take either horn of it you want, and we will see how the going goes on.

He said, "There are five thousand languages on the earth, and the Bible has been translated into only one thousand of them." Wonder just what he intended by that? I suppose he meant that God could save just the one thousand; and so the four thousand of them would have to remain unsaved, according to my position. If that is what he wants to say about it, we will be glad to have him say it in his next speech. So I wait further development upon that point.

Then he came to his third point and says, "Does the Holy Spirit operate directly upon the sinner?" He affirms that He does. He gave a number of passages proving that the Holy

Spirit operates. Not a single one of them contained anything about “directly.” The word directly or its equivalent is not found in a single one of them. Friend Tingley simply assumes that there is something there that isn’t there. He bases his whole contention upon his assumption. That’s all.

Now then let’s get at the scriptures he gave. 1 Cor. 2. He read the entire chapter to prove that the Holy Spirit operates directly on sinners. Now, the second chapter of 1st Corinthians. I do not want to read the entire chapter but just a few things that my opponent read to prove that the Holy Spirit operates directly upon sinners. Now, he read this verse right in connection with the others. Verse 12, “Now we have received, not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.” He applied that to alien sinners. Here’s the Holy Spirit operating upon alien sinners in conversion; but Paul is referring to the revelation of God to them who are already saved, including himself. To whom does “we” refer? “That we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.” Friend Tingley, tell us, does that mean alien sinners? If it doesn’t, your whole argument is lost. If it does, then Paul was an alien sinner, because he included himself in the expression “we.” In this same connection he came on down to the fourteenth verse. “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” So he said the natural man can not receive the things of the Spirit; so there must be a direct operation. Well, is a “direct operation” a thing of the Spirit? Is that power which you say the Spirit works upon a man one of the things of the Spirit? If it is, your passage says he can not receive it! So it cuts you loose from that because he can not receive the things of the Spirit; and the operation of the Spirit is one of the things of the Spirit. How about conversion? Is that one of the things of the Spirit? This says he can not receive the things of the Spirit, So he can not receive conversion, according to your application of the passage. We will have more to say about that later.

He also said, “The sinner must receive the Spirit before he can receive the word.” He said, “I give Romans 8:9 as the passage “ “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” Here’s the passage that proves, according to friend Tingley, that an alien sinner must receive the Spirit before he can receive the word. Now, then, what about it? When he receives the Spirit, Paul says he is not in the flesh. “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwells in you.” Now, when the Spirit dwells in you, you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit. He said that refers to alien sinners. All right; then alien sinners are not in the flesh when they receive the Spirit prior to receiving the word. Then, they must be out of the flesh, and, they are no longer sinners. The passage does not do him any good at all, because even by his application, we have shown that they are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, when they receive the Spirit; and all of that, he says, before they can receive the word. That being true, they are out of the flesh when they receive the Spirit and have never yet heard the word of God Almighty.

In Rom. 5:5-the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. Yes, and that did not say “directly.” It did not say a word about a direct operation. We learn in 1 John 4:19 that we love God because He first loved us; and the love of God is revealed to us through the testimony of the Spirit revealed in the gospel. Certainly, through that it is shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost.

He came to Acts 7:51. If he needed just one passage, that would be it. “Stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears.” “Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost. As your fathers did, so do you.” Now, what did those men resist when they resisted the Holy Spirit? Read

right on down through the following verses and you will find they “stopped their ears”! They stopped their ears and rushed upon Stephen with one accord. When they stopped their ears they resisted the Holy Spirit. My friend says it must be otherwise. That is not the passage he wants. He will have to find something better than that. That shows they resisted the Holy Ghost by resisting the preaching of Stephen. Even as their fathers did. When you turn back to Neh. 9:30 you will find how their fathers did it, when they refused to hear the testimony of the Spirit of God in the prophets. It was in that way they resisted the Spirit.

Note, now, John 16:7-11. Here he said, “Now the Spirit was going to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment.” Yes, but it does not say he will reprove them or convince them directly. That’s the thing he has to read into it. We turn to Acts 2 and we find the fulfillment of that promise. The Spirit came. How did the Spirit, on that occasion, reprove the world of sin? Through the preaching of the apostle Peter. He preached to them, and when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts and cried out unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, “Men and brethren what shall we do?” They were convinced by the Spirit through the preaching of the word on the day of Pentecost.

Mr. Nichols: You have four minutes.

Mr. Porter: Thank you. Then he said, “The word is powerless unless accompanied by the Spirit,” said Jesus. We want the passage where Jesus said that. That’s just Tingley’s assertion; and we are not taking his assertion for it. We must have the passage that said so.

He came to John 3:1~”born of the Spirit” and the case of Nicodemus. He said, “The other day there was a baby born of my daughter in the hospital by a direct operation; and so the birth of the Spirit must be a direct operation.” Well, Tingley, is the Spirit your mother? Is that what you’re getting at? Is the Spirit your mother? Be careful or you are going to have a “he” becoming your mother, the first thing you know.

He gave another, “If we have not the Spirit of Christ we are none of his.” But if we have the Spirit of Christ we are his, according to that passage; and he says you have the Spirit before you hear the word. Then, you are his before you hear the word.

In Acts 10 :44, “The Holy Spirit fell on all them which heard the word.” This is the case of the conversion of Cornelius. He said here we have both the word and the Spirit. While Peter preached the Holy Spirit fell on them that heard the word. There’s the word and there’s the Holy Spirit’s part. There are two things. Yes. There was a miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit that enabled them to speak with tongues. Is that what you mean by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit on sinners? Tell me, please, in your next speech-was Cornelius a sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him? Was Cornelius an alien sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him? You have given it to prove your proposition. We are going to demand that you come

up and tell us whether he was an alien sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him. If he was not an alien sinner when the Spirit fell on him, then this case is not going to do you any good, because your proposition says an alien sinner. If he was an alien sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him, and that is what you mean by a direct operation of the Spirit, then you are going to have to have a visit of angels, a vision, and tongues and all of those things accompanying the conversion of all sinners by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. He can just take whichever he wants to take on that. We are going to insist that he take one of them, because he will have to do that to stay with his proposition and to get before you the things that he is contending for. I believe that just about covers his speech. If I have over-

looked anything, I have done is unintentionally. I certainly thank you for your patient hearing during this thirty minutes' speech.

TINGLEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE - FIRST NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appreciate very much my worthy opponent. He has done exactly as I expected him to do. I was greatly interested in his being perturbed over my losing time. Why should he be so concerned about my wasting time. Did you ladies and gentlemen notice the time he wasted in answering the arguments I presented while I wasted my time? Certainly, if I wasted time in presenting the arguments-he knowing full well what he did- deliberately wasted time to answer or explain my wasting time.

My proposition does not have a thing in the world to say about who the Holy Spirit is in actual words. I know that. The question does not have anything to say actually about does or can the Holy Spirit operate. I recognize that. One of the laws of logic is that any individual in debating a point has a natural and a perfect right and it is obligatory upon him to deal with the fundamental basis. The fundamental basis is my worthy opponent's dishonor of the Holy Ghost.

My worthy opponent accepts intellectually what I said about who the Holy Spirit was. I knew that before I said it. I wanted him to admit it. My worthy opponent said that he accepted the fact that the Holy Spirit could operate directly upon the sinner. I knew he would have to say that. My worthy opponent, is as nimble as a monkey, said that He does not. He can. He is God. But He does not do it.

I have instance after instance of where the Holy Spirit did do it. That's whole issue at stake, ladies and gentlemen; and I'm not here just to debate, I'm not here just because some proposition was agreed upon. I believe in this audience there are earnest seeking men and women who want to know how to know God. You are the ones I'm after. I want you to find peace and rest within your soul. I read to you a number of instances where the Holy Spirit does operate on a sinner. I will read them again for the further information of my opponent, but the Word of God and the Spirit of God are able to do something definite and positive in making you a new creature in Christ Jesus.

My worthy opponent reminds me of a story I heard. A colored fellow attended one of these big modernistic churches in the North where a modern preacher did away with the New Birth and did away with the Holy Spirit operating in the New Birth and did away with anything miraculous in the New Birth. (Ladies and gentlemen, the whole issue at stake is that my worthy opponent does not believe that the Spirit of God in conversion actually directly changes the nature-the nature and mind and heart of the sinner. He'll beg that question and argue that question and sidestep that question and quote scripture after scripture but he does not believe in the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in changing the heart and nature of the sinner in conversion). The darkie listened to the preacher do away with the things that he loved. After the service was over he came up and said, "Doctor, that was a beautiful sermon. It was wonderful language. And doctor, you proved with words that there was not such a thing as the new birth. You proved to yourself that there was not such a thing as the new birth. There was only one mistake." "What was it?" "You should have added, 'As I knows of.'" "As sure as anything in the world, an individual who has ever had God speak to him knows the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner.

I would like to have my worthy opponent bring a definition of the word directly. He

said it means immediately. I ask him to bring in the definition of directly from Webster's unabridged dictionary and read it to you. He again is begging the question.

He said I did not believe in conversion wrought by the word. He quoted scripture after scripture- 1 Cor. 1:21, John 1:20 and a great host of them. I will not take your time to read the list of them. You heard them. This one for instance, 1 Cor. 1:21, "For after that the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." He paused after every one and said, "Tingley does not believe that." "That could not be according to friend Tingley." I do believe it! I believe all the Word! I read those scriptures to you to establish the fact that a man is converted, born again of incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. Let's be honest. Ladies and gentlemen, above everything else be brutally honest. Write down on one side where the Word is the direct agent in conversion. Be honest and write down on the other side where the Spirit is the direct agent in conversion and you will find they balance the one the other continually. It is the Word! It is the Spirit! Both of them operate in saving the sinner. With

out the Spirit a man can never have a witness of the Spirit within him and know that he has passed from death unto life. Ladies and gentlemen, that is the issue.

I want to make it very clear: the Holy Spirit is God. The Holy Spirit can operate. The Holy Spirit' does operate. Now, I call your attention to something. He will watch it from now on. I counted until I lost count. Over and over and over again my worthy opponent betrayed the real thought of his heart and what he believes by referring to the Holy Spirit as "It." "It." "It." That's what my worthy opponent believes. If I can get him to honestly open up to you, he does not believe that God has anything directly to do with changing a man's nature, renewing a man's mind, shedding the love of God abroad in his heart in the matter of conversion at all. It is a mechanical matter! Purely of the head!

Now, let me turn back to I Corinthians 2. He complained that I read all of it. It's the Word of God any how. He complains greatly about verse 14 and well he might. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." They can not be accepted by his reason. I would call his attention to the fact the apostle Paul has said, "I don't come in words of man's wisdom. I don't come with enticing words. I don't come with human persuasive power. I do not come appealing to the intellect." Over and over throughout the chapter he said "It is not a matter of the intellect." "For the natural man can not receive." I would ask him to tell us, in all honesty what is meant by not receiving and what the commentators say. I will tell you now. He will beg the question. It means intellectual assent, intellectually receive. He can not receive with his mind the things of the Spirit. They are received only by spiritual revelation, they are received only by spiritual operation. Now, They are discerned, they are understood by the Spirit.

Let me answer very briefly now. Tomorrow night we will deal with them far more fully.

"Is it possible for the direct operation of the Holy Spirit to save a sinner without preaching the word?" "Is it possible for a sinner to be saved by the influence exerted through the Word without the direct operation?" I would say, with God all things are possible but this is not God's program. God demands both Spirit and Word.

"Does the direct operation of the Spirit precede or follow the preaching of the word?" It may precede, it always must accompany.

"What does the direct operation of the spirit do for the sinner that can not be done by preaching of the gospel?" I read to you from I Cor. 2:14, that "The natural man can not receive the things of the Spirit of God." It is utterly impossible for just the Word. Let me

pause and give you an illustration. Lew Wallace, an agnostic, was drafted by a group of men to write a story about Jesus to prove he was not the Son of God. Lew Wallace began to study the accounts of the gospel. He became convinced that Jesus was the Christ. Somehow, it did not have any effect upon him. One day, very humble he went to a simple old godly soul who said, "It's got to be the operation of God. It's got to be God revealing His word." He very humbly said, "Oh God, reveal thy word to me. Let thy Spirit reveal thy word to me." And God did. Before he left that humble cottage, he wrote a letter to his agnostic friends who had drafted him to write the story now known as "Ben Hur" He told them that God had revealed Christ to him as his personal Lord and Savior.

"Is the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit the same as the direct operation of the Spirit in conversion." It is the same Spirit but not the same operation. That was one for dispensational fulfillment. The Holy Spirit operates today directly upon any individual heart.

"Does the Holy Spirit in its direct operation on the spirit speak to the sinner?" He may or he may communicate with the spirit in various ways.

"If the Holy Spirit speaks to the sinner what does he say that is not already said in the word of truth?" For one thing the Holy Spirit opens up the heart of the sinner. The Holy Spirit opens up the mind of the sinner that is closed by his stubborn resistance to God.

"If the Holy Spirit does not speak to the sinner, then in what way does he exert power upon him?" My worthy opponent is doing exactly the thing that he will do in his next speech (if he is not guarded now) and will do tomorrow night. He will keep crying out "How." The question is not "How?" but "Does the Spirit operate?" I could give you any number

of ways both from the Word and from human experiences how the Holy Spirit operates and I'm not going to be drawn off into needless and foolish questions.

"What does the sinner do when he resists the direct operation of the Spirit?" Well, my worthy opponent, ought to know what the sinner does when he resists the Holy Spirit. Genesis the sixth chapter tells us exactly what he does. They hardened their hearts. They resist the Holy Spirit by hardening their hearts and rejecting the Spirit's word to them and the Spirit's entreaty.

Now let me deal further with some of these scriptures and give you some additional scriptures. My worthy opponent dealt at great length . . . (By the way, did you note that he did not deal with this: Rom. 5:5, "Hope maketh not ashamed because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost." How does the sinner become converted, how does he change from loving the world to having the love of God within him? What happens? The Word of God says it is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost. There is no mention of the word. There is no mention of any other-it is the Holy Ghost).... Again note this please. He quoted at great length and dealt with it-Rom. 8:9, "But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." Ladies and gentlemen, this says that a man is not converted if he does not have the Spirit of Christ. If he does not have the Spirit he isn't converted. My worthy opponent does not believe in a spiritual experience whereby you know in your heart by the voice of the Holy Spirit that you are a child of God. My worthy opponent does not believe that. Mark this, the Bible says, "If any man have not that Spirit, he is none of His." He gets that Spirit in conversion by the Spirit communicating directly to him.

Now, let me note this. Man is damned not only by refusing to receive the Word but also by rejecting this Holy Spirit. My worthy opponent asks "How may he reject it?" John 4:24, says, "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Not only in hearing-it will be through the mind, it will be through the heart, it may be through the body on the knees but the communication to God is to be in spirit. Gal 5 :17, for the flesh lusteth against the Spirit. There is a warfare going on between man's flesh and man's spirit. The Spirit against the flesh-they are contrary one to another. Hebrews 10:29 says, "Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Spirit of grace and of the son of God and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." Mark this my friends. Man is lost and pushes aside the Spirit of grace and thrusts him out. 1 Cor. 2:14, The neural man can not intellectually receive, cannot "cognize" is a good word, can not recognize, can not with his mind get the concept of the Spirit of God for-get this-it is foolishness to the natural man. Neither can we know them for it has to be a spiritual perception. Jude 19, these be they who separate themselves, sensual, fleshly, feeling with human feelings and human things having not the Spirit.

Now in regard to the word directly. We are going to have a good bit to say about that tomorrow night. What is meant by directly. My worthy opponent does not believe that by communicating to the heart, communicating to the mind, communicating by circumstances, communicating by providences, the Holy Spirit communicating directly, then my worthy opponent is not debating the subject and is begging the question.

If I take a pencil out of my pocket and write, I am writing directly on the paper. Yet my worthy opponent will endeavor, in order to confuse the issue, to throw up a smokescreen so you will not see that there is a divine spiritual reality whereby you can know you are born again by a change inside. He will do all he can to do away with that by throwing smoke in the air. He will tell you I am not operating directly, I'm operating through a pen. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am operating directly in writing the word. If I feed myself I am operating directly. I am feeding myself and yet it is my arm or my fork or my spoon. It's begging the question simply and only to try and say if there is any agent the Holy Spirit uses, He is not doing it. If I take an ax to cut down a tree, I examine the tree, I examine it very carefully. I tie ropes to it. I'm cutting down the tree. I hack it on one side for awhile, then I go around and hack it on the other side, I watch it, tighten two or three ropes. My worthy opponent and I are debating about how that is done. I am operating directly upon the tree. When my worthy opponent is driven into the corner that he is being driven into, he will come back and say, "No, you're operating

through the ax, through the ropes, through the chopping on various sides." That's begging the question! That's being dishonest! That's not being square with this intelligent audience. It is the ax that I am using. That ax is helpless without me. Ropes I use them. I tighten them. The tree falls where I want it to fall. I, by direct operation, chop down that tree.

If you have rejected the Holy Spirit of God, if you have rejected that voice of God that's revealed Himself to you, you are not a child of God. He operates directly upon the sinner and he can accept him or reject him.

Well, my worthy opponent asks, "How?" If I only had one scripture, Acts 9:6 would be enough. "He trembling and astonished said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do." Now Paul did not have the word preached unto him. Paul was on his road to Damascus to bind Christians and haul them to Jerusalem to slay them. A light above the light of a noon day sun shone around this alien sinner. God's power by direct operation to Paul caused him to say, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" When was Paul saved ? Any man who confesses Jesus as Lord is saved. Paul confessed Jesus as Lord on the Damascus road. The

Holy Spirit operated directly upon Paul. He had a vision before he heard the Word and he was saved! The Holy Spirit operates directly upon sinners since He operated directly upon Paul.

If my worthy opponent wants to get into Acts, that's good. Acts 16:25-30 is sufficient scripture. "At midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God; and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every ones bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awakening out of his sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, he drew out his sword and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice saying. Do thyself no harm for we are all here. Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, Sirs what must I do to be saved?" What startled him? The earthquake. Who brought the earthquake? The Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is God's agent in this world. I write. I write directly. The message I want to give. The Holy Spirit directly shook the earth. Who convicted that jailer?

Honesty, if my worthy opponent will face it, honesty will compel him to admit that the Holy Spirit convicted the jailer directly and there is not any record of Paul and Silas preaching the word to the jailer until after he was convicted by the Holy Spirit. When did he hear the Word? After he was convicted. After the Holy Spirit had operated directly upon him. The Holy Spirit does operate directly upon sinners.

2 Cor. 3:3 is a good scripture. "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart." How are ye become epistles of Christ? How are you become epistles of Christ? "Ye are become epistles of Christ by the Spirit." The Word, the message of God and the nature of God, the new nature apart from the law that I could not keep, is written within my being on the fleshy tablets of my heart by the Spirit. The Spirit operates directly upon the Corinthians in converting them.

1 Cor. 12:3 is another good one. "Wherefore, I give you to understand that no man speaketh by the spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed. And that no man can say Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." No individual can say in saving confession that Jesus is Lord except by the revelation directly to his heart through the Word and other instruments that Jesus is Lord by the Spirit of God. Jesus is Lord. By reason men can not receive it. It's got to be spiritually discerned, spiritually received, spiritually understood. My friend, that is conversion. No man can confess Christ unto salvation except the Holy Ghost operates directly upon him.

In my last moment that remains, I would ask you very earnestly as one who must account to God-do you know you are born again? One day I was-by the Spirit of God and by the Word of God. I have known it from that day to this, by His Spirit within my heart. You, too, can know it. I thank you.

PORTER'S SECOND NEGATIVE - FIRST NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am delighted for the privilege of coming before you again at this time to continue my denial of the proposition which friend Tingley has been affirming for another thirty minutes, to the effect that there must be a direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon sinners in

conversion, or there can be no conversion.

Now, as to whether the Spirit operates through the word- through the truth-my opponent affirms that it does in his proposition. He has been having a great deal to say about my contending that it operates through the truth; and he insists that that's the same as no operation, because it's a mere influence or something of that kind. Since his proposition says that it does operate through the truth it comes back to him with all the force that he has tried to put into it, because his proposition says that it operates directly "as well as through the word of truth, the gospel of Christ," thus indicating that the Holy Spirit does operate through the truth. And that's the thing I'm contending for and denying another operation referred to as a direct operation of the Spirit.

He said he was rather amused at me because I told you about his wasting half of his speech in dealing with certain scriptures and arguments regarding the personality of the Holy Spirit; and said if he did so, he did it ignorantly; but I came along with my eyes open and wasted half my time in replying to him. Well, it's certainly the duty of the negative to reply to what the affirmative says, whether it is wasting time or not. It's my duty to show that he is wasting his time in giving something that has no connection with the proposition. I'm doing the very thing that the negative requires me to do when I take up whatever you introduce, Mr. Tingley, regardless of whether it is anywhere close to the proposition or not, and show the audience that it is not. That's how I wasted my time.

Well, he said again that the proposition does not say anything about who the Spirit is, or whether he can operate, but he was simply giving the basic truths upon which these matters rest. Therefore, he endeavored to prove that the Holy Spirit is a person; and he said, "I knew that Porter would agree with me on that-I knew that he was going to say that; I knew that he believed that: but I just wanted him to come out and say so." I do not know whether he thought I would come out and say so, or just what he thought about it; but at least he knew that I believed that. After having said he knew that I believed that-that I believed in the personality of the Holy Spirit-before he got through with that speech he turned around and said that Porter betrayed his actual belief about it when he referred to the Holy Spirit as "it", contending that I did not believe in the personality of the Spirit. Yet, he said that he knew that I did believe it. Now just which way is he going to have it? Elder Tingley, if you knew that I did believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit, then why did you turn around and say that I betrayed my feelings and my faith in saying that it was not a person at all? Maybe I did use the pronoun "it". If I did, I certainly did not intend to indicate that he was not a person. I have always believed the Holy Spirit to be a person; and friend Tingley says that he knew that I believed that. He knew that I agreed with him perfectly on that, and yet I turned around and betrayed that I did not believe what he knew that I did believe. So that's that.

He said also he knew that I would say that he could operate directly. Yes, he knew I would say that. I am certainly not endeavoring to limit the power of God, the power of divine beings, the persons of the trinity. It is not a question of whether or not they can do so but whether or not that is their program. (I believe that's the way Elder Tingley referred to it when he answered my question).

We are going to notice what he said about one or two of these questions right here. My first question: "Is it possible for a direct operation of the Holy Spirit to save a sinner without the preaching of the word?" And the second, "It is possible for a sinner to be saved by the influence exerted through the word without the direct operation of the Spirit?" He said concerning both these questions, "Yes, all things are possible with God; but it is

not God's program." Well, he is insisting that when I deny the Holy Spirit is operating directly, I am denying that he can do it. If I admit that it is possible for him to do so, then I must admit that he does so. It comes right back to Elder Tingley. If he admits that it is possible for God to save one without the direct operation of the Spirit, then he is going to have to say that He does it that way, or he is limiting the power of God, you see, according to his own argument. Or if he says that it is possible for God to save one with the direct operation of the Spirit without the word, then he must say God does it that way; for if he can do it that way, that's the way He does it. That's the way he reasoned about this proposition. If the Holy Spirit can operate directly, then the Holy Spirit must operate directly. That's his conclusion. If it works in one case, it will work in both cases.

By the way, I'm still interested about that fish, eggs, ham and everything coming directly down from heaven. I just wonder if God is feeding him that way. He promised to tell us something about it, but he did not seem to remember it; so we are still wondering about that. Does he have to get it through some medium or does it come directly-without means? Does God feed you, Elder Tingley, like He fed Israel in the wilderness on that journey from Egypt to the land of Canaan? I want you to come up and face that. Does God feed you like he fed them? Speak up and tell me if you want to. I would not object. We want to know whether God is feeding Tingley like he fed the Israelites in the wilderness. God can do it, can't He? And if He can do it, He must do it, according to your argument. If the Holy Spirit can operate directly, you say He must do it. If he can feed you like he fed Israel, then He does it, doesn't He? Is that the way you get your food? Now, come on and tell us. That proposition on "can" is just about torn up. His "can" has exploded.

As to what God can do, and what the Holy Spirit can do, that, after all, is not in the proposition. The proposition does not say "that the Holy Spirit can operate directly, but is says the Holy Spirit does it that way-the Holy Spirit operates directly. Now, I am not limiting the Holy Spirit as to what the Holy Spirit can do. The Holy Spirit can operate on a dog or a mule or a canary bird. That does not mean that he is operating on them. I recall a statement in the book of Matthew that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham, but He did not do it, did He? Did God raise up children to Abraham through stones? Why, certainly, God is able to do so and so. God's power is unlimited. We're not talking about what God can do or what the Holy Spirit can do. The question is: What is God's program? Is God doing it that way? That's the question, and that's the issue. That's the issue my friend is side-stepping, and I'm sure the audience is beginning to see it.

He said the Holy Spirit must come and operate directly upon a man that he might know God. I want you to know God; I want you to be at peace with God, he added. But how can men know God? That's the question. I Cor. 1:21, Paul said, "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Now Paul reasons that the world by wisdom did not know God, but they knew God through the foolishness of preaching. That's the way they came to know God. They learned of God when the gospel was preached to them.

He told the story of the colored person and then later on about Ben Hur as though that would sustain his proposition. The colored man who went to a meeting, where they did away with all miraculous work, said, "Doctor, that was a very beautiful sermon." He proved that there was no new birth, and so on, but, "You should have said 'As I knows of.'" Well, if Elder Tingley "knows of" some of these cases where the Holy Spirit operates directly, why, then, he ought to begin to tell about them. If he "knows of" them, let us have some of the information; and then maybe we will know something about them. As for the new birth,

I'm not doing away with the new birth. I know that we are born of the Spirit-the book says so-but 1 Pet. 1:23 also says that we are born by the word, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

He reasoned awhile ago that to be born of the Spirit meant that there must be a direct operation of the Spirit, just as when the baby was born of his daughter by a direct operation. So he made the Spirit his mother; and we are still insisting that he tell us if he the Spirit-is his mother of which he was born directly. If he is not, then he has the wrong parallel-the wrong illustration-and ought to find something else.

As to the word "directly" he said, "Why doesn't Porter bring on Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and tell us what it means?" It's in your proposition, Tingley. You signed it. The rules that we agreed upon in this discussion say that the man who is affirming must define his proposition; that's the thing. Why don't you bring along Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and let us see what it means? Tell us what he says about it- whether "directly" means as he has introduced it tonight; or whether it means without means, without medium. Well, maybe he will bring it tomorrow night, and we will read it.

He came to the negative arguments which I introduced. He said I gave a whole list of them and he did not have time to fool with them. He did not want to waste any more time, you see. He did not have time to fool with them, so he just referred to one-I Cor. 1:21. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." He said, "Porter said Tingley does not believe that." He says, "Tingley does believe it." He said, "Yes, I do believe it." Well what about those four thousand tongues he talked about awhile ago out of the five thousand that had no Bible translated into their language? You indicated awhile ago that I could not reach those people because the Bible had not been translated into their language. You said- you promised me- you'd tell me something about it in your next speech. You did not say a word about it. He was just as silent as the tomb about it. Not a single, solitary word was uttered as to what he meant by the four thousand languages into which the Bible had not been translated. Does he indicate by that that it takes a direct operation of the Spirit to save these four thousand tongues? Is that what you mean, Tingley? Why didn't you tell us? I'm still insisting that you tell us in your first speech tomorrow night. Do you mean by that illustration that the Holy Spirit must operate on these four thousand tongues in order to save them when they can not hear the word? You get down to this and tell us about it. Do not forget it like you did tonight. You have such a marvelous forgettery. Please, do tell us something about it.

He said, "I believe in all of these because on the one side there is the word operating as a direct agent, and on the other side there is the Spirit." Well, you said you believed the Spirit operated through the word-or do you? Your proposition does. You signed it anyway. It says that the Holy Spirit operates through the word! And that He also operates directly. Now, then, will you please explain yourself. What do you mean by "directly" in contrast with "through the word?"

He turned around awhile ago and gave a number of arguments in which he tried to say that "directly" means through some means, through some medium, like he was writing on the paper directly with a pencil. Now that was through a medium. He said, "That's what I mean by 'directly'." "All right; then if that's so, when the Holy Spirit operates through the word he is operating directly, isn't he? Is he? Is he?"

(Mr. Tingley nods, "Yes.")

Mr. Porter: The Holy Spirit operates directly through the word? Well, then you do not need any direct operation of the Holy Spirit apart from the word; it is already through the

word. My opponent has reached the end of his trail! For he now says that when the Holy Spirit operates through the word that's a direct operation. Do you want to back out?

Mr. Tingley: "No."

Mr. Porter: He's not going to back out but stay with it. All right. He's going to stay put. Well, I'm going to see that he stays put.

The Holy Spirit operates through the word. Tingley says so. His proposition says so. He says, "That is a direct operation of the Spirit!" Well, then, how many direct operations of the Spirit must a sinner have? If the Spirit operates through some other means besides through the word, then what's the other means? What's the other agency through which he works besides the word? You say it's direct because it's through some medium, through some agency. Then, what's the other agency? This thing is going to get interesting before the next two hours are over. We are going to see what my friend Tingley will tell us about that tomorrow night.

He came back to 1 Cor. 2:14, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." He said, "Paul is showing all through this chapter that it is not a matter of intellect." In other words, a man's intellect has nothing to do with it. I suppose that's the reason he is insisting on a direct operation of the Spirit. It does not appeal to man's intelligence; so he has some sort of direct, mysterious thing that does not appeal to the intelligence of man. Paul did not indicate anywhere in that chapter that it was not a matter that concerned man's intellect at all. Paul is showing that man, by his own wisdom, could not know God; and the natural man is the man who rejects divine revelation and depends on his own wisdom; and that man can not receive the things of the Spirit, because he rejects divine revelation. That's the natural man. (1 Cor. 2:14).

Now, back to the questions: "Does the direct operation of the Spirit precede or follow the preaching of the word?" He said, "It may precede but it must accompany." Well, if it does not precede, then the preaching of the word does not do any good, does it? Because you are reasoning that he can not do anything about it. He can not understand it. He can not know it. He can not learn it. He can not comprehend it unless the Spirit precedes it. So the Holy Spirit must precede in direct operation through some other medium beside the preaching of the word, through which he also operates directly in order to save the sinner. Friend Tingley has, I do not know, how many direct operations of the Holy Spirit to save the sinner.

"What does the direct operation of the Spirit do for a sinner that can not be accomplished by the preaching of the gospel?" He said, "It reveals the word." Tell us how it reveals the word. He is not concerned about the "how." That gets him into trouble, you see. He's not concerned about the "how." He just knows He does it because He does it! But he does not know how He does it or anything about it. That's the predicament of the gentleman brought about by his false position in this matter.

"Is the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit the same as the direct operation of the Spirit in conversion?" He said "It's the same Spirit." I did not ask if it is the same Spirit. I did not ask that question at all. Certainly, it's the same Spirit. You're side-stepping, friend Tingley. You said, "It's the same Spirit but it is not the same operation." Then, Acts 10:44 does you no good, does it? He gave the case of Cornelius where the Spirit fell on all them that heard the word; and Tingley, was that a miraculous outpouring of the Spirit? Yes or no; shake or nod.

Mr. Tingley: "Yes."

Mr. Porter: That is not the conversion you talked about in your proposition, is it?

Mr. Tingley: I could answer but I think I better . . .

Mr. Porter: Yes, I think you better .

Mr. Tingley: Mr. Moderator. I would ask your ruling on this matter. I would be very happy-time out please-if you would not ask the opponent any questions and force him to speak. If you will consult Hedge's rules, you will find that such is unparliamentary and improper tactics. If the opponent does desire me to speak, I should have adequate time to answer; and I will be very happy to answer. I will be very happy to answer all the questions tomorrow night. This is merely stage play, and I ask you to rule in regard to this.

Mr. Nichols: I would say to save time I believe it would be a good idea for the speaker to use his own judgment. He does not have to speak from his seat, if he does not want to; and I believe it is better not to until his time comes. Many times these questions are placed just to emphasize the point; and if that's it, why not just wait until your time comes. I will say, use your own judgment so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Porter: When I asked these questions of friend Tingley, I did not expect him to speak from his seat, but he did that. Then, when he did that, why, that's perfectly satisfactory to me if he wants to do it.

Mr. Cairns: I beg your pardon. You almost forced him to do it. You just put him into a very embarrassing position. Please don't do that again.

Mr. Porter: Well, he can force me if he wants to try it. I am perfectly willing to abide by that which I give him. If he wants to try forcing me, let him go ahead.

I simply asked in order to emphasize, and I am trying to emphasize that Acts 10:44 has no relation to the question under consideration, according to Tingley's own admission already made. He agrees that in Acts 10:44 we have a miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit. If he does not agree, let him deny it tomorrow night. He will not dare deny it because he has already committed himself tonight that the outpouring of the Spirit on Cornelius was a miraculous outpouring, because it enabled him to speak with tongues. Now, my friend introduced Acts 10:44 to prove a direct operation of the Spirit on the sinner. Yet he says the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in a miraculous form is not the same operation as that which takes place in conversion. Then, Tingley, will you please tell us why you introduced that passage? If you knew that that had no relation to the operation which you are contending for-that there's a difference between the operation on the sinner in conversion and the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit, why did you introduce a miraculous outpouring of the Spirit to prove your idea of the operation? If you knew it did not do it, why did you introduce it in the first place? I asked him awhile ago to please tell me, "Was Cornelius a sinner when he received the Holy Spirit on that occasion?" And not a single word has he said. He's a promising fellow. He promises to do it in his next speech; he will not do it from his seat. He promises to do it in his next speech; and in his next speech he forgets about it. I am insisting that tomorrow night, friend Tingley, you tell us whether Cornelius was a sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him. I'll tell you what I will do. I will put it in writing tomorrow night, and I will see that you answer it. I'll not let you forget it. Was Cornelius a sinner when the Spirit fell on him? Was it a miraculous outpouring? Tingley says it was. Then, he says the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit is not the operation that's mentioned in my proposition. Why, then, did you try to prove your proposition by scripture that you say you knew had no relation to it? Let's see him "wiggle" out of that!

He came to Romans 5:5 again and said, "Porter did not deal with this-that "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit." Oh yes, he did! I referred to that and

showed that in 1 John 4:19 we have the statement made that we love God because he first loved us. Where do we learn of God's love? Through the things in His word, and through the revelation of that word, we learn of the love of God; and we are made to love him because he first loved us. It has come through the Holy Spirit because the Holy Spirit dictated that word. The words of the New Testament are the words of the Holy Spirit.

Back to Romans 8:9. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwells in you." He said, "Now this says you are not converted unless you have the Spirit. You must have the Spirit or you are not converted." Well, do you have the Spirit before you are converted? That's what we are getting at. This refers to men who are already converted and who had the Spirit. But did they have the Spirit before they were converted? If they had the Spirit before they were converted, then they were not in the flesh when they were converted-they got out of the flesh before they were converted. Without conversion and without hearing the word they are out of the flesh! Saved-not in the flesh-converted-and never did hear the truth of God, according to friend Tingley's position.

He came to Jude 19-those having not the Spirit. Well, that does not say a word about the direct operation of the Spirit or any other operation of the Spirit on the sinner. So it has no relation to the question in hand. We are discussing the conversion of the alien sinner. Let him find something about that. That's what we want him to get at.

Then he came back to the word "directly." He said, "Now I will show you what I mean by the word directly." He took his pencil and said, "I'm writing on this paper. I am writing directly on the paper-through a pen-through a pencil." Well, if that's what you mean by "directly" in your proposition, tell us what it is that the Spirit operates through when he operates directly. You operate through the pencil on the paper and you call that a direct operation; and your proposition says that the Holy Spirit operates directly on the heart of the sinner. Now, I want to know, through what? In order for you to have a parallel case, you must have the Spirit operating through something. One part of the proposition says, "through the word." I agree with that. What about the rest of it? Through what does the Spirit operate that compares with your operating through the pencil on the paper directly? Now, let us have the next scripture which he introduced along that line.

Then, the illustration about the ax and the tree. He takes the ax and goes out to cut down the tree. He cuts a little on this side and a little on that side. He hacks here and he hacks there. He tightens his ropes here and he loosens them over there. The first thing you know, the tree is down, and he has operated upon that tree directly through the ax. Now, if my friend could have just stood aside and thrown his ax away and have blown the tree down, he might have something corresponding to his proposition. As long as the man must operate through the ax, that's not direct. That's through means. That's through a medium, friend Tingley, that's not direct. "Directly" means "without means," "without any medium," "nothing intervening." So that's the thing you must have. You have not found that in these. The illustrations you have given prove my position. The man cuts the tree with the ax. He exerts the power on the tree through the ax. The Spirit exerts his power on the heart of the sinner through the word that's preached to the sinner. There you have your parallel-both of them through agencies, both of them through means. But that's not the direct operation of the Spirit. You must have your direct operation in some other way, because if you do get it that way, you have only half your proposition-the other half is left begging for support.

Well, he said if I were to tell Mr. Porter how, I'd just give him Acts 9:6, in which Saul of

Tarsus is reported to have said, "Lord what will thou have me to do?" He said when Saul made that inquiry he had not heard the word. The word had not been preached unto him, and so there must have been a direct operation, because the word had not been preached to him. Well, Jesus had just said to him, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutes", and that convinced him. You claim the direct operation of the Spirit was not the speaking of Jesus but the light that shown about him. Jesus did speak to him before he made the inquiry. He heard the word of Jesus before he said, "What wilt thou have me to do?" That upsets his direct operation there; besides if that was the direct operation there, and he received the Spirit there, then tell me why Ananias came to him three days later and said, "The Lord sent me that you might receive your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit." Tingley said he was filled back there when he saw the vision. Ananias said he had not been filled until three days later. So there's something wrong somewhere.

Then in Acts 16:25-30, in the conversion of the jailer, he says that the Holy Spirit operated directly-that the Holy Spirit directly shook the earth. Through what means? Through what agency, Mr. Tingley? You said "directly" means through some agency. Will you please tell me through what agency the Holy Spirit shook the earth that night. Furthermore, that earthquake, he said, was the operation of the Spirit on the jailer. When the jailer awoke out of his sleep, following the earthquake, and saw the prison doors open, what did he do? He got his sword and started to kill himself. That was the result of a direct operation. It almost led the man to suicide. But the preacher spoke and said, "Do thyself no harm. We are all here." Then, when he heard the words of the preacher, he came in and fell down trembling and brought them out and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And the preacher preached the gospel to him and he obeyed it. There's your direct operation of the Spirit. The operation of the Spirit, according to Tingley, almost led the man to death. He was just about to commit suicide because the Holy Spirit operated on him! Well, now, that's proving his proposition with a vengeance.

Then in 2 Cor. 3:3, "Ye are our epistles, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not upon the tables of stone, but upon fleshy tables of the heart." Notice Paul says, "Ministered by us." That's preaching, operating through the word. Now, where's your direct operation? In order for him to have a direct operation, besides the ink being "administered by us" he will have also to upset the ink bottle and pour it out directly upon the paper in order for his position to hold. He did not upset the bottle of ink. The ink was administered through the pen. "Ye are our epistles, ministered by us; written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God." Friend Tingley, when you write an epistle, and you use the pen, and the ink comes through that agency (the apostles said we're the pens, it's administered by us) then do you turn around and upset the bottle of ink on the epistle when you get through, or before you start, or just when do you get your direct operation in there?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

TINGLEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE - SECOND NIGHT

Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: Again I am very happy to stand tonight in defense of the truth of the gospel. I would take a moment of valuable time to commend the chairman on those words. I appreciate them very much. I am not here to be just speaking to people. I am not here to win some debate or surpass some man. I am here very desperately in earnest that people might know the Lord Jesus

Christ as their Savior. That's my sole object in being here.

The question is: "The Scriptures," the Word of God, "teach that in the conversion," by that we mean the regeneration, the renewing, the justification, that which takes place in a man when he changes from a sinner into a saint, "of alien sinners." "The Holy Spirit," the third person of the Godhead, "operates directly upon them as well as through the Word of truth" or the the gospel.

The question is: Does the Holy Spirit operate. Last night my worthy opponent over and over cried out "How . . . how . . . how . . . how." That is not the question, does not enter into the question, has nothing to do with the question. The question is: Does the Holy Spirit operate directly?

The tactic of a debator in desperation is always to ask a multitude of questions which are incidental and not of primary importance to the question involved. This multitude of unimportant questions will tend to confuse the issue until the public loses sight of the point at issue so says one great manual on debating. My worthy opponent followed that tactic last night- leading us up blind alleys, but I refused to go. I will go with him for just a moment answering some of the questions that are incidental and have nothing to do with the debate.

1. Was Cornelius a sinner? 2. How does God give you fish and ham directly? 3. Does God feed you like He fed the children of Israel? 4. Is the Spirit your mother? 5. Through what agency did the Holy Spirit operate to produce the earthquake? 6. Explain what you mean by five thousand languages and the Bible in only approximately a thousand of them? 7. If Elder Tingley knows of any cases of where the Holy Spirit operated directly let him tell us some.

So that none of you will think that I am sidestepping in the slightest, I am going to take a moment to answer these. Now watch my worthy opponent dwell on the unimportant and irrelevant questions to confuse and becloud the issue and make you forget what we are debating. First, "Was Cornelius a sinner?" Yes, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." He was saved by the Word and the Holy Ghost falling upon him.

"How does God give you fish and ham?" I will give you one illustration. Eighteen years ago we lived in Ensley on rice for ten days. We ran out of rice. Tomorrow was Sunday-nine mouths to feed-not a solitary bit of money or food. I waited on the Lord from nine until approximately eleven. A knock came on the door and I went to the door. There was a bushel basket full of food for breakfast, dinner and supper and lasted us for several days. God can answer prayer by ravens, or jackasses, or man. That time He chose a man and a woman. They lived eighteen miles away, knew nothing of my need and only heard me preach once and never had spoken to me personally in their lives. I have a God whose Holy Spirit is in the world, who answers prayer. Let my worthy opponent now make light of miracles.

"Does God feed you like he fed the children of Israel?" He fed me just as miraculously as he fed them.

"Is the Spirit your mother?" That is begging the question. It takes a man and a woman to beget a child. It takes the Spirit and the Word to convert the sinner. My worthy opponent does not seem to know that with God there is no sex, that angels neither marry nor are given in marriage.

Five, "Through what agency did the Holy Spirit operate to produce the earthquake?" Through His divine prerogative as the Creator of the earth.

"Explain what is meant by five thousand languages and the Bible in approximately a

thousand?” Jesus commanded us to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. It is significant, ladies and gentlemen, (I did not want to say this, my worthy opponent begged for it, seven times in one speech last night, I give it to him now) the churches that believe in the direct operation of the Holy Spirit have been earnest to carry out the command of Jesus. The so-called churches of Christ are notoriously the slowest and most dilatory in carrying out His command, having the least missionaries of any body of people in Christendom out in the foreign fields. I challenge my worthy opponent to tell you how many languages his missionaries have translated the Bible into even how many missionaries he maintains in the foreign lands. It is the smallest number not only pro rata but total of the 256 denominations in America. “By their fruits ye shall know them.” Proselyting and confusing disciples is not the business of true Christians.

“If Elder Tingley knows of any cases where the Holy Spirit operates directly, let him tell us so.” My worthy opponent thinks it light to poke fun at miracles. My daughter, now a mother of two children, when a baby of thirteen months was stricken with infantile paralysis and left with a twisted and deformed leg. Several months later, in answer to prayer, with no hope offered by the doctors at all, while playing in the yard, as amazed friends watched, the Spirit of life without human means of any kind straightened the leg of that fifteen months old baby. Now let him poke fun at a prayer hearing, prayer answering God, a miracle working Spirit of God.

The Holy Spirit does operate directly upon the earth and all men. The Holy Spirit operates upon matter-inanimate matter: Genesis 1:2, “The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” On beasts: Psalms 104:29-30. “Thou sendest forth thy Spirit and they are created.”

On babes in the womb: Luke 1:41-44, when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost and she spake with a loud voice.

The Holy Spirit operates directly in inspiration. 1 Sam. 10 :10, The company of the prophets met him and the Spirit of God came upon him.

The Holy Spirit operates directly in dreams and visions. Gen. 28:11-17. Jacob’s ladder at Bethel.

The Holy Spirit operates in demoniacal possession. Acts 5 :3, Peter said to Ananias, “Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost and to keep back part of the price of the land” and lying Ananias dropped dead.

In preparing the hearts of sinners for the gospel. Acts 16:14. “And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.” Two things: The Lord must open her heart, she must attend the message of Paul. People hear the message preached but there is no response of any kind. Their hearts are hard, they resist the Spirit, they can not receive, they cannot accept, they will not accept because they reject the Spirit which opens the heart.

My worthy opponent said quite a bit about Romans 5:5, when I pressed him last night. “Hope maketh not ashamed because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.” My opponent asked, “Did they have the Spirit before conversion?” I answer, they had the Spirit in the act of conversion. The proposition states the Holy Spirit convicted, the Word was received by Spirit operation through the love of God shed abroad in their hearts making them children of God in conversion by the Holy Ghost.

Last night in both messages I quoted and referred to John 16:7-11. I emphasized very strongly one word. My worthy opponent was as silent as the tomb about it. It is, "He (the Holy Spirit) will reprove the world," the world of sinners, the world of saints. "He will convict the world." He was upon the world poured out in the world, and will convict the world. I want him to deal with that tonight. Again, he was as silent as a tomb last night about John 3, "Born of the Spirit." You know "Born of the Spirit?" is found three times in that scripture. There is no life without direct influence of a life giving agent. Matthew 1:2 uses the same word and it is translated, "Abraham begat Isaac." The same word as used in John 3, "Born of the Spirit." "Abraham begat Isaac." Matt. 1:20 is the same word. "That which was conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." Exactly the same Greek word. In 1 John 5:18, "Whosoever is born of God." Same word. The individual is born of the Spirit. We perfectly agree that the Word must be preached, that the Word saves, that the Word brings men to life but my worthy opponent insists on there being no life giving agency, no person of the Godhead. It takes a father and a mother to beget a child, it takes a positive and a negative to give life. It takes the Word and the Spirit to beget life. The Spirit must deal with the heart of a man.

1 Cor. 12:3. Again he was silent upon this scripture that Jesus is Lord no man can confess but by the Holy Ghost. A man can hear about Jesus and read the scriptures. Then he can say with his lips, "I believe Jesus is Lord." That does not mean he is converted. The Bible is very clear. It is not mental assent. He can say he is moved by the story of Calvary, but it does not mean emotional assent. No man can truly say so that he is a born again child of God-say it as a child of the Father, "Jesus is Lord" except it is the Holy Ghost which has wrought this within his heart.

My worthy opponent said I spilled a bottle of ink. I could not understand for the life of me what he was driving at. He was talking in regard to 2 Corinthians 3:3. I tried honestly to figure it out and I hope he will show me where the ink is spilled. Let me show you where he did upset the apple cart. 2 Cor. 3:3. If I could get my worthy opponent to read the verse before and the verse after there'd be no debate. But my worthy opponent will take a word, grab it out, put them all together and cry "See." I could prove the moon is made of cheese by that system. My worthy opponent absolutely ignores the clear statement of 2 Cor. 3:2, "For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ ministered by us." He dwelt at great length on the "ministered by us." See it is ministered by us! That's correct. Paul came and preached the gospel to the people at Corinth. They became epistles of Christ by the ministry of Paul. That's true! But how did they become the epistles of Christ? It goes on to tell you. He did not read that to you. All he could see was "Ministered by us." There's something else. "Written not with ink!" It was not even the letter to the Corinthians, it was not even the words! What caused the change within them? The verse reads, "Written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God!" Not in tables of stone, not on parchment, not on things but in the fleshy tablets of your heart by the Holy Ghost! The Holy Spirit accompanied Paul.

My worthy opponent dealt at some length with Paul's conversion. He said, "Paul was saved by preaching." That it was Jesus preaching that saved him. There has to be the Word but Paul was saved by miraculous operation of God and God not only operates now by the Holy Spirit-and then-and Paul was saved by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. The word says so. Acts 22:8, "And I answered Who art thou Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutes". Paul said, "What wilt thou have me to do?" Listen, if you will read carefully Acts 25:14, Acts 9:7 you will note this fact that when the light shone they

were all smitten; and when the voice spake the people with Paul heard a noise, the Book says, but didn't hear the word. There was no intelligent message for the natural man. The Spirit was operating upon him, and a man must receive the Holy Spirit, and Paul alone of all the crowd that travelled together received by revelation the fact that that was Jesus. Acts 22:9, "Them that were with me saw indeed the light and were afraid but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me."

My worthy opponent asked about the earthquake. I have already answered it. In Acts 16:25-30, but just a word. His argument is a specious argument. He said that the Holy Spirit there nearly killed the jailer. I did not say that nor suggest that. One of the tricks of debating for those who are seeking by subterfuge to confuse people's minds is to put in the mouth of the opponent things he did not say. The jailer almost did kill himself, not because of the Holy Spirit, but because of his danger and desperation and sins. Anyone, ladies and gentlemen, who has ever been under the presence and power and conviction of the Holy Spirit knows that they reach a point of desperation where desire for food leaves them, sleep may leave them, and their heart cries out for God. It is a war in the spiritual realm between the Holy Spirit and the soul bringing the soul to accept and receive the word. His heart was prepared for the Holy Spirit-for his salvation-and he was saved by the Holy Spirit and the word.

Though it is not in the debate and does not enter into the question, my worthy opponent kept crying last night, "How? How? How? How? Tell me?" I could resort to stage play. I could nettle and needle my opponent. I could address him and pause. He is not allowed to speak yet I could say, "Speak. Answer me," and I could embarrass him, too. I was a gentleman before I was a Christian! But I will answer my opponent, "How?" I will give him eleven hows or all the time will allow. He wants to know how the Holy Spirit operates directly. I. Rom. 15:9, by mighty signs. II. by wonders. III. Acts 2, through foreign tongues. IV. tongues of fire. V. and mighty wind. VI. Acts 18:16, by bearing witness with our spirit. VII. Acts 16:25, by the earthquake. vm. Acts 10:44, by the miraculous falling on Cornelius. IX. Luke 2:26, by revelation to Simeon. X. Acts 5:33, by killing lying Ananias. XI. Acts 16:14, by opening Lydia's heart.

Now to the arguments. If I only had one scripture, Joel 2: 28 would suffice, "And it shall come to pass afterward that I will out my spirit upon all flesh." Good flesh, bad flesh, rich flesh, poor flesh. "All flesh." My worthy opponent will say the Holy Spirit is poured out upon saints and not upon sinners. "The Holy Spirit does not operate directly upon sinners," he says. God's Word says it is poured out upon all flesh including alien sinners. "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." The Spirit is upon all flesh.

If I only had one scripture, 1 Cor. 6:11 would be enough. "Such were some of you but ye are washed, ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God." Now how were the Corinthians converted. They were washed. That's one thing. They were sanctified. That's another thing. They were justified. That's another thing. All going into conversion-washing, setting apart, justifying-that is the bundle of conversion according to this in Corinthians. How did this come about? It came about on the basis of the name of Jesus and in the name of the Lord Jesus. Who wrought this conversion? "And by the Spirit of our Cod!" Our God wrought the washing, the sanctifying, the justifying-the Spirit of God. My worthy opponent must meet these clear, unmistakable statements of the word of God. The Holy Spirit therefore operated directly upon the Corinthians.

If I only had one scripture, Titus 3:5 would be enough. “Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to His mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration,” that is, the regenerating of the heart, taking the sinful nature and making it new again, “And the renewing of the Holy Ghost,” the making new of our minds and hearts, regenerating our hearts. How? Who does it? Where does it come from? “Of the Holy Ghost.” “The washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Certainly the Spirit operates directly. Ladies and Gentlemen, there isn’t one word in the Bible that says that the Holy Spirit only operates through the Word but for every scripture that my opponent can trot out, and were we to debate on this subject for six nights, every scripture he could stand and quote about the Word doing something in the new birth, I could stand and quote an equal scripture saying that the Spirit does the same thing. The Word operates directly upon the sinner and the Spirit operates directly upon the Sinner. It takes both.

Listen again. If I only had one scripture, 1 Cor. 12:13 would be enough. “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 all been made to drink into one Spirit.” How are men put into Christ? He is put there by the Spirit for “by one Spirit” we all were baptized into one body. None can become a part of the body of Christ unless the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them into Christ.

If I only had one scripture, Romans 15 :18-19 would be enough. “I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonder, and by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem and round about Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.” What is it? The gospel of Christ is fully preached everywhere? Why? Because Paul declared the whole counsel of God and the Gentiles were obedient. What was the power that gave the Word and Paul power and the Gentiles ability and power to receive it? “Mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God.” Yet, my worthy opponent says “That’s not so.” He says, “These signs and wonders and the power of the Holy Spirit. There are none. That’s not so.” The word says “It is so.” Paul’s preaching would be vain without the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit with signs and wonders. Why? To make the Gentiles obedient. How? By the power of the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit operates directly upon the Gentiles- upon sinners-to convert them.

If I only had one scripture, Matt. 12-31 would be enough. “Wherefore I say unto you all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men.” An individual may blaspheme the word without being damned. The very next verse says an individual could blaspheme Jesus Christ and not be damned. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is an unpardonable sin. Why? The Holy Ghost is the only life giving agency that could put a new nature within a soul! The Word is powerless except when it is accompanied by and the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner as well as the Word.

If I only had one scripture, Acts 2:4-5 is enough. My worthy opponent complained about my reading whole chapters last night. I’ll give him the gist of it then tonight. “They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.” “Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Where were they pricked? In their hearts. Where does the message come? To the head! To our intellect! What moves the inner being of a man? The Holy Spirit who was poured out. “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized. And the same day there were

added unto them about three thousand souls.” The Holy Spirit brought: the wind operating directly upon men, the fire operating directly upon men, the unknown tongues operating directly upon men. The Holy Spirit by the phenomena operating directly upon men convicted them in their heart. Operating directly upon men, He converted three thousand of them. The Holy Spirit as well as the Word operated.

Man’s nature is a depraved nature. There must be a complete spiritual transformation in the man wrought by the Holy Spirit. John 3:5 says “Verily, verily I say unto you, except a man is born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of God.” Is my time up?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

PORTER’S FIRST NEGATIVE - SECOND NIGHT

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad indeed for this privilege to come again before you in the negative of the proposition which my friend Tingley has been affirming the past thirty minutes. The same proposition was affirmed during the session last evening. “The Scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners, the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them as well as through the word of truth or the gospel of Christ.”

While it is fresh on your minds I want to notice just briefly the last argument my opponent introduced; and then I will go back and review the statements that he made.

He was discussing the matter of the operation of the Spirit in Acts 2. Of course, if he “had only one scripture,” any of these would do, because he gave a number of them and said either would be sufficient if he had just one. If he “had only one scripture,” he said Acts 2:35, 37-41 would be it. He said that I complained last night because he read a whole chapter. So he would just give the gist of it tonight. I made no complaint whatsoever. I merely mentioned the fact that he read an entire chapter to prove the operation of the Spirit upon sinners, coming in a direct manner, when it had no reference to it, but referred to the revelation of the will of God to the apostles as they received it, and as it is there discussed by the apostle himself. I did not complain at his reading whole chapters. He can read all he wants to as far as that is concerned. I will be right on his track regardless of where he leads.

He spoke concerning this particular question: “When they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?” He said note the fact “they were pricked in their hearts.” He said that referred to the Spirit, because the word goes to the mind or the head or the intellect, while the Spirit goes to the heart. It could not refer, therefore, to an operation upon their hearts through the word, because the word is addressed to the head, and the Spirit goes to the heart. This was his argument. He said the word does not reach the heart; the word merely reaches the head. I wonder if friend Tingley will be so kind as to tell us in his next speech just what the heart is. We might have something interesting along that line if he will be so kind as to tell us-if he does not think the question is altogether irrelevant, and that it has no connection at all with the proposition or the issue under discussion.

I want to turn and read a passage. (I can tell you what it says, but I want to turn and read it in order that you may get the effect of it and know that I am reading from the book of God). I have turned to Luke 8:11-12, keeping in mind that friend Tingley says that Acts 2 can not refer to the word because it reached the heart, and the word simply reaches the head. Well, in Luke, the eighth chapter, the Lord gave the parable of the sower; and in

explanation of that parable concerning the seed that fell by the wayside and was picked up by the fowls of the air, we have this statement, "Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." Now Jesus said, Elder Tingley, that the word reached the heart; that if that word were allowed to remain in the heart, the man would even be saved. The devil knew the only thing necessary to keep men from being saved was to get the word out of their hearts. Tingley says it is not so; the word does not reach the heart! It only reaches the intellect; it only reaches the head; and the Spirit reaches the heart. But here we find Jesus said the word was in their hearts. The devil took away the word out of their hearts, and did it "lest they should believe and be saved." Now, Elder Tingley, tell me: If the word had remained in their hearts, would it have effected their salvation?

I have two or three questions. My friend objects to the questions. He says they are incidental and unimportant. They becloud the issue and make people forget just what we are discussing. The fact is, they are focusing the issue too strongly for my opponent. They are getting down to the issue too well. That's where the trouble is, and that's why he is complaining. It puts him on the spot to have to tell what he believes about this or that, what position he is going to take relative to this matter or that. That's the reason why he is objecting so much. He must face them, anyway, regardless of his objections. I have here five questions:

The first one he answered awhile ago. I will read it. I am not expecting him to answer it again. Was Cornelius an alien sinner at the time the Holy Spirit fell on him? He can ignore that one when he comes to answer, because he has already given us his answer on that.

Second. Was the outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius a miraculous outpouring?

Third. Since you say that the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit is not the same operation as that used in the conversion of sinners, then is the case of Cornelius applicable to your proposition?

Fourth. If a direct operation means an operation through some means or agency, through what agency, besides the word, does the Holy Spirit operate directly?

Fifth. As there are four thousand tongues into which the Bible has not been translated, does the Holy Spirit operate upon and save the people who are identified with those tongues?

Now, then, one or two things. One passage I failed to get to last night; and he came along and said I was as silent as a tomb about that, and a number of others. Well, this particular one I said nothing about. It was the last one noted in my notes, and I was just ready to notice it when my time was called.

That was 1 Cor. 12:3 - that no man can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Ghost. Now, what my friend needs to find is that no man can say that Jesus is Lord except by a direct operation of the Holy Ghost. He does not find his direct operation there. It merely says he can not say it except by the Holy Ghost and does not say anything about a direct operation of the Holy Ghost. Well, over in the second chapter of Acts and verse 36, the apostle Peter, who was speaking by the direction of the Holy Spirit, said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Every man who accepts the statement made by the apostle Peter on that occasion, and, in harmony with and in view of that statement, says that Jesus is Lord is saying it by the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Ghost revealed it through

Peter. There is nothing at all in the text to indicate a direct operation of the Holy Spirit.

Now, then, my friend is coming and talking about how and insisting that the “how” is not the issue—that it is not in the proposition. Friends, it is the issue, and it is the only issue! He says the issue is, Does the Holy Spirit operate? That is not the issue. Both of us agree that the Spirit operates through the word. Friend Tingley agrees with that because he has it in his proposition that the Holy Spirit operates through the word. I agree that this thing is so. We both agree that the Spirit operates and, therefore, that is not the issue. When we say the Holy Spirit operates through the word, that is how, that is a manner. There’s a method by which it operates. It operates through the word. That’s how. We both agree on that “how” and both agree that the Spirit operates by that method. But in addition to that—besides that—friend Tingley says it operates directly upon sinners; and that’s another method. It does involve the “how” and the “how” is the only point at issue in this discussion tonight.

Friend Tingley, you just as well come up and face the issue. You can not side-step in that way. You are going to have to face what your proposition says; and I am going to be right on your heels until we come to the close of this session, keeping before this audience the fact that the method, the manner, the “how” of the operation is the issue. It is not whether he operates—we both agree to that, Tingley. We both agree that the Spirit operates and that it operates through the word. We both agree on that method. But you say in addition to that method, it operates by another method—it operates directly; and that has to do with the “how.”

You remember last night he asked me why I did not bring up Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary and give him the definition. I said. “Why it’s your proposition. You’re the man who is obligated to define the terms of your proposition, according to the rules signed.” But since he hasn’t done it, I’m going to comply with his request tonight and give him the definition. I have here a definition copied from Webster’s Unabridged Twentieth Century Dictionary, and it gives six definitions to the term “directly.”

First. “In a straight line or course, rectilinearly; not in a winding course; as, aim directly at the object; or gravity tends directly to the center of the earth.” Now, is that the definition Tingley wants? We will wait and see.

Second. “Immediately, soon; without delay; as, ‘He will be with us directly’.” Is that the one he wants? We will wait and see.

Third. “On the instant that; as soon as; immediately when; a common but incorrect English usage.” He gives an example from Dickens, “Directly he stopped, the coffin was removed by four men.” Does he want that one?

Fourth. “Openly; expressly; without circumlocution or ambiguity; without a train of inferences.” And the example from Hooker, “No man has been so impious, as directly to condemn prayer.” Is that the meaning of the word in his proposition?

Fifth. “Exactly; precisely; just; as ‘He is directly in the way’.” Is that his definition?

Sixth. “Without the interposition or intercession of any person or thing; as, ‘I conducted my business directly with the owner’.” There’s the only definition that can apply to the word as used in his proposition. The word directly, therefore, means “without the interposition of any person or thing;” and when he says the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner, that’s without the interposition of any person or thing. It’s not through an agency—“without anything between;” “without anything intervening.” That has to do with method or manner, and that’s the issue. I am persuaded that Glenn V. Tingley knows that’s the issue and is afraid to face it.

He said in the opening of his speech just made that he did not come here to win victories over an opponent, but that he was here that people might know the Lord. Well, friend Tingley, don't you know that you're wasting your energy. They can not know the Lord through your preaching. You argued last night that they can not know and no need to preach to them until the Spirit operates on their hearts and prepares them for it. And so if these people are to know the Lord, they'll not learn it from your preaching or mine, according to you. They'll have to know Him some other way. So the "how" is still there; and he must face the matter.

Then he came down to Cornelius. Was Cornelius an alien sinner when the Holy Spirit fell on him? He said, "Yes, he was a sinner." I want you to remember that it goes down on record that Glenn V. Tingley says that this man was a sinner; and he said he was converted or saved by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the word-both of them. Why, Tingley, that outpouring of the Holy Spirit there was a miraculous outpouring. You said last night, in answer to a question which I gave you, (and I can read it here if you deny it), that the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit is not the same operation as that that converts the sinner. Yet you gave the case here of Cornelius-one on whom the Holy Spirit fell miraculously- and said that saved him, after having said that the operation that saves a sinner is not the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit. Well, now, just which do you want? You can not have both of them. You are going to have to give up your miraculous operation and hold to the other; or you are going to have to give up the other if you hold to that, because you have said they are not the same operation. Let him deny it if he wants to. I will read it right here and the record will show it. We already have some transcriptions of the debate last night. You can go to his speech and see whether or not that is what he said. "It is not the same operation." So you have the wrong operation there to save the sinner. You are going to have to find a different one, friend Tingley.

Then he came to the question about the fish and the ham, and he said, "Yes sir. God feeds me directly." He said one time he ran out of rice, and they did not have anything to eat. He said he waited upon the Lord until a certain time, and he heard a noise at the door, and he went to the door, and there was a bushel basket full of food enough that they could have their breakfast and a number of meals through a number of days. He said God chose a man and a woman. Well, that was not "directly" then-it was through means. You have the wrong thing. I asked, "Does God send you food directly from heaven?" That's the point. You say God sent it here in a bushel basket brought by a man and a woman. Well, that was using an agency; that was using means. That is not in harmony at all with your contention, for "directly" means "without the intervention or interposition of means," agencies or things of that kind. So you will have to try again. That's over on my side of this deal. It is not with you at all.

Then to the five thousand languages. He said the churches who believe in a direct operation of the Holy Spirit believe in carrying out the Lord's message to preach the gospel unto all the world and thus do missionary work. He had a number of things to say about the church of Christ's missionary activities. Well, we'll let that go for what it is worth and insist that he answer the question whether or not these four thousand out of five thousand who have not the translation of the Bible in their tongue are converted and saved by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. I asked the question in writing, and I hope he will not forget it.

Then he said, "Porter pokes fun at miracles." No, I don't poke fun at any miracles, Not at all. I believe there are miracles recorded in the Bible; and I'm certain of the fact that men

performed miracles. I do not poke fun at miracles, but when men claim there are miracles which are not miracles, I don't accept them just because they say so.

Then he told about his daughter's being stricken with polio and God's healing her twisted limb when she was fifteen months old. May I ask here, Mr. Tingley, how long was that daughter in the hospital before God healed her? How long was that daughter in the hospital? We await your answer.

Then, just to show how the word operates-rather how the Spirit operates-he gave us a number of scriptures here. Luke 1:41-44. He said the Holy Spirit operated on a babe in the womb-on John the Baptist in the womb of his mother Elizabeth; that the Holy Spirit operated upon that babe. Well, Tingley, did the Holy Spirit operate upon that babe to convert it? We are talking about the conversion of sinners. I want you to tell me: Did the Holy Spirit operate upon that babe in the womb for the purpose of converting that babe? If not, then it does not have a thing to do with your proposition. Your proposition says, "The conversion of sinners." He does not like these questions. They force the issue. That's the point.

Now, 1 Sam. 10:10-The Holy Spirit brings inspiration. So it operates in that way. Well, I know the Holy Spirit operated to bring inspiration but to say that it still operates that way and inspires men today, as the apostles and prophets were inspired, is a different proposition. Now, let him prove it!

Genesis 28:11 to 17-it operated through a vision to Jacob. Was that for the purpose of converting Jacob, the alien sinner? Was that the idea of it? If not, then it is out of connection with your proposition. It even operated upon liars in Acts 5:3 when Anninas and Sapphira were struck dead because they had lied to God and the Holy Ghost. Well, what was the purpose of that operation? Now, there is a direct operation of the Spirit, he says, right along with his proposition. And it killed those upon whom it operated. The earthquake almost got the jailer last night, and now this operation has both these people killed; and that proves his proposition. That is a direct operation of the Spirit, friend Tingley, that did not bring salvation-it brought physical death. Is that what your proposition says? You had better read it again.

Acts 16:14. It prepares the heart for a gospel reception-the conversion of Lydia whose heart the Lord opened. Yes, I believe the Lord opened her heart. But I notice it did not read, "Whose heart the Lord opened with a direct operation of the Spirit." If he had just had that in, he would have had his proposition sustained; but he did not have that. Not whose heart the Lord opened with a direct operation. It does not say that. The fact was that Paul preached to her and her heart was opened. That is, the eyes of her understanding were enlightened, as we have in Ephesians 1:18. So being enlightened, her heart was opened, and she attended to the things there spoken by Paul. Let him find the direct operation in that.

Romans 5:5-"The love of God shed abroad in our hearts." I dealt with that on two occasions last night showing by 1 John 4:19 we love God because He first loved us. Our love for God is produced by God's love for us, and that love is revealed in the gospel. We learn of it only through the gospel as dictated and directed by the Holy Spirit; and therefore, the love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit through the preaching of the apostles of the Son of God. Let him find his direct operation.

Then to John 16:7-11, and he said, "Porter was as silent as the tomb about this." The record will show; and when you get a copy of this debate and read his first speech, on the second night where he said "Porter was as silent as the tomb about the one word in this passage," you take your copy, go back and read and see whether or not I was as silent as the tomb, or just what happened.

He said, "The Spirit will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment." "Reprove the world"-there's the word he said Porter was as silent as the tomb about. I believe the Holy Spirit will reprove the world, that He will convict the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. Acts 2 is the fulfillment of this. In Acts 2 we find the Holy Spirit's coming and inspiring men to preach; and when Peter said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ, they were pricked in their hearts." There's where the Holy Spirit convinced men of sin through the preaching of the apostle Peter. It does not say "directly" at all.

Then over in Titus 1:9 Paul speaks of certain ones holding forth the faithful word or sound doctrine "that he may be able" by that sound doctrine "to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." The word "convince" in that passage is from exactly the same original word that "reprove" comes from in John 16. "Reprove the world" . . . "Convince the gainsayers." And Paul said you can do it by sound doctrine. Elder Tingley says, "You can not do it by preaching; it takes the Holy Spirit in a direct operation to do it." You can take your choice. I will stand with Paul.

Then on John 3, he said, "Here's another place he was as silent as the tomb." Turn back and read the record when you get the book and see whether I was silent as the tomb or not. "Born of the Spirit." I showed in connection with that from 1 Pet. 1:22-23 that you are born of the seed-the incorruptible seed-by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. As to the mother and things of that kind we shall say more presently.

He said it is the same word in John 3-"Born of the Spirit"- that we have in Genesis about Abraham, when it is said that Abraham begat Isaac; the same word as in Matthew 1:20 that Jesus was conceived of the Holy Ghost; the same word found in 1 John 5:18-"Born of God." Yes, all of them are from the same word. And, friend Tingley, did you not know that it is the same word exactly in 1 Pet. 1:23 that says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever?" Note, friend Tingley, that it is also the same word found in 1 Cor. 4:15 in which Paul said, "I have begotten you through the gospel"-the same word! Didn't you know that, Tingley? Didn't you know that I'd catch you when you tried a thing of that kind?

Well, it takes two, he said, "the father and the mother to bring about the birth." I am just wondering, then, in his application of it, who the mother is.

Now to some other matters. Regarding the bottle of ink, he said, regarding 2 Cor. 3:3, "Why I did not say the bottle of ink was spilled. I made no such statement as that." I know you didn't, but in order to sustain your theory that is what would have to be done. Not only "ministered by us," or written with the pen, but there must be a direct outpouring upon them if it fits your theory in your case. That's the thing you'd have to find. You did not find it. You did not say a word about it. I know that; but I called your attention to it, and I am insisting that you find it in order to make it fit your theory about it. Yes, Paul said, "ministered by us"- "written . . ." "How? How?" Well, you said, "Here's how." I thought you were not discussing how. I thought "how" had nothing to do with it. But he comes along and says, "How?" Well, the "how" is that "it is not with ink; that it is not the Bible; that it was not the letter; not the word; but with the Spirit." All right, then, Paul administered the Spirit, because he said, "Ministered by us." If that was not through his preaching or writing or anything of that kind, then tell me how Paul ministered the Spirit to those men and placed it upon their hearts. We await your answer. He does not like questions. I do not blame him.

He said Paul was saved by a miraculous operation of the Spirit. Well, what is a miracle? A miracle, respected friends, in the natural realm is when something occurs that is the result of a deviation from an established law. That is what it takes to make a miracle. Where a thing occurs in harmony with established law in nature, that is not a miracle. There must be a deviation from the established law. And in the spiritual realm the same thing is true; and if Paul was converted by a miracle, he was converted by a deviation from an established spiritual law. What does Paul say about it? Romans 8:2, Paul says, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Paul said he was made free by an established law. Friend Tingley says, "No, he was made free by a miraculous conversion." Take your choice.

Then he said, regarding Paul, "Why the Holy Spirit was operating (and they were all smitten); but all of them did not hear the word because the Spirit prepared the heart of Paul and did not prepare the others." Well, why didn't he prepare the others? Was God a respecter of persons? Why were not the others prepared by a direct operation of the Spirit? It operated upon them. They were all smitten; they all fell to the ground, you say, but did not hear-because the Lord prepared Paul's heart but did not prepare the others. They were not to blame for it, then, were they? If the Lord did not make the preparation, then they were not to blame for it. But in Acts 26:14 we are told why they did not understand-because Paul said, "The voice spoke to me in the Hebrew tongue." That's why. Not because his heart had been prepared and theirs had not; but the Lord spoke in a language which he understood.

Then concerning the earthquake. He said, "I did not say that the earthquake led the man to attempt suicide." I know you did not say that, but that is the conclusion of your argument. He said the earthquake was a direct operation of the Spirit. So it led the man into an attempted suicide, for he started to take his own life and was hindered only by the voice of the preacher who spoke and said, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." And that stopped the suicide act. The direct operation almost caused that fellow to take his own life. The words of the preacher stopped him and then turned around and saved him when he obeyed the thing preached.

Now then he comes to the "how" again-Romans 15:9- "by signs."

Mr. Nichols: Three minutes.

Mr. Porter: Thank you. Yes, signs here were to make the Gentiles believe; but those signs were not worked upon the men to be saved. If so, prove it. Signs were for the purpose of confirming the word; and he preached a doctrine that had never been preached, and the words were confirmed by signs following. But the signs were not necessarily worked upon the man who was converted but upon somebody else-upon the afflicted.

Then in Acts 2, "by tongues." But that was a miraculous outpouring, and he said, "That's not the one I'm talking about." All those passages he gave along that line are right in the group with this one.

Then, one other scripture-Joel 2:28-here it is, he said, "All flesh." "Pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Well, in Acts 2:16-17, regarding the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, Peter said, "This is that of which Joel spoke." It was a miraculous outpouring. Tingley says, "That's not the operation in my proposition." Well, why did you use it then? What did you introduce that passage for when it had to do with miraculous operation and not the one in conversion? You said, "They are different."

1 Cor. 6:11-"washed and sanctified by the Spirit." Yes, but it does not say by a direct operation of the Spirit. Eph. 5:26 says we are cleansed and sanctified "through the wash-

ing of water by the word.” Here we have it ascribed to the word, and the Spirit does it through the word.

Then he said that there is no passage saying the Holy Spirit operates only through the word. Well, will he find the passage that says the Holy Spirit operates directly? Let him produce that. He is in the affirmative.

Then to 1 Cor. 12:13- “Baptized by one Spirit.” Yes, but does he mean that was a miraculous baptism? Let him tell us about that, and we will see his position on it.

He came to Romans 15:18, which was just mentioned, and Matt. 12:31-”Blaspheming the Holy Spirit.” Is that the operation of the Spirit in conversion? He’s getting entirely away from the proposition. To oppose the thing which my opponent is preaching is not blaspheming the Holy Spirit. To oppose speculations and human theories and traditions is not to blaspheme the Spirit. Let him produce the passage that has to do with the proposition.

That finishes everything he said; and if I have a moment or two, I will say some other things.

Mr. Nichols: About half a minute.

Mr. Porter. About a half minute. Just remember this. Paul said in Romans 1:16, “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.” And in James 1:21, “Receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save your souls.” Now, friend Tingley says if it is able to do it, it does it. All right; so here is the word able to save your souls. If it is able to do it, tell me, friend Tingley, does the word save the souls of men ?

I thank you very kindly.

TINGLEY’S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE - SECOND NIGHT

Mr. Chairmen, Gentlemen Moderators and Worthy Opponent: First, let me say I have not complained of legitimate, proper, and right questions. I was rather glad he asked the questions on the paper the other night, but it is the questions that are irrelevant, that have nothing to do with the proposition-or very little to do with it-but are simply wild goose chasing that I objected to.

In answering these questions that were handed me, the first one: “Was the outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius a miraculous outpouring?”

Anything that the Holy Spirit does, according to the natural man is miraculous. There are certain dispensational outpourings of the Holy Spirit but any operation of the Holy Spirit to any individual is miraculous.

“Since you say the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit is not the same operation as that used in the conversion of sinners, then is the case of Cornelius applicable to your proposition ?”

And here is what I said: “Is the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit the same as the direct operation of the Spirit in conversion?” It is the same Spirit but not the same operation. The Cornelius instance was one for dispensational fulfillment. The Holy Spirit operates today directly upon any individual heart; in any miraculous dispensational outpouring, the Holy Spirit can and does convert as part of its program. The Holy Spirit will convert whenever an individual receives the Spirit.

“If a direct operation means an operation through some means or agency, through what agency besides the word does the Holy Spirit operate directly?”

Through any matter, person or thing. My worthy opponent seems to forget that the

Holy Spirit is a person, the third person of the Godhead-God present in our midst.

Again I started counting how many times he called the Holy Spirit "it." Whenever he forgets himself, he always-for my worthy opponent does not believe in the personal presence of the Holy Spirit in the world today. I challenge him to be honest with his heart and honest with the teaching of the church of Christ.

"As there are four thousand tongues into which the Holy Bible has not been translated does the Holy Spirit operate upon these tongues to save people who are identified with those tongues?"

Yes, whenever any missionary or Christian bears witness and the Holy Spirit accompanies the witness of the word.

Now we have finally got down to the issue. I said in the first speech that I made and in the early part of it that my worthy opponent would try and dodge the issue entirely and cry out, "How? How? How? He said here, "How is the issue and it is the only issue." Ladies and Gentlemen, let me read the subject of debate especially for the benefit of my worthy opponent. "The scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them as well as through the Word of truth or Gospel of Christ." Where is the word "How?" Where is there a suggestion of "How?" My worthy opponent artfully dodges the issue.

Two or three more things:

"How long was daughter in the hospital?" She was only in the hospital for about ten days or two weeks and the doctors did their best to get us to consent to an operation. We refused and waited on God and after the congealing of the cartilage, three months after the infantile paralysis, a helpless cripple who could never have a straight leg-so the doctors said-God healed her. But what's that got to do with it? I am answering the questions that he insists on injecting.

My worthy opponent said I read 1 Corinthians 2, which had nothing to do with the sinners but only the disciples. Let me read to you the fourteenth verse: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." Who is he talking about? The natural man. How can the Spirit get to the natural man ? Not through natural avenues. It must be spiritual and spiritual preception.

Again I would call the attention of my worthy opponent- his definition is very good. It's not the latest one. I have what seems to be the latest one from Webster's New Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. I would call attention to this. This is one that he read: 'In a direct way. Without anything intervening.'" My worthy opponent seems to dwell upon the matter and I suppose that will be acceptable. Look up the word "intervening." I have a dictionary before me and the word "intervening" says: "To enter as something extraneous. To come in between by way of hindrance or modification." To operate directly I may operate upon my child with a paddle, a kiss, with a gift. I may operate by word. That's operating directly. The Holy Spirit may operate in any way, with any matter, with any thing or any person. But if the Holy Spirit operates directly through matter, thing or person contacts and speaks to or deals with a person that is direct operation. I gave you eleven ways whereby the Holy Spirit in the scriptures operated directly.

My worthy opponent said Paul said he was converted by an established law. He said, "Tingley says he was converted by a miracle not by an established law." He said that a miracle was something deviating from the known laws of nature. Did you get that? "Known laws of nature." "Known laws of nature." My worthy opponent may not know all the laws.

The balance of the definition, “transcending our knowledge of these laws.” A miracle is not something contrary to law as my worthy opponent suggested. A miracle is something subject to higher law than laws which we know. So says the dictionary.

In regard to two or three other matters: Ladies and gentlemen, I wish that we could be honest as we will wish we had been when we stand before our Lord, and read 2 Corinthians 3:3- “For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink.” The apostle Paul ministered to the people the word but it was not even the writing of the word that wrought change in their hearts, “but with the Spirit of the living Cod not in tables of stone but in fleshy tablets of your heart.”

Ladies and gentlemen when you go home tonight get your Bible and kneel by your bed and open it and ask God to show you what the Word says, then read at least twenty times 2 Cor. 3:3.

They my worthy opponent found fault with what I said about John 3:1-8. He is exactly correct that 1 Pet. 1:23 and other scriptures which he gave the word “born” is exactly the same one used in “born of the Spirit.” He says, “The way we are born in John 3 is by incorruptible seed.” But John 3 doesn’t say that. It says “Born of the Spirit.” “Born of the Spirit.” Show me any time where the Bible says that “born of the Spirit” means being born of incorruptible seed; that that is the way the Spirit causes individuals to be born.

Again, he said that John 16 was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. “He will reprove the world of sin.” He said that that happened on Pentecost. Was the world at Pentecost? This is the age of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit, whether you believe it or not, is present in the world today-operating as a Person and will operate on any heart who will be sky blue and brutall

The world was not at Pentecost! This is the mission of the Holy Spirit throughout all this age. “He will reprove the world”-all men.

Then he asked, “Whose heart was opened by direct operation of the Holy Spirit?” I will ask him to read Acts 16:14, “Lydia’s heart was opened.” Lydia’s heart! God works through the Spirit of God now. This is the age of the Holy Spirit.

I called your attention to the fact that it is the Spirit and the word. On the blackboard behind me-(I am sorry that you will be unable to see at the back but I will read the scriptures to you. I ask that my moderator point out the scriptures as I read them to you.)

I want you to see: (1) What the Word does in conversion, (2) what the Spirit does in conversion. The Word operates, the Spirit operates! My worthy opponent can not erase this part (pointing to the “Word” on blackboard) and say the Spirit does it all this way. There is not a word in any of these that says the Spirit does it this way (pointing to “Word”). It says the Spirit does it! That’s operating directly! How He does it, I again repeat, is not the question. He operates directly, without anything coming in between, without anything pushing him aside, without anything intervening. That is from the dictionary that my worthy opponent read!

1 Peter 1:23-”Being born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible by the word of God.” John 3:5-”Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God.” “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of Spirit is spirit.”

Psalms 119:50-”Thy word hath quickened me.” John 6:63- as well as the Word-it is the Spirit that quickeneth.

Luke 8:11-now in the parable “the seed is the word,” as well as, Rom. 5:5- “the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.”

Mark 4:11-“the sower soweth the Word,” as well as that, 2 Cor. 3:3-“written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God.”

John 17:17-20- “Sanctify them through thy word, thy word is truth. Neither pray I for these alone but for them also which believe on me through their word.” The Word as well as 1 Pet. 1:2 - “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit.”

2 Cor. 4:4- “Lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ who is the image of God should shine unto them,” and as well as that the Holy Spirit, Gal. 4 :2~”As he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit.”

The Word: 2 Thess. 2:14- “called you by our gospel.” The Spirit as well as the Word, 2 Cor. 3:6- “the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life.”

Rom. 1:16- “The gospel of Christ is “the power of God unto salvation” as well as, John 15:3- “Even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father.”

The Word: Heb. 4:12-For the “word of God is quick and powerful sharper than any two-edged sword,” as well as the Spirit, John 16-the Comforter: “I will send him unto you. When He is come He will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgement.”

The Word: 1 Cor. 1:21- “By the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” Rom. 8:9 Just as well as the Word directly the Spirit operates. “Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.”

John 15:3- “Now ye are clean through the word” and as well as the Word, 1 Cor. 12 :13- “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.”

John 8:32- “the truth shall make you free.” Rom. 15:16- “being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.”

Rom. 10:19- “the hearing of the Word of God” as well as 1 Cor. 12:3 that “no man can say Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost.”

Luke 16:31- “they hear not Moses and the Prophets” as well as Acts 10:44 “While Peter yet spake the word the Holy Ghost fell.”

John 20:30-31- “Many other signs truly flid Jesus, but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing you might have life,” as well as that, there is the direct operation of the Spirit. Rom. 8:1-2- “Walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.”

Acts 4:1 “Many of them which heard the word” coupled with that-as well as Acts 2 :4- “They were filled with the Holy Ghost.”

Acts 15:7- “Should hear the word of the gospel and believe” as well as the Word there is the Spirit, Acts 15:8- “Giving them the Holy Ghost even as He did unto us.”

Rom. 10:13-11 “How shall they hear without a preacher,” as well as the preaching there must be the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. 2:11 “Receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.”

Psalms 19:7- “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” John 4:24 “God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and truth.”

James 1:18- “Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth,” as well as Rom. 15:19 -”Through mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God.”

Both of these are necessary. Both are direct. Both are true. Neither of them is alone. Not once does it say the Word without the Spirit. Not once does it say the Spirit without the Word.

Ladies and Gentlemen, let’s not be specious in our arguments. Let’s not be prejudiced in our thinking; and let’s not be so set that we can not honestly examine the truth. If

it said, "The word-and the word operates only by the Spirit-the Spirit does not operate direct," or if it said, "The Word only operates by the person of the Holy Spirit" then we could do away with one or the other. He accepts the one. I accept the one. He refuses to accept this. (Pointing to the Spirit). I accept it. I believe the whole Bible is the Word of God.

If I say, "I am going to eat," you believe that I am going to eat without anything entering between it. You believe that I am determined to do this, and if I were God, nothing could intervene. God over and over says the Spirit converts. He says the Spirit sanctifies, the Spirit justifies, the Spirit washes, the Spirit cleanses-the Spirit is the one that operates. Likewise the Word but it takes the two-the positive and the negative. That is the ground for a sinner coming to Christ. He is converted by the Spirit and the Word.

Now I was speaking in our last speech about our nature

and the kind of individuals we are. In 2 Cor. 5:18 it says, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away and behold all things are become new." [Ladies and Gentlemen, if a complete regeneration, renewal has not taken place in your being by a power greater than you so that you are a changed creature-the old things passed away-you have no part nor lot in this matter. That change can be wrought by a person- "not with ink," "not written" but "by the Spirit written on fleshy tables of the heart."

Titus 3:5- "Not by works of righteousness but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing, of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Rom. 8:5- "For they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh." There is many a sin bound person in this place who is chained by sin, and you know you are tied and hamstrung and can not get free; and there are a thousand passions within that possess you; and you are a slave to the flesh and its desires and its passions. Men and women, you can be born of the Spirit. "They that are after the Spirit mind the things that are of the Spirit." Conversion means a complete, dramatic, drastic change whereby I accept the gospel of Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God makes me a new creature in Christ Jesus. That is conversion. Apart from the Word there is no conversion. Apart from the Spirit dealing directly with the sinful nature of the person there is no conversion.

After the sinner is convicted by the Holy Spirit, has faith in the gospel of Christ and Christ as his Savior, he receives an internal witness of personal salvation so that faith becomes a matter of knowledge with him. Rom. 8:16- "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." I John 4:13- "Hereby know we that we dwell in him and he in us because he has given unto us his Spirit." Gal. 4:6- "Because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father." The word is Aramaic and is signifies our common word, "Papa." To the sinner God is the Creator, the great God before whom we must stand. The apostle Paul says that when an individual is born or converted by the ;Spirit of God an automatic change takes place and you know he is born again because he says not "great Creator," "great Judge," but "Papa, God."

2 Cor. 1:22- "Who hath sealed us, given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. 2 Cor. 5:5- "Now he that wrought us for the selfsame thing is God who hath also given us the earnest of his Spirit." In Rev. 22:7 we have, "And the Spirit and the bride say come. Let everyone that heareth say come."

In Luke 2:26 we have the Holy Spirit revealing to Simeon directly.

In 1 Thes. 1:5 we have "For our gosped did not come in words." It was not in the preached word only. It was not in the word of God that we declared. It was not in the written word only. Listen to the wording "But also"-I will let the debate stand or fall on this verse. If I say, "But-also," it means something additional or something operating directly.

As I come here, this comes here. Listen, "For our gospel came not to you in word only but also in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance." The word as well as the Holy Ghost both must operate or the sinner can not be saved.

In Acts 5:30 we read "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom you slew and hanged on a tree as we are witnesses as we are witnesses of these things and so is also the Holy Ghost." The disciples were witnesses of it so is also another voice the voice of the Spirit of God was witnessing that Jesus was raised from the dead. He operates directly.

"It is the Spirit that quickeneth. The flesh profiteth nothing." There is no life imparted except by the positive and the negative-the word and the Spirit operating directly one as well as the other operating upon the sinner.

2 Thess. 2:7 tells us further that the mystery of iniquity doth already work only he who now letteth will let till he be taken out of the way." The Holy Spirit is still in the world. The Holy Spirit even restrained the development of evil until God's purpose is fulfilled.

My worthy opponent is still following the same program that the enemies of the apostle Paul followed. He speaks of them in Gal. 4:2~"For then he that is born after the flesh persecuteth him that is born after the Spirit." So now, two kinds: the flesh and the Spirit. If you have not been born of the Spirit you are hopelessly, imparably, eternally lost without God and without hope.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have proven to you in the course of my debate "that the scriptures teach that in the conversion of alien sinners the Holy Spirit operates directly upon them as well as the word of truth or the gospel," because:

(1) The Holy Spirit was omnipresent in the Old Testament age.

(2) He has come from the Father in Christ's name.

(3) He is the third Person of the Trinity.

(4) He is deity and can not be limited.

(~) He is God and Lord and is worshipped.

(6) He is a person with personal names and a personal pronoun is used to describe Him. Therefore, if He is God He can operate directly.

(7) The Holy Spirit does the things a person can do. He does divine work, gives life, prophecies, has all the attributes of personal deity, therefore, He can operate directly upon the sinner.

(8) The Holy Spirit invites the sinner to Christ. Man's sinful nature can only be changed by a divine miracle of the Holy Spirit. Man only receives the Spirit, therefore, the Holy Spirit does operate directly upon the sinner.

(9) The Holy Spirit is the one who convicts the sinner and alone produces repentance. Anyone who has not the Spirit of Christ is none of His. The new birth is wrought by the Holy Spirit, therefore, the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner because one can resist the pleading of the Spirit.

(10) Because you can accept and become epistles of Christ by the Spirit.

(11) Because the Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, therefore, the Holy Spirit does operate directly upon the sinner.

(12) Because the Holy Spirit operates directly upon Paul, because the Holy Spirit operated directly upon Cornelius, because the Holy Spirit operated directly upon the jailer, therefore, He can operate directly upon the sinner.

(13) The word is powerless unless it is accompanied by the Holy Spirit.

(14) No man can call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Spirit. r~

(15) We are baptized into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit, therefore the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner.

(16) The Holy Spirit is the lifegiver.

(17) The Holy Spirit is sent that we might know the Word.

(18) And the Gentiles were converted by the Spirit of God, therefore, the Holy Spirit operated directly upon the Gentiles.

(19) Because one is born either of flesh or of the Spirit.

(20) Because the Holy Spirit restrains evil until God's purpose was complete.

(21) The Holy Spirit is witness added to the Word proving its authenticity, therefore the Holy Spirit can operate directly upon the sinner.

(22) Finally, because the Holy Spirit operated directly upon Simeon.

(23) The Holy Spirit can be blasphemed.

(24) The Holy Spirit by direct miracle operated on three thousand on the day of Pentecost, therefore the Holy Spirit can operate directly upon the sinner.

I thank you my friends.

PORTER'S SECOND NEGATIVE - SECOND NIGHT

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you now for the closing speech on this particular proposition. After this, of course, other questions will be discussed for the remaining nights.

Just a few things regarding the closing remarks of my friend, and then I shall go back to the beginning. He ran a great number of scriptures in, showing the operation of the Spirit on this and that, among which he said that the Spirit operated directly upon Simeon; therefore, it operates directly upon the sinner. Now, then, I just wonder why my friend did not tell whether Simeon was an alien sinner. He fails to get to those things. He gives a lot of scriptures where the Spirit operated, or where there was a spiritual manifestation, or revelation of some kind, upon God's children and then assumes and concludes from all of that that the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the sinner. Well, there's just no connection between his passages and his proposition. The scriptures he gives have to do with the children of God and his conclusion has to do with the alien sinner. So there's no connection between them in that way.

He came back to the idea of "can." He said the Holy Spirit can operate. Well, I dealt with that last night. We are not talking about what the Holy Spirit can do but what he does. You know I said that God can feed a man with bread directly from heaven, as He fed Israel in the wilderness, but He is not doing that. "The Lord is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham," I gave you from Matthew 3, but He did not do that. So just because God can do a thing, or the Holy Spirit is able to do a thing, does not prove that it does it! All of his efforts along that line is wasted energy.

He called our attention here to a number of things on this side (pointing to chart) dealing with the word and on this side (pointing to "Spirit" on blackboard) dealing with the Holy Spirit; and in between them "As well as." 1 Pet. 1:23-born of the word as well as born of the Spirit. All through the whole list on both sides he has distinguished between the word and the Spirit-the word on the one hand, and the Spirit on the other. In other words,

the word does certain things, and the Spirit does certain things, both accomplishing the same result; but according to friend Tingley's argument, there is no word in the Spirit and no Spirit in the word. The Spirit is not operating through the word, and the word is not operating through the Spirit. Each one is distinct and separate from the other and carries on independent of the other. That's his argument. Yet his proposition says that the Holy Spirit operates through the word. It says, "The scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the alien sinner operates upon him directly as well as through the word." The proposition says the Holy Spirit operates through the word. Then, when the word is said to do a certain thing, and the Holy Spirit is said to do the same thing, why the Spirit does it through the word! The proposition says that. Then in addition to that, he must have an independent, direct operation that isn't through the word-and so that does not come through the word. So there's no word in the Spirit and no Spirit in the word of his operation, according to his chart.

I believe all these passages given here (pointing to the blackboard). I believe that there are certain things ascribed to the Spirit, and that, as these passages show, the same things are ascribed to the word. Since friend Tingley's proposition says that the Holy Spirit does operate through the word, I insist that he should have shown that this was a direct operation and not that which goes through the word, because he admits that it does operate through the word. That takes care of the whole chart because it is all along the same line. Every passage deals with the same principle, and to answer one of them answers the whole chart. I am insisting the Holy Spirit does these things, and the word does these things, but the Spirit does them through the word; and thus the operation is carried on. But Tingley says, "Not so. He does them through the word, all right, but He does them again." So he has to have two effects and two operations. Sometimes the Spirit does all these things through the word, but then besides that, he must do them all independent of the word. Now, that's his contention; that's his theory; that's the issue.

Now, then, back to the beginning. He said he had not complained at the written questions; it was those other questions that he complained about. Well, I don't insist that he answer them from his seat. I press these questions because I do not want him to forget them in his next speech, and whether they are written or given orally they're the same questions; and if he doesn't complain at them when they are in writing, why complain at them otherwise, because they're the same questions exactly?

He spoke concerning the questions- and I want to notice them here:

"Was the outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius a miraculous outpouring?" He says, "Every operation of the Spirit on men is a miraculous demonstration or outpouring." Is that right? I do not want to misrepresent you.

Mr. Tingley: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Porter continues:

I certainly do not want to misrepresent him. That's certainly what he said-that every operation of the Spirit upon man, as it connects with man or concerns man, is a miraculous outpouring. All right; then the operation here was a miraculous outpouring upon Cornelius, and every one upon any man, anywhere any time, is also miraculous. Last night I asked him this question "Is the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit the same as the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion?" He said, "It's the same Spirit but not the same operation." All right, then it's not miraculous. If a miraculous outpouring is not the same operation as that that takes place on the sinner to convert him, then the operation on the sinner to convert him is not miraculous. Since he says now in answer to this question

that every operation of the Spirit on man is miraculous, then there is no operation on man by the Spirit in his conversion, Tingley being witness. Every one is miraculous, he says, but the miraculous outpouring is not the one that converts him. So there is none that converts him then, because, he says, they all are miraculous! There's where he is and there's where he's going to stay!

Then on the next question he never gave any answer, but he talked around it. "Since you say that the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit is not the same operation as that used in the conversion of sinners, then is the case of Cornelius applicable to your proposition?" He talked all around that but never did say whether it applied.

All right. Next: "If a direct operation means an operation through some means or agency, through what agency besides the word does the Spirit operate directly?" He said, "Through any matter, person or thing." Well, we'll have more about that presently.

"As there are four thousand tongues into which the Bible has not been translated, does the Holy Spirit operate and save the people identified with those tongues?" He said, "Yes." Well God has changed his program since last night. Since last night God has changed his program, because last night I asked my friend this question: "Is it possible for the direct operation of the Holy Spirit to save a sinner without the preaching of the word?" He said, "Yes, it's possible for God to do that because all things are possible with God, but it is not His program." It is His program tonight, isn't it Tingley? Last night it was not. Last night he said, "That's not God's program. God does not do that. That's not the Holy Spirit's program. It could be done that way, but it is not." That's what Tingley said last night. Tonight he says the Holy Spirit operates upon those people in the four thousand tongues that have no written word and converts and saves them without the word. So, then, it's His program tonight to save men without the preaching of the word by a direct operation of the Spirit; it wasn't last night. I wonder when God changed His program. Whenever you get the book you'll just have to turn back and read and see if that isn't what he said. I stake my word of honor upon it that you'll find it in the record just that way. That it was not His program last night to save people independent of the preaching of the word, but tonight it is His program, and so He saves the people of the four thousand tongues without the preaching of the word. (Mr. Tingley held up the question with his written answer. Mr. Porter glanced at it and read):

"Yes, when any missionary or Christian bears witness." What do you mean by that? "Yes, he does it without the word when any missionary or Christian bears witness." Does the Christian bear witness in words or how?

(Mr. Tingley nods: Yes.)

He bears witness in words? Well, that's through the word. I said "without words." You have got right back on my side of it. (Laughter). "Why yes, he does it when the Christian bears witness. When the Christian preaches the word, then ~'od saves the sinner without the word." Friend Tingley, I would not be in a position like that at all. I would not want in a place like that. If I could not contend for a doctrine that would keep me out of a hole like that, I'd give up the doctrine, because I'd be sure it's false. Yes, sir, the Holy Spirit operates upon those men in the four thousand tongues who have no written word when Christians bear witness through the preaching of the word. God saves them without the word when the word is preached! Now if you can accept that, you can accept almost anything.

Then he came back to the matter about "it"-that I referred to the Holy Spirit as "it," and that I did not believe the Holy Spirit is a person. Well, I'll just read some of the passages he quoted awhile ago in some of those statements he made to explain that. He gave us last

night Rom. 8:26 about the Holy Spirit's interceding. The record will show that he introduced the passage- that "the Spirit itself intercedes for us"! The Spirit itself"-the very passage you gave called the Spirit "it." Then you gave one awhile ago, just before you sat down, Rom. 8:16, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirits that we are the children of God." He left out the "itself." He did not put the "itself" in, but it's in there. "The Spirit itself beareth witness;" and so the very passage he gave calls the Holy Spirit "it." So I'm in pretty good company when I simply refer to it sometimes that way. The record will show that I have also referred to him as "he" and "him" and "his" and things of that kind. He is referred to in the scriptures both ways; so I am in perfectly good company when I use it that way.

Then he gave Gal. 4:6 just before he sat down. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth his spirit into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father"-or "Papa, papa." Why? Why, Tingley, you have the wrong passage; you ought to find the passage that says, "In order to make you sons, God sent forth his Spirit into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "In order to make you sons!" That passage says, "Because ye are sons." Does that refer to an alien sinner?

Then he said about the how and the where, "No, there's no how in it. Where does the proposition say anything about how?" Well, the word "how" doesn't occur there, but the words occur there that show method. "That the Holy Spirit operates through the word"-isn't that method? Why didn't you say something about it, Tingley? Were you afraid? "The Holy Spirit operates through the word." Isn't that method? Doesn't that tell how? If it operates through the word, isn't that method or manner? Certainly the how is there; and "in addition to that" or "as well as that" Tingley says it operates "directly," and there's your method too. There's the "how" again.

He said, regarding those definitions that I read from Webster, that they were all good but not the latest. Well, if they were good, why didn't you tell me which one applied to the term in your proposition? I asked you to do it. One of them says, "Without interposition of any means or agency," or anything of that kind. If that isn't the one that applies, why didn't you point out the definition that does apply? Oh, he said, this latest definition gives it "nothing intervening." And so it means the Holy Spirit operates "without anything hindering." Well, if nothing can hinder that operation of the Spirit-if that's the meaning of it, Tingley-how was it that it converted Paul and prepared his heart and did not convert the other fellows? Did something hinder? Did something hinder? You said it operated on all of them; it knocked them all down; but only Paul's heart was prepared. He didn't prepare the other fellows. Did something hinder?

Then he came to his daughter in the hospital and said she was in the hospital about two weeks about ten days or two weeks-and then God healed her. He said, "What has that to do with the proposition?" Nothing. But you introduced it. Not a thing on earth! We are not discussing the working of miracles, the healing of the afflicted of broken and twisted limbs or things of that kind. We're talking about the conversion of sinners, and certainly it had nothing on earth to do with it; but you are the man who introduced it; and so I had to reply to it. I'm in the negative; I'm simply following Tingley, that's all.

Back to 1 Cor. 2:14. He said, "Now, Porter said I read a whole chapter here that applied to the disciples, and I just call your attention to 1 Cor. 2:14 that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. Now, here's the unconverted man, and he can not receive the things of the Spirit." I ask Tingley, Is conversion one of the things of the Spirit? Is the power of the Spirit one of

the things of the Spirit? Well, this says the natural man does not receive them, and you say the natural man does receive them in order that he might become a child of God. This passage says he does not receive them. So you have the wrong passage or the wrong position.

Now, he said regarding the “intervening matter” that when you “operate directly” you may still have an agency. He said he might operate upon his child in various ways, or through various means, by a kiss, by paddling and so on. Well, I suppose if he used a paddle on it, he would still have an agency. That would still be a means or a medium through which he administered his power; that would not be direct.

Then back to this statement: He said. “I have shown there are eleven ways in which the Holy Spirit operates directly.” I thought “how” had nothing to do with it; and here he has found eleven ways, eleven methods, eleven manners, in which the Holy Spirit operates. And yet the “how,” the manner, or the method has nothing to do with it.

Rom. 8:2 again. He said a miracle is not something contrary to law. I showed that a miracle is not a result of an established law. If a thing takes place in harmony with established law, and by the working of that established law, it’s not a miracle. When a child is born as a result of the operation of established law, that’s not a miracle. If a child is born like Jesus was, that’s a miracle. That was a deviation from established law, and there’s the difference. And so in the spiritual realm there must be a deviation from the established law to have a miraculous regeneration. Paul said in Rom. 8:2 that “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.” Tingley says, “No. It was a miraculous regeneration and not an established law at all.” Take your choice.

Back to 2 Cor. 3:3- “Ye are our epistles, ministered by us; written not with ink, but with the Spirit; not on tables of stone, but on fleshy tables of the heart.” Now he said, “Paul ministered the word.” Well, but this says the writing was done by the Spirit and Paul said, “It was ministered by us.” I plead with my opponent to tell me how Paul ministered the Spirit to them in a direct way.

John 3:1-8- “the same word again.” Yes, the same word as found in 1 Pet. 1:23- “begotten,” and so his argument fell flat upon that proposition.

Back to John 16:7-11-where “when the Spirit is come he will reprove the world of sin” and “Porter said this was fulfilled at Pentecost.” He said, “Was the world at Pentecost?” Well, a part of them was there. A part of the world was there, and that’s when the Spirit came. Jesus said, “When he comes”-and that’s when he came-on Pentecost. Right then and there he began to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and judgment; and he is still doing it today in the same way that he did on Pentecost-through the preaching of those inspired men.

On that day of Pentecost when the Spirit came, Peter spoke as the Spirit directed him to speak and said, “Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ. When they heard this, they were pricked in their heart.” “When they heard this, they were pricked in their heart.” Why, Tingley’s proposition says they have to be pricked in the heart first before they can hear. The Holy Spirit must quicken their heart first to enable them to hear, for they can not know a thing about it until the Spirit first operates; and, then they can understand and know! Peter said they were pricked when they heard thi~not when the Spirit operated upon them to enable them to hear this -but “when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart.” All right. The Spirit convinced those men of sin, of the fact that they had murdered the Son of God. How did he do it? Through the preaching of the apostle Peter; and through that

same means the Holy Spirit is convincing the world today. That's not a direct operation.

And, by the way, did you notice how he dealt with Luke 8:12? Did you notice how he set that thing aside? Did somebody say something about somebody being as "silent at the tomb?" Seems like I heard that expression sometime-about somebody being "as silent as the tomb." I gave him Luke 8:12 and I do not think he was asleep when I gave it to him. In Luke 8:12 Jesus explains the parable of the sower. He tells about the seed that fell by the wayside and was picked up by the fowls of the air and explains that to mean a man who hears the word, but the devil comes and catches the word out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved. Remember, Tingley said, "The word does not reach the heart; that reaches the head." I wonder why he forgot that? He has a marvelous forgettery. Oh, it's marvelous how he can forget those things! Yes, the word was in the heart. Jesus said so. Tingley said, "It is not so. The word doesn't reach the heart; the word reaches the head." You remember I asked Tingley to tell me what is the heart and somebody was as "silent as the tomb." I wonder who?

Now, what is the heart of man? Was the word in the heart? Did the word reach the heart? If the word did not reach the heart, how was it in the heart? How did it get there if it didn't reach it? Jesus said in order to keep that man from being saved the devil caught the word away. The devil comes and takes the word out of the heart, lest he should believe and be saved. This shows that the devil knew if the word remained in the heart, the man would believe and be saved. The word could not get to the heart, according to Tingley. It just reaches the head. Well, that will look all right in print. I will be glad for some of you to search that some time and find out just what the heart is- whether or not Tingley told you about it, or whether the Lord told the truth.

He came to his chart again, but I have dealt with that, showing that the Holy Spirit does operate-that it operates through the word-and the thing that is ascribed to the Holy Spirit is also ascribed to the word. Since Tingley admits that the Holy Spirit does operate through the word it is his responsibility to prove that these passages do not refer to that operation, but that they refer to another operation in a direct manner. That's what he failed to do. He merely assumed that. He made an assertion that it was so, but he gave no proof, for his proposition does admit that the Holy Spirit accomplishes them in connection with it by a direct operation; and so he assumed the thing and gave no proof of it whatsoever.

2 Cor. 5:17- "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." Then in connection with that-Titus 3:5- "By the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Yes, I believe the Lord saves us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit; but it does not say by a renewing accomplished by a "direct operation of the Holy Spirit." Since you agree that the Holy Spirit does renew men through the word, then it is up to you to prove that this does not refer to that, but that it refers to the other operation (that you have not found anywhere in God's book) upon an alien sinner.

Then he said, "If I say, I am going to eat, then nothing intervenes," and that, therefore, he eats directly. In other words, he does not use a fork nor a knife nor a spoon-he does not use any kind of means or agency when he eats; he operates directly' Well, what does that have to do with the question? Nothing, but he introduced it. I am simply following Elder Tingley. He is in the lead, and where he leads I will follow.

Rom. 8:17- "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God." Yes, "that we are the children of God," but your proposition says, "alien sinners." You have the wrong passage. You want to find a passage that says the Spirit itself con-

verts the alien sinner through a direct operation. That isn't what you found. It is not there. You found a passage that applies to God's children, and you make it apply to alien sinners.

2 Cor. 1:22- "He sealed us with his Spirit." And Eph. 1:11 He gave us the earnest of the Spirit. Well, who is the "us?" Do you tell this audience, Elder Tingley, that the "us" applies to alien sinners? Why, Paul said, "He hath given unto us . . ." "Us" who? Why, "us" children of God, "us" Christians! That's not an operation upon an alien sinner. That passage applies to God's people, not to alien sinners. Can't you beat that, Tingley? I believe I could beat that.

Rev. 22:17- "The Spirit and the the bride say, come," and since the Spirit says, "Come," that means the Spirit operates direc~Dy upon alien sinners. Well, since the bride says, "Come," that means the bride operates directly upon alien sinners. I wonder how the bride does it? The bride is the church, I presume. How does the church operate upon sinners without means? If it proves it in one case, it proves it in the other.

Then back to Luke 2:26-where he revealed to Simeon. But Simeon was not an alien sinner.

Then 1 Thes. 1:5- "Our gospel came not to you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." And so he said, "Here is the word; and here is the power; and here is the assurance; and here is the Holy Spirit." "Our gospel came not in word only." Well, I believe that. But Paul said it also came in power, and it came in the Holy Ghost; but that's not your position. Your position is the Holy Ghost comes first and prepares the way for the word. The word does not come in the Holy Ghost; the word does not come in power; the power comes first and prepares the way for the word to come. So that does not fit.

Acts 5:30- "The Holy Ghost witnessing to certain things there. Well, again, that's aside from the proposition. What he wants to find is where the Holy Ghost operates upon an alien sinner to convert him-where it operates directly-not through the word. That's the thing he has not found.

John 6:63- "The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life;" and it's the spirit that quickens. Well, I believe that, but there is not a word said in it about any direct operation of the Spirit on sinners.

2 Thess. 2:7-He restrained evil-and still he has nothing there about a direct operation upon an alien sinner to convert him.

And Gal. 4:20- He said it is true, as it was then, that he that is born after the flesh persecutes him that is born after the Spirit. In other words, Porter is persecuting Tingley. That's the application. That's the thing that he indicated by the passage- that Porter is persecuting Tingley. Porter is born after the flesh and Tingley is born after the Spirit, you see, and so I am after him and I'm persecuting him. That's the application. If that's not the meaning of it, and if that's not the connection it has with this proposition in this debate, I wonder just what connection it does have.

He says I am persecuting him. Well, we'll let the audience decide that. I'm certainly "prosecuting" the false doctrine he's trying to put over to you-I'm "prosecuting" that. Maybe he thinks the "prosecution" of a false doctrine is a persecution of the man that teaches it. I don't know. He confuses prosecute and persecute; he ,confuses false teaching with the false teacher, I suppose. So I "prosecute" his false teaching, and he thinks I'm persecuting the false teacher. No, I'm not persecuting him; I'm just "prosecuting" the thing that he's teaching. That's all.

Now, then, that covers his speech and how much time do I have?

Mr. Nichols: About three minutes.

Mr. Porter continues.

About three minutes. All right; we will just make that three minutes long and just take a look at a few things.

I gave you last night, in my first speech, a number of negative arguments, showing what the word does and what it accomplishes. To only one of these did friend Tingley find time and disposition to refer. 1 Cor. 1:21 says that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." The thing that pleased God did not please Tingley; and Tingley says, "No, preaching can not save anybody. It takes the Holy Spirit in a direct operation to accomplish that."

Then I showed how faith comes. John 17:20-Jesus prayed for "them that believe on me through their word"-not through a direct operation of the Spirit.

Rom. 10:17 says "faith comes by hearing the word of God"-not "faith comes by a direct operation of the Spirit upon the heart."

John 20:30-31 says, "These are written that you might believe." "You can not believe as a result of what's written. You have to have the Spirit to first convince you in a direct way before you can even hear and understand," says Tingley.,

And then Acts 4:4- "Many of them which heard believed." They believed as a result of hearing and not as a result of a direct operation.

Acts 15:7- "The Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word and believe." Their faith came as a result of preaching.

Rom. 10:13-14- "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard," showing that belief results from preaching.

Luke 8:12-the devil removed the word from the heart, lest the man should believe and be saved; and so if the word had remained in his heart (that it could not reach and could not be in because Tingley said it could not, but Jesus said it was), then that man would be saved. The devil knew that; so he simply removed the word of God.

I showed what the gospel does-that it is "the power of God unto salvation." Rom. 1:16. I showed that Paul said, "I have begotten you through the gospel."-1 Cor. 4:15.

I have shown what the law of the Spirit does. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. 8:2.

Psalms 19:7 says that "The law of the Lord is perfect or complete, converting the soul." But Mr. Tingley says, "No, it's not complete; it's not perfect. You must have a direct operation to perceive it or it can not convert at all."

I also showed what the word does. It begets. Jas. 1:18. It quickens. Psalms 119:50. That it cleanses. Psalms 119:9. That it sanctifies. John 17:17.

My time is up, and I thank you very much.

THIRD NIGHT

Proposition: The Scriptures Teach that Water Baptism to a Penitent Believer of the Gospel is Essential to Salvation From Alien Sins.

W. Curtis Porter, Affirms

Glenn V. Tingley, Denies

PORTER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE - THIRD NIGHT

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad indeed for this privilege of affirming the proposition that has just been read in your hearing.

I have engaged, through the years, in a number of just such religious discussions as this; but as far as I now recall, I have had an experience today that I have not had before that of having such a discussion on my birthday anniversary. I do not know a better way to celebrate that than to engage in this discussion. I am glad indeed to be here.

As many of you know, some five years ago, it was discovered by medical science that I was a victim of one of the rarest blood maladies known, called Polycythemia vera. If you have difficulty in remembering that name, then just call it Erythrocytosis. But the malady consisted in the production of too much blood. The malady was inevitably fatal. No remedy was had and the only thing I could do was to give my blood away. During the first two months I gave away fourteen pints of blood. For nearly two years I gave, on an average, a pint of blood every three weeks. The doctors gave me only two years to live. When the two years were nearly up, there was developed in California an experimental treatment with atomic energy. I went and took the treatment and my life was spared. Because of that I have been able to reach this milestone in life today. Since I received the treatment of atomic energy, however, my brethren have had to treat me gently, lest I explode. (Laughter).

At the present time my malady is out of control, and for the past year I have been giving away blood once every three weeks; but I have promise of another treatment soon of the atomic energy. So I am glad that through the development of medical science and the providence of God, I have been able to reach this milestone in life and that I can engage in this discussion tonight in defense of what I am fully convinced is the truth of God Almighty.

The proposition is: "The scriptures teach that water baptism to the penitent believer of the gospel is essential to salvation from alien sins." The rules require, of course, that we define the terms of the proposition. By "the scriptures" I simply mean the word of God, the book that we often times call the Bible. By "teach" I mean that it says so in so many words or that words are used to convey that idea or make necessary that conclusion. By a "penitent believer of the gospel," I mean, of course, by the term "gospel" that which we recognize as the word of truth revealed to us in the New Testament scriptures. The "penitent believer" is the believer who has repented of his sins. To that man "water baptism"-and by water baptism I mean immersion in water by the authority of Jesus Christ in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit-is "essential" or is necessary to his justification. "Essential to salvation from alien sins." By "alien sins" we mean sins that have been committed while an alien sinner; that is, prior to obedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ. By "salvation" I simply mean the forgiveness of sins, pardon or remission of sins.

I believe that defines sufficiently the terms of the proposition, and the issue is simply this: Is baptism a condition of salvation from sin? I affirm that it is and my opponent denies. That is the issue between us tonight. Of course, what the scriptures teach here makes room for faith and repentance; and we believe that faith and repentance are necessary and without them a man could not be baptized according to the requirements of the New Testament. All the statements made in God's book relative to faith and repentance as

conditions of salvation we whole heartedly believe and accept. But along with that there is also a condition that is called baptism; and that, too, is essential to the salvation of men.

I call your attention to a number of arguments which I wish to introduce at this time to sustain the proposition.

My first argument will be based upon the statement made by the apostle Paul in I Cor. 1:12-13. Here Paul says, "Now everyone of you saith, I am Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Now this statement made by the apostle Paul lays down an eternal principle, and to that principle I certainly invite your attention. Here were men in the church at Corinth calling themselves after men; some saying, "I am of Paul;" others, "I am of Apollos;" "I am of Cephas;" and some saying, "I am of Christ." Or as some translations of the scripture give it, "I belong to Christ; I belong to Paul;" "I belong to Cephas." Of course, to be "of Paul" would mean to belong to Paul; to be "of Apollos" would be to belong to Apollos; to be "of Cephas," to belong to Cephas; and to be "of Christ" would be to belong to Christ. The apostle Paul shows that in order for one to be of Paul there are two things that must be necessary. There may be other things, but these things are absolutely essential. Here were men saying, "I am of Paul" and Paul showing that they could not be of him because these two things were not true. He says, "Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?"-thus showing that in order for a man to be of Paul, or to belong to Paul, he must first, have Paul crucified for him; and in the second place, he must be baptized in the name of Paul. If Paul had been crucified for him, that would not be sufficient to make him of Paul unless he had been baptized in the name of Paul. Since Paul had not been crucified for him, and he had not been baptized in the name of Paul, then he had no right to say, "I belong to Paul."

The same principle holds true with respect to Apollos. In order for men to belong to Apollos, Apollos must be crucified for them, and they must be baptized in the name of Apollos. Without those two things being true, according to the principle laid down by the apostle Paul, men could not belong to Apollos.

Then the same with respect to those who said, "I am of Cephas." Cephas must be crucified for you, and you must be baptized in the name of Cephas. If that had not been true, then they were not "of Cephas" and they did not belong to him.

That same principle comes on down to those who said, "I am of Christ," or "I belong to Christ." The same two things must be necessary. In the first place, in order to belong to Christ, or to be of Christ, Christ must be crucified for you. In the second place, you must be baptized in the name of Christ. If the principle does not mean that, it does not mean a thing beneath the stars tonight. These two things are necessary that men belong to Christ, or that they be of Christ. Christ must be crucified for them; they must be baptized in his name. It is true that Christ has been crucified for us. That we can take as a fact. But it is also true that we must be baptized in his name or we do not belong to him. I, therefore, insist that this passage shows beyond any doubt that baptism is an essential condition in the plan of salvation-that men who have not been saved from their sins do not belong to Christ; but if men belong to Christ, if they are of Christ, then they have been saved from their sins. And that applies to those for whom Christ has been crucified and those who have been baptized into his name. I shall insist that my opponent pay attention to this and attempt to set it aside or make a very strong effort to do so.

The second argument to which your attention is called is this. All the verses of the New Testament which mention baptism and salvation together put the salvation after bap-

tism. Now remember that. All the verses in the New Testament which mention salvation and baptism together put the salvation after the baptism. They never put the salvation before! I have not time just here to call attention to all of them but here are some samples: Mk. 16:16 says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Where's the salvation placed? After baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Baptism first; salvation follows. Acts 2:38-Peter said, "Repent, and be Baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Baptism placed first, followed by the remission of sins. Acts 22:16-Ananias told Saul, "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." First baptism; then the washing away of sins. Gal. 3:27-"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." First baptism; and then "into Christ." 1 Peter 3:21- "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." First the baptism and then the salvation. I give these simply as examples of the principle stated in the argument introduced. Others could be added but that will suffice. Some of these passages will come up for individual investigation as I give them in additional arguments.

My third argument in substantiation of the proposition that baptism is a necessary or essential condition of salvation from sin is found in the language of Jesus Christ in Mark 16:16. I quoted it briefly a moment ago. Now, I wish to elaborate upon it to some extent. Here we have Mark's record of the great commission the Lord gave to his apostles. I begin reading with verse fifteen. We hear the language, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Note the fact that it does not say, "He that believeth and is saved can then be baptized if he wants to." It is not, first believe; second, salvation; and third, baptism. It is first, believe; second, baptism; and third, salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." The Lord placed belief first, baptism second and salvation third. If that passage makes belief necessary to salvation, it also makes baptism necessary to salvation. The salvation is conditioned, in the language of Jesus, upon those conditions. Remember that no amount of reasoning can make that read, "He that believeth and is saved can then be baptized," because that is not what the Lord said. People will quibble about it, and will try to reason around it, and get it out of the way; but if the thing were expressed in material value, there would be no quibble about it. Suppose, for example, that when you go home from this discussion you turn on your radio and hear the President of the Ford Motor Company broadcasting this statement: "He that believeth and is baptized shall receive a new Ford." Do you suppose there'd be any quibbling about it? Would people try to reason the thing away and claim that it is not essential- "you do not have to do that, just believe in Ford and that is all that's necessary." No, you would not hear any quibbling about it. If you should hear that broadcast tonight from the Ford Motor Company, there'd be the biggest baptizing in Birmingham before daylight that you ever heard of. You would not be able to keep people knocked out of the river or the creeks with a club; and among the first to get wet would be my friend, Elder Tingley. (Laughter).

(Mr. Tingley laughingly nods, and says "I expect that's right.")

He says he expects that's right! If a Ford were involved, Elder Tingley would not try to reason it away! But if salvation is involved, he tries to get around it. Is salvation worth as much as a new Ford, Tingley? Do you think more of a new Ford than you do salvation? You said you'd do it if it were a Ford involved. You would not try to reason it away; you'd accept it; you'd do it. You'd be one of the first men to get wet; but where the salvation of the soul

is involved he tries to reason the thing out and get it entirely out of the way. He knows if he tried to do that with a new Ford, somebody else would get the new Ford, and he'd be left out, you see. I am saying if it were expressed in material values, there'd be little quibbling about it. Why quibble, then, when salvation is the thing involved, and the Lord said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"?

We pass from that to my fourth argument, which is based upon the statement made by the apostle Peter in Acts 2:38. Men had just inquired, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter had stood there in the presence of the multitude of people who had been guilty of crucifying the Lord of glory. He told them of the fact that they had crucified him—that their hands were dripping, as it were, with the innocent blood of the Son of God. They were pricked to their hearts. They cried out and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" What were they wanting to know? Why, they realized they stood condemned in sin; the guilt of sin was upon them. They had crucified Jesus Christ. They desired to be free from that condemnation. So they inquired, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter said in Acts 2:38, "Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now notice that. He laid down two conditions as essential to remission of sins. He did not merely say, "Repent," but he said, "Repent and do something else." He said, "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins." He made both the conditions of repentance and baptism necessary to the promise offered—the remission of sins. Both of them were for the remission of sins or in order that the remission of sins might be obtained.

That expression is used on other occasions. For example, in Matthew 26:28, Jesus, referring to his blood, said it was shed "for the remission of sins." I wonder if that meant the Lord shed his blood because sins were already remitted. You have the same expression there, both in the Greek and in the English that we have in Acts 2:38— "for the remission of sins." Jesus shed His blood "for the remission of sins." But we are told to be baptized "for the remission of sins." If, when Jesus shed his blood for the remission of sins, that does not mean that remission was already obtained but that remission of sins might be obtained, then when Peter said be baptized for the remission of sins, it means the same thing.

And so he told men to be baptized that remission of sins might be obtained. That's what we mean by salvation from alien sins for the penitent believer. Peter shows it here to be a condition of salvation with which men must comply in order to get the remission of their sins.

In Mark 1:4 we have even the same thing with reference to John's baptism. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Now you have the expression three times: Mark 1:4 says, "For the remission of sins;" Acts 2:38 says he baptized for the the remission of sins." Matt. 26:28 says Jesus' blood was shed "for the remission of sins." You have this same expression in all three of the passages. If Jesus did not shed his blood because sins had been remitted already, then John did not baptize because their sins were remitted. If it means in order to obtain in one case, it means the same in the others. We have the same identical expression. I insist the language of the apostle Peter proves beyond doubt the truthfulness of my proposition.

Then we find, too, a number of translations may be referred to to give us that expression. I want to read just a few of them briefly on the statement in Acts 2:38— "For the remission of sins."

The King James Version reads, "For the remission of sins."

The Catholic Revised Version reads, "For the forgiveness of your sins."

John Wesley's translation, "For the remission of sins."

Moffatt's translation, "For the remission of sins."

Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott, "For the forgiveness of your sins."

Weymouth's translation, "For the remission of your sins."

20th Century translation, "For the forgiveness of your sins."

The Revised Standard Version, a production that appeared in 1946, "For the forgiveness of your sins."

The American Bible Union, "Unto remission of sins."

American Revised Version, "Unto the remission of sins."

Charles Foster Kent's translation, "That your sins may be forgiven."

Goodspeed's translation, "In order to have your sins forgiven."

Charles B. Williams' translation, "That you may have your sins forgiven."

Thayer, the great Greek-English Lexicographer, renders this passage, "To obtain the forgiveness of sins."

That's the language of the apostle Peter in Acts 2 :38, "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins"-in order to have your sins forgiven, to obtain remission of sins; unto the remissions of sins.

Just here I want to say a little about the word "unto" in that connection. Let me read from the Revised Version. "Baptized unto the remission of sins." We find that word "unto" used a number of times. Romans 10 :10-Paul informs us, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." First the belief and the righteousness follows-"unto righteousness." In Acts 11:18, God hath unto the Gentiles granted "repentance unto life." First the repentance, and that followed by life. Romans 10:10 "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." That shows the confession first, and then the salvation. 1 Peter 1:3-the Lord "hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." "Begotten unto a lively hope." First the begetting, and then the lively hope. We have the same thing in Acts 2:38 in the Revised Version, "Baptized unto the remission of sins." First the baptism, and then the remission of sins to follow.

Then I pass on to my next argument which is based upon the statement made by the apostle Peter in 1 Peter 3:21, "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." Now I want you to note this language in 1 Pet. 3.21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." I have written on the board here, but I know you cannot see it from all parts of the audience:

Baptism doth now save us.

Baptism doth not save us.

"Baptism doth now save us." That's what Peter said in 1 Pet. 3:21. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Peter says baptism now saves us! He did not say it is the only thing-certainly not. But he did say that "Baptism doth now save us." You would not have to change that much to make it read like my opponent would like for it to read. Not a very great change would be necessary; just one letter, that's all. Just erase that "w" from the little word "now" and put a "t" there. You have exactly what friend Tingley is preaching. "Baptism doth not save us." That's all the change you would have to make. Just change the "w" to the "t" and you would have it. Peter said, "Baptism doth now save us."

I heard one time of a preacher discussing this matter with a certain lady, and she said,

“My Bible does not read that way.” He said, “Oh yes, it does.” She said, “No, it doesn’t.” He said, “I know it does.” She said, “I know it doesn’t.” She went and got her book and brought it, opened it to the passage, and sure enough it didn’t. She had taken the scissors and cut it out. If you have not taken your scissors and cut it out, it reads that way in your Bible. 1 Pet. 3:21- “Baptism doth also now save us.” I am going to ask my opponent, friend Tingley, to erase from the board the statement that he does not believe. They are not the same. One says, “Baptism doth now save us.” The other says, “Baptism doth not save us.” I challenge him to erase from the board the statement that he does not believe. Will you do it, Tingley? (Mr. Tingley: “Yes.”) He says he will do it. All right. Tingley says he will do it. We are going to see how he lives up to his promise now. We want him to erase from the board the statement that he does not believe. We will await further developments and the activity along that line.

I come now to Galatians 3:26-27. Here we are told that you “are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Now notice that. “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Let’s get the twenty-sixth verse which I just quoted in connection with it. “Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus . . . for.” That little word “for” comes from an original word “gar” which means “the cause” or to “introduce the reason.” That’s the way lexicographers define this term. “You are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for”-the reason is, “as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” This shows that the man who has not been baptized into Christ is not a child of God by faith. Only those who have been baptized into Christ have the reason assigned. The reason introduced by the apostle Paul is that you are God’s children “because you have been baptized into Christ.” You are God’s children by faith because you have thus been baptized. If you have not been baptized into Christ, then this statement certainly shows beyond doubt that you are not the children of God by faith.

You know too, that every affirmative has a negative. I want to read verses 26 to 29 and let you see the negative of that idea there. Gal. 3, beginning with verse 26, and it reads this way, “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Now let’s see what the negative of that would be. “Ye are not all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have not been baptized into Christ have not put on Christ. There is Jew and Greek, there is bond and free, there is male and female: for ye are not all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be not Christ’s, then ye are not Abraham’s seed, nor heirs according to the promise.” That shows the man who has not been baptized into Christ is not Abraham’s seed; and he is not an heir according to the promise. He has not put on Christ; and he is not a child of God. I am willing to fight it out upon those passages tonight. But we have others.

Next I call your attention to the statement made in the conversion of Saul.

(Mr. Nichols: You have two minutes.)

Mr. Porter: Well, I’ll get this much of it. In Acts 9:6, when Saul had cried, “Lord what wilt thou have me do?”- the Lord said, “You go into the city and there it shall be told thee what thou must do.” It was not what he might do if he wanted to, but “you shall be told what you must do.” I am going to ask my friend Tingley, since my time is just about up now, to tell me when he comes to the stand what Jesus told Saul to do. What was Saul told

that he must do when he got to the city of Damascus? He would there be told something that he must do. I want friend Tingley to tell me what it was that was told him over there that he must do. I shall wait for him to tell that; and if he does not tell it, then I will tell you myself when the proper time comes. I am insisting that he tell us just what it was that Saul was told when he was told something that he must do. The Lord said, "Thou shalt be told what thou must do." I am certain that there was something told him over there that was essential; something that was necessary; something that he needed to know; something the Lord wanted him to do. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

TINGLEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE - THIRD NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very happy to stand in the defense of the truth. The statement has been made very clearly and I accept the definition of my worthy opponent in regard to the subject we are debating. "The Scriptures Teach that Water Baptism to a Penitent Believer of the Gospel is Essential to Salvation from Alien Sins."

I have some questions tonight that I want to ask my worthy opponent that are not sidestepping but are definitely questions in regard to the issue. They are:

- (1) Do you believe that if a man believes, repents and is baptized, he shall be saved?
- (2) Can such a believer who is saved so sin as to be lost?
- (3) Can he be restored?
- (4) Does he have to be baptized again?
- (5) Are Methodists, Presbyterians and all pedo-Baptists lost and will they go to hell?
- (6) Are Moody, Finney, Sankey, Billy Sunday, Wesley, Whitfield, Luther and all have not been baptized by immersion lost and in hell?
- (7) What baptism saves-church of Christ baptism, Missionary Baptist baptism or Christian and Missionary Alliance Baptism?
- (8) Will you accept one whom I have baptized without rebaptizing them?
- (9) If baptism is essential to salvation then are babies lost?
- (10) Are those baptized by the Missionary Baptist and Christian and Missionary Alliance saved or doomed?
- (11) Show me one scripture which states that a man is lost if he is not baptized.
- (12) Give me a scripture which states that a man who repents and believes on his deathbed and can not be baptized is lost.
- (13) A most important question: I want my opponent to tell this crowd whether or not it is true that he believes that a person has no chance to be saved who is not baptized in his particular church of Christ.
- (14) I challenge my opponent to tell this audience why Paul did not baptize a new convert every time he believed.

These questions as you can see are very pertinent for we are dealing not with the teaching of the Word, but with an ancient controversy which has made Roman Catholicism what Roman Catholicism is. It builds bigotry, prejudice; religious organizations that separate themselves from every other religious organization; set up states and institutions of their own; separate from every other one; demand that they and they alone have the only prerogative of seeing men brought to God by their organization.

We will deal first with the first Scripture that he dealt with. I shall not follow him up

blind alleys nor will I try to lead him in blind alleys; but I will meet him head on in the face of every single scripture in the Bible that any intelligent man can read or study that teaches the doctrine that my worthy opponent is advocating.

The scripture which he first read was Mark 16:16. He compared an automobile to salvation. I would answer my worthy opponent, for he asked me to answer you, I have been baptized by immersion-by immersion! I believe in it with all my heart. I probably baptize as many, perhaps more, than any other minister in the city not excepting the church of Christ ministers. That I have done consistently for eighteen years. I believe in it. I was baptized by one who himself had been baptized by immersion. It may seem funny to compare the destiny of a man's soul and salvation with a Ford. Salvation has no comparison to a new Ford. We dare not quibble about these things.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Why is it he insists on only reading part of the verse? Why is it he does not read all this portion of Scripture. He rang the changes on that several times but did he ring the changes on "BUT he that believeth not shall be damned?" It does not say, "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned." Does it not look reasonable that if baptism were essential to salvation that it would have been made plain that damnation is conditioned on unbelief and disobedience to the ordinances of baptism? My worthy opponent may fail to quote all the passage but it's there, "BUT" . . . why will a man be damned? By not being baptized? Lest some would twist and wrest the Scriptures, God said, the thing that damns a man is not believing! Never once, does He suggest that lack of baptism mean damnation.

The first point to settle is: What does "shall be saved" mean? Does it mean that a baptized believer shall be saved in heaven? It does not say a baptized believer shall be saved if he does not backslide, but it does say, he "Shall be saved." Does my friend accept that? I will.

Who is to be baptized? The believer. What is the condition of the believer?

(1) "He shall not perish," according to John 3:14-15-16. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so shall the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

(2) The believer is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God."

(3) The believer hath everlasting life. John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

(4) What is the condition of the believer? "He has passed from death unto life." John 5:24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

(5) He is justified. Romans 5:1- "Therefore being justified by faith, ye have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

(6) His soul is saved. The believer who is to be baptized- his soul is saved. 1 Peter 1:9, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your soul."

(7) He is born of God. 1 John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Now is that man to be baptized? Yes. Why of course he "shall be saved." Does my opponent accept that position? Jesus Christ taught it, and the believer is saved!

He is saved by faith!

Now if you add baptism to his religious life, he is still saved. Being saved by faith, baptism does not undo what faith has already done so “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” We believe that only believers should be baptized. All believers should be baptized. By it they enjoy the rights and privileges of the Christian life; by it they are manifested as children of God. By it they show forth the symbol of the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord. Baptism is a picture of their salvation—a likeness of it and the atoning work of Christ whereby it is accomplished—but baptism itself does not give salvation and Jesus never once intimated such a thing. The man who is saved by faith proceeds at once to lovingly obey his Lord and to be baptized. Such a man will be saved, not because baptism helps to perfect salvation; but because he has faith that saves him and that leads him to do all that His Lord commands him to do.

“He that entereth a train and is seated shall reach Atlanta.” “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Now suppose a man enters a train but does not take a seat. Will he not go to Atlanta anyhow if that train goes there? The taking of the seat involves his comfort but does not involve his going to Atlanta. So baptism relates to the privileges of the Christian life and does not secure such a life. The believer has entered the gospel train and whether he takes a seat or not, he will reach heaven if the train does.

Again, note the language, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be damned.” The contrast is between salvation and damnation. To what point of time does that damnation look? Eventually to the future. Then to what period does its word of contrast look? Also to the future. Then salvation means salvation in heaven. Does my worthy opponent believe that “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” in heaven? Of course my opponent does not believe that.

All the absolute essentials to salvation are stated in God’s Word both negatively and affirmatively. For instance, (1) repentance unto life—the positive; negative, “Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.” (2) “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,” positive; negative, “he that believeth not shall not see life.” (3) Positive, “the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin”; negative, “without the shedding of blood there is no remission.” (4) Positive, “He that loveth is born of God”; negative, “he that loveth not, let him be accursed.” He that (believeth) is baptized shall be saved—but in all the sixty-six books of the Bible there is not one word that says that he that isn’t baptized shall be damned. I defy my opponent to trot out one Scripture that says “He that is not baptized shall be damned.”

Now watch my worthy opponent. He will come back and harp on Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38 and will not answer these questions I have advanced and will not touch a large number of the Scriptures that I am going to quote. I was down to see Governor Graves one time and he had some pet squirrels in a cage. In that squirrel cage was a little squirrel and four or five steps. That little squirrel started around in that squirrel cage. He made that thing jiggle and jiggle. I never saw so much effort and so much wind and so much work and no body getting anywhere in my life. When the squirrel stopped, he was exactly where he started. My worthy opponent will get on these steps that you have heard him outline in his first speech—which was a very good speech. He outlined his points well. I appreciate him giving me this material)—From now on—tonight and tomorrow night—he will run, hop, skip and jump and sweat and steam and work himself into a lather and all it will be will be on the same thing. And we will be exactly no place—if we follow my worthy opponent in his final speech tomorrow night—any farther than we are after his first speech tonight.

Now, J. W. McGarvey, one of the greatest preachers and authorities in the church of Christ in the past generation, he and every scholar on earth will tell you that Mark 16 from the ninth verse to the end of the chapter-the authorities in the church of Christ and every other scholar and your own Bible will have brackets around it-will tell you that that portion is not in the oldest and most reliable manuscripts.

Now since my worthy opponent takes this scripture in showing that you must be baptized to be saved he must take the following. Let me read: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned." If this applies in this age of the Holy Ghost which began according to my opponent at Pentecost this other is also for this whole age and "these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils. They shall speak with new tongues." I am going to ask my worthy opponent (1) whether he believes in speaking tongues. If he wants to take just part of the scripture let him cut out the part,he does not want. Let him do it honestly. My friends, my worthy opponent rejects the balance of Mark. He will argue around it in every possible way. I want my worthy opponent to tell you whether he believes in speaking in tongues. If one is true, the other is true.

The next verse says, "They shall take up serpents and if they drink any deadly thing it will not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." I want to ask my worthy opponent (2) to tell this crowd whether or not he will accept fully the scriptures and handles snakes. I want to ask him (3) if he believes in drinking poison. Now you can not take part of the scripture and not take all of it. I want him to explain that. Why does my worthy opponent wrest this verse from its context-only quoting part of the verse? Why is it that the churches of Christ so conveniently forget the verse that immediately precedes Mark 16:16, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And the church of Christ has the fewest missionaries and do the least missionary work; and it professes to believe that only by the preaching of the Word can men be saved; and yet it is the most lax in teaching the word around the world of any and all denominations in America! Let me ask my worthy opponent (4) to explain why he does not follow the fifteenth verse as well.. He places such great emphasis on the sixteenth and forgets to remember the fifteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth.

Listen my friends, are you going into all the world? My worthy opponent cuts out part of the scripture. He does not quote the whole verse. Is that fair? By this method I could prove by the Bible that there is no God. The Bible says so in plain unmistakable terms according to the logical procedure of my worthy opponent. But the portion in front of it, part of the same verse, says "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." And all the fools are not dead yet.

Keep this in mind. Here's one Scripture which says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." This is not in the oldest manuscripts and it is the only Scripture where baptism is thus placed with belief and the next word says, "He that believeth not shall be damned" and does not mention baptism; therefore my worthy opponent tells you salvation depends on baptism. and he bases it on doubtful authority.

Mark 16:16 does not show that baptism is essential to salvation. It does not read, "He that believeth and is not baptized shall be damned." This plainly tells the believer this is the condition of salvation-believing. He might as well add to believing other things such as "He that believeth and is baptized" takes the Lord's supper, attends church, brings his tithe shall be saved. That would still be true. Add all you want. It would not take a solitary

thing away from the truth but lest people misunderstand, God said, "Wait a minute. It's a failure to believe that damns the man." Yes sir, I will make you that statement. It does not say the things that come after faith are necessary to salvation. The very fact that it says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," shows the one, prime essential.

Listen, if baptism is necessary to the soul's salvation do you think a great God would have left it out and have made the mistake of not saying, "He that believeth not and it not baptized shall be damned"? Our God loves men too much for that. Now my opponent said very plainly that a man-a believer-has to be baptized to be saved or that baptism is necessary to salvation. That's what he said. Now let's stop right there a moment. My opponent says that the penitent believer before he can be saved has to be baptized. The Roman Catholic Catechisms of Christian Doctrine, No. 1, says-they give it to their children, compel them to study it-in this Catechism you can find identically the same phrases and words that my worthy opponent uses when he says that a man has to be baptized in order to be saved. I want to get that clearly before us so that we will not have any dispute about what baptism means. Quoting now. (1) "Subject: Baptism. What is baptism? Baptism is a sacrament which cleanses us from original sin and makes us children of God and the church." (2) (Roman Catholics) "Is baptism necessary to salvation? Baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation."

I want to ask my opponent a question. He makes the church and the kingdom synonymous and says they began at Pentecost and will end at the coming of Christ. My worthy opponent tells you that unless you are baptised into the church of Christ you are not going to be saved. Dismissing that phrase there are, my friends, some forty million people who believe in other modes than immersion-and I think every one of them ought to be baptized as an act of obedience by immersion; not in order to be saved but because they are saved! My worthy opponent declares that faith saves when it obeys the command of Jesus. That settles it. Even granting that my worthy opponent is right when he makes that statement, let's concede for argument's sake the following now: Faith obeys before baptism, because to confess Jesus is obedience. My opponent will concede that when one obeys, he confesses Jesus Christ. My opponent may say we must obey all the commands of faith to save. Well then what will follow ? It follows-that if one must obey all the commands-that one is not saved even when he is baptized because there are many commands beside baptism. That's not all. If one must lead a perfect life before baptism saves him, my opponent's position- mark my word: my worthy opponent will probably not refer to this again (I know a multitude of good Methodists and Presbyterians. Their word would be accepted in any court and they have never been baptized by immersion. So would millions of others. According to the statement of my opponent and the Roman Catholics these forty million good Methodists and Presbyterians are bound for hell because my opponent has not baptized them)-baptism is necessary to salvation, he says. That's what the word essential means and I'm sure my worthy opponent will stand by his word. Now the burden is upon him.

It means, my friends, that Dwight L. Moody who was never immersed and was one of the world's greatest evangelists and soul winners-it means that Dwight L. Moody is in hell if my opponent is right in this debate. It means that John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, is in hell if my opponent is right. It means that John G. Paton, that great Presbyterian missionary to the New Hebrides where they ate men for breakfast, dinner and supper-he changed the whole country from cannibalism to Christianity-it means he is in hell if my opponent is right. It means that Dr. James M. Gray, head of the Moody Bible Institute for so

many years, is now in hell. He was never immersed. If baptism is essential to salvation, then babies are lost for they go astray speaking lies as soon as they are born, says Psalms 58:3. It means every soul who repents and turns to God on his death bed is lost if my opponent is right. It means that uncounted millions of saints of God who have been saved by the grace of God and have gone their way home to heaven from dying beds- that just because they have not been baptized according to my friend's plan-they're in hell now! Ladies and Gentlemen, God is not a God of vindictive and horrible judgement. Our God is a God who makes the way so plain that a wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein.

Now the second scripture my opponent introduced was Acts 2:38. Will my opponent take Acts 2:38? Again he deliberately did not read the rest of Acts 2:38. He only read part of it. I will show you time after time that his entire argument is always built on little phrases lifted out of their setting. You put it into its place and it falls to pieces. The rest of the verse reads, "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost for the promise is unto you and to your children"-all Jews following you -"and to all afar off"-a scriptural term describing the Gentiles. For two nights my worthy opponent has been arguing that there is no direct influence of the Holy Spirit and now he accepts the first half of Acts 2:38 and does not even read the last half of it. I want him to read all the scripture in its context.

Now coming to this: I am going to be perfectly frank and tell you that this is one scripture where it may mean either way. Years ago I said, "God I want to be brutally honest so I can meet you without shame." Now I hope my worthy opponent will concede that. Let me read. "Then Peter said unto 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 the whole thing hangs on a little preposition. The preposition is "eis"-e-i-s. "For" "Into" "Unto" "With reference to." Every Greek scholar knows that it means two ways-one of two ways-and a possibility of a third way. First, in order to- that is necessary, essential for a definite purpose; or with reference to, the basis of, the ground of. It can mean two things:

(1) in order to; (2) or, with reference to, or on the basis of. I am going to be fair and say that it might mean either way. But this is not the only scripture on baptism. Peter tells us that no scripture is of any private interpretation, that is, it must be interpreted in the light of all the rest of the scripture. I will show you what I mean by saying the preposition "eis" may mean and does mean here "on account of" taking for example Matthew 26:28 "For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Therefore "eis" means in the first case "in order to," for Christ did not shed His blood on account of remission of sins but remission of sins comes because His blood was shed therefore this is the first meaning of the preposition. You take this next statement. I will read this. I want you to make it very plain-Matthew 10 :41, "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward. He that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward." Now here is the second meaning: "In the name of a prophet" can not mean in order to a prophet but the reward comes on account of or because of the prophet.

I thank you.

PORTER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE - THIRD NIGHT

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I

never felt better nor had less to do in my life than I have now facing me with respect to the speech which my opponent has just made. That was certainly a very fine appeal for prejudice and sympathy. Whenever a man finds himself cornered on a proposition and finds he can not meet the issue, then he begins to plead for sympathy and to stir up prejudice against his opponent by claiming he's going to send somebody to hell.

Well, the fact is there is only one theory that might be proclaimed that would not send somebody to hell and cause somebody to have prejudice against the advocate of it, and that's the theory of Universalism-that everybody is going to be saved. If that is what he wants in order to please everybody and keep everybody in a good humor, why, then, that's the thing that he should preach. Suppose that what I am preaching does send somebody to hell-that is, if it is true, somebody goes to hell who has not obeyed it. Would that make it not true because somebody goes to hell? How about that which my opponent preaches? Are we going to determine the truthfulness of a thing by whether it sends somebody to hell or by what the Bible says? What's the criterion? What's the standard, anyway, by which we are to judge this thing-whether somebody goes to hell as a result of it or whether the Bible teaches it?

According to the position of my friend Tingley tonight, there are millions going to hell who do not accept his doctrine, because, he says, "You must believe or you will go to hell." There are millions of people living now who do not believe, and they are good people, and their word would be accepted in courts, too. He has referred to Methodists having their word accepted in court, and all of that, and said, "According to what you preach, you send them to hell". There are men who do not believe in Christ whose word would be accepted in court, and whose word is a word of honor, and could be depended upon; but they do not believe in Christ. His theory sends them to hell. Well, if that means anything against me, it means just as much against him. If he wants to create prejudice instead of meeting the argument, that's his privilege; but I'm here to tell you what the Bible says.

I was amused at how my opponent met those arguments "head on". You know he said, concerning scriptures I introduced, he was going to meet them "head on"-he was not going to side-step any of them or go around them. He said, "I'll just meet every one of them head on." And when he made his lunge at them he missed the locomotive entirely and hit the coal tender, for he missed completely the very first argument I made-did not even refer to it.

My friend said the first argument was Mark 16:16. Everybody in this audience knows that my first argument was 1 Cor. 1:12-13, in which men said, "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." I challenge my opponent to come up and explain it and face it and tell us something about it. He did just like all the rest of them I have ever met have done. He saw the handwriting on the wall and passed it by. Men must be baptized in the name of Paul, and Paul must be crucified for them, in order to belong to Paul. Apollos must be crucified for men, and they must be baptized in his name, in order to belong to Apollos. Cephas must be crucified for men, and they must be baptized in the name of Cephas, in order to belong to Cephas. And Christ must be crucified for men, and they must be baptized in His name, in order to belong to Christ. Elder Tingley, didn't you hear that argument when I made it? Were you asleep when I made that? You said you were going to meet this thing "head on", and that was the very "head," and you missed it completely. He did not get within eleven hundred miles of it-didn't even mention it. Yet he was going to meet them "head on!" He was afraid of a head on collision, it looks like; so he side-stepped that one. And out of all the arguments I introduced, my opponent mentioned

two of them. That's all! Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38 are the only two that he even referred to during his thirty minute speech.

He was talking about a man running around in a squirrel cage. I wonder where he's going. Why, he said, "In that squirrel cage there were little steps, and the squirrel goes around and around and around." And these scriptures I have introduced on baptism are the steps in the squirrel cage. Well, bless your life, the last two nights of this debate he will not even have any steps to go in his squirrel cage, because he is going to affirm that salvation is by faith alone, and he can't even find one scripture that says anything that even resembles it. He will not have any steps for his squirrel cage. In fact, he will not even have any cage except that one he is in as a result of the arguments he has made, and he is going to stay in that one.

Now, then, he resolved a good long while ago that he was going to be brutally honest. I suppose he thinks I'm honestly brutal. (Laughter.) But I'm going to attend to him just the same and let him think what he pleases about it.

Now, we come to his questions. I was amused at my friend. Last night and night before he complained about my asking questions; and he said that when men ask question that shows that they are in desperation. Wonder where he is tonight! (Laughter.) "They are in desperation when they begin to ask a lot of questions." He asked more on this one paper than I asked on both of mine in two nights. Yet, when I asked them I was in desperation! I wonder where he is. What prompted him to ask them? Well, we are going to answer them.

"Do you believe that if a man believes, repents and is baptized, he shall be saved?" Yes the salvation mentioned in my proposition.

Second. "Can such a believer who is saved so sin as to be lost?" Yes. Will you say he can not? Let my friend tell you tonight if he believes that a man can not so sin as to be lost. If a child of God dies drunk, will he go to heaven or hell? Now, you come up here and tell us. We will put him on the spot on that since he has introduced it.

"How can he be restored?" By meeting the requirements of the gospel. Acts 8:22.

Next: "Does he have to be baptized again?" No.

Next: "Are Methodists, Presbyterians and Pedo-Baptists lost and will they go to hell?" Another appeal for prejudice. Everybody who fails to obey the gospel of Jesus Christ will be lost, whether that is his Methodists, Baptists, Glenn V. Tingley, W. Curtis Porter or anybody else! We are depending upon the word of God for our proof. We are not resorting to the idea of how many will go to hell in order to see whether a proposition is true or not, but what the Bible says about it. That's our standard. When men can not meet the argument they resort to these things.

"Are Moody, Finney, Sankey, Billy Sunday, Wesley, Whitfield, Luther and all who have not been baptized by immersion lost and in hell?" The same answer as the preceding one. You could have put them both in one question.

"What baptism saves, the Church of Christ, Baptist or Christian and Missionary Alliance?" The baptism of the New Testament.

"Will you accept one whom I have baptized without rebaptizing him?" Not if you baptize him according to what you preach.

Next: "If baptism is essential to salvation, then are babies lost?" No! You remember, my friends, just before my opponent sat down he said, "Babies are lost if baptism is necessary to salvation." We are going to hand it back to him and just let him take the other end of it. My opponent says that faith is necessary to salvation. Then babies are lost,

because they can not believe; and Tingley is in the same hole where he thought he had me. (Laughter.) Tingley says, "Babies are lost." Now, all you mothers who are thinking about the theory of Porter sending somebody to hell, just think about the theory of Tingley sending babies to hell because they can not believe. I do not believe they need any faith, baptism or anything else to go to heaven, because I do not believe they are lost to start with. But Tingley does. He sends babies to hell, by his theory, because they are in sin; they are little depraved devils and can not be saved because they can not believe. Now, that's the doctrine of Glenn V. Tingley. If you want to swallow it-line, hook, sinker and all-it's your privilege. My appetite does not run that way.

"Are those baptized by a Missionary Baptist or Christian and Missionary Alliance saved or doomed?" The administrator is not the thing that determines whether the baptism is scriptural, but if they are baptized according to what you preach, that is not New Testament baptism. That's all.

Again: "Show me one scripture which states that a man is lost if he is not baptized?" Luke 7:30 says those who rejected John's baptism rejected the counsel of God; and 2 Thess. 1:7-9 says those who obey not the gospel will be punished with everlasting destruction. All right.

"Give me a scripture which states that a man who repents and believes on his death-bed and can not be baptized is lost." Well, I don't know of any passage that mentions any man on his death bed, but the scriptures show that a man must obey or be lost, whether he is on his death bed or wherever he is.

"A most important question I want my opponent to answer is to tell this crowd whether or not it is true that he believes that a person has no chance to be saved who is not baptized into his particular 'Church of Christ?'" I have no particular church of Christ nor one that isn't particular. I have no church at all. But men must obey the gospel of Jesus Christ, as given by the Lord Himself in Mark 16:16, or they can not be saved.

"I challenge my worthy opponent to tell this audience why Paul did not baptize a new convert every time he believed." Well in Acts 18:8 we are told that "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized." Paul baptized only a few of them. Somebody else baptized the rest. The record says many of them were. How do you know that none of them were baptized?

Now, then, back to his speech. He came to what he called the first scripture, Mark 16:16, but that was not the first. Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." He said, "Porter read only a part of it." I deny the allegation and charge the "alligator." (Laughter.) The record will show-and it's on these records right here-that I quoted the entire verse. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." That can be played back to anybody that may want to hear it; and you will find out that it is so-that I quoted the entire verse.

He said, "I have been baptized, and I believe in baptism with all my heart." Well, we'll see how much of his heart is involved as we go along. Baptism, after all, you remember, is revealed in the word. Of course, the word can not reach his heart anyway, he said last night. I wonder how he believes in baptism with all his heart if the word can not reach his heart. It's through the word that he finds out about baptism; it's the word that commands baptism; and faith comes by hearing the word; but the word can not reach his heart. So how's he going to believe it with his heart if the word never reaches his heart? Would you tell us about that, Mr. Tingley, in your next speech? "I'm dying to know!"

"But salvation here has no comparison with a Ford," he said. Well, I guess not. He put

the Ford above salvation, because he would do what Henry Ford would say about being baptized to get a Ford; but he will not do what the Lord said to get salvation. If Ford would say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall get a new Ford," he says, "I would do that. Yes, sir." He said, "I would be one of the first men to get wet because I'm concerned about a new Ford." But when the Lord said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," he said, "Oh well, that's all right; I'll get the salvation in spite of whether I'm baptized or not. If I am baptized, it will not keep me from getting the salvation, but I'll get it anyway." But, of course, he would know that Ford would not give the Ford to him unless he met all of the requirements. He would not take a chance on missing the Ford, you see; but he would take a chance on missing salvation. So there's no comparison between the Ford and salvation. I believe that salvation is greater and worth a greater effort than a Ford. Elder Tingley would do more to get the Ford than he would salvation! So it's just a matter of which you put on the upper plane. That's all.

But the rest of the verse says, "He that believeth not shall be damned." It did not say, "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned." No. I know it did not. If it had, it would have been silly. Suppose that some of you teachers who have a class in school, would give your class this statement tomorrow: "He that eats food and digests it shall have health." You require the class to bring the negative of that on the following day. The next day Johnnie comes back with this: "He that eats food and digests it shall have health; but he that eats no food and does not digest it shall starve." I wonder what kind of grade little Johnnie would get on that? What kind of grade would you give him, Elder Tingley, if you were his teacher? "He that eats food and digests it shall have health; he that eats no food and does not digest it shall starve!" What's the person going to get, Elder Tingley? Would you give him 100% on that? What kind of grade would you give him? Why, that's silly-the very idea of digesting food that you haven't eaten. Let me tell you, my friends, the man who has not believed can no more be scripturally baptized than a man can digest food that he has not eaten. Not any more. They are parallel. It takes both eating the food and the digesting the food to bring health; but eating no food alone will bring starvation; and you do not have to say, "And does not digest it." It takes both belief and baptism to bring the salvation; but unbelief alone will bring the damnation; and you do not have to say, "And is not baptized". It would be silly if you did. That's the way he hits it "head on," and when he hit it "head on," he hit it in a hard spot, didn't he?

But the scripture says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Now," he says, that does not say that he shall be saved if he does not backslide, but it says he shall be saved. Friend Tingley, why didn't you read the rest of the verse? "He that believeth not shall be damned." The "shall be damned" is just as forceful and just as emphatic as the "shall be saved." If the statement, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," means the man who does that will go to heaven in spite of everything-that he can not ever become an unbeliever and be lost, then, when the rest of the verse says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," that means he never can become a believer and be saved. One is just as emphatic, one is just as strong, as the other. "Shall be saved"- "Shall be damned." Do you believe the rest of it? The unbeliever shall be damned? And that means he never can be saved, that he is doomed forever? No chance of his becoming a believer, because it says, "He shall be damned." If "shall be saved" means saved in heaven, "shall be damned" means lost in hell!

Then he introduced a few scriptures on faith. John 3:16-Believe on the Lord that you may everlasting life. "No baptism there." Yes, and no prayer there either, Elder Tingley.

John 3:36- "He that believeth not shall not see life." And the American Revised Version reads, "He that obeyeth not shall not see life."

John 5:24 and Rom. 5:1- "Hath life and is justified." That's the believer, you see. And 1 Peter 1:9-the end of faith is salvation. All of these ascribe salvation to faith. Not a one of them says anything about faith only. That's the thing he will have to try to find the last two nights; and all those will come up for investigation again.

1 John 5:1-the believer is born of God. Yes, and 1 John 4:7 says, "He that loveth is born of God," and that is not faith alone. 1 John 2:29 says, "He that doeth righteousness is born of God." Are there three births-one by faith, another by love, and another by doing righteousness? Or does it take all of these to bring about the one birth ? Wonder if he will tell us?

He said, "All believers should be baptized to enjoy the privileges of the Christian life." Now, if you have not been baptized, you can not enjoy the privileges of the Christian life. Saved all right, a child of God, but you can not enjoy the privileges of a Christian life unless you are baptized! You should be baptized that you might enjoy those privileges. You can't do it unless you are baptized, according to my friend Tingley. Well, that's slipping some. He's scooting a little bit. He may get to the truth after awhile.

Then to his train proposition. "He that enters a train and sits down shall go to Atlanta." I want to put that on the board just here if I can in a minute. Here we have it: "Enters the train (marking "E" on board) and sits down (marking "SD" on board) and goes to Atlanta (marking "A" on board)." He that believeth (marking B on board) and is baptized (marking another B on board) shall be saved (marking S on board)."

(Blackboard)

Enters train-Sits down-Reaches Atlanta

Believeth-Is Baptized-~~Shall be Saved~~

He makes belief equal to entering the train; and being baptized equivalent to sitting down; reaching salvation equivalent to reaching Atlanta. Since the man who "enters the train" can "reach Atlanta" without "sitting down," so the man who "believes" can "reach salvation" without "being baptized." "Sitting down" is not necessary in "reaching Atlanta"; "being baptized," therefore, is not necessary in "reaching salvation." So we cross them out. (Marking "Sits down" and "Is baptized" off the board). Entering the train is the thing necessary to reach Atlanta. My friend, did you know that I could go to Atlanta without "entering the train?" Didn't you know that

I could go to Atlanta without entering a train ?" Why I could walk or go in an automobile. There are a dozen ways I could go to Atlanta without "entering a train." So "entering the train" is not essential to going to Atlanta. We'll cross that out (Marking off "Enters train"). And since faith is equivalent to it, we cross that out too (Crossing out "Believeth"). So we do not have to believe or be baptized either to get salvation, according to his illustration.

Then, we look at it from another angle. "He that enters the train and sits down shall reach Atlanta." The "sitting down" is not necessary. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The "baptism" is not necessary. But in order for it to fit my opponent's theory, since he says "He that believeth is already saved," it should say, "He that enters the train reaches Atlanta before he has time to sit down." (Laughter). "He that believeth is saved before he has time to be baptized." Is that so, Tingley ? That's your position, isn't it? "He that believeth is saved before he has time to be baptized." So "He that enters the train

is already in Atlanta before he has time to sit down.” (Laughter). Now, I know anybody can see that. You may not accept it, but you can see it. I’m just certain of that.

He comes, then, to the matter of verses 9 to 20-that all the scholars say that this is not in some of the oldest manuscripts. (Verses 9 to 20 of Mark 16). Friend Tingley, I want to ask you this question-I wish you would tell me in your next speech: Do you accept Mark 16:9-20 as the word of God? Put it down and tell me about it. Do you accept Mark 16:9-20 as the word of God? He said that’s not in some of the old manuscripts, but the very same manuscript that leaves it out leaves out the entire book of Revelation, where he goes to get his thousand year reign. It leaves out a lot of other parts, too, if that’s the way he is going to deal with it. So we wait to see what he will say about it. He’s a Fundamentalist, but here he is rejecting the scriptures; setting aside all of these closing verses of Mark 16: because he can not meet the issue. That’s the easiest way out of it-turn infidel and get rid of it.

Then, he was speaking about missionary work and talking about the Church of Christ being the most lax of all people in missionary work, which is required in Mark 16:15. Well, the fact is we do not advertise our missionary work, and friend Tingley knows nothing about it. We have one church today- the Broadway church in Lubbock, Texas- that is sponsoring forty missionaries to Europe! And \$160,000 is being spent in the effort. What do you know about what the Church of Christ is doing? Nothing! Just as you know nothing about what the Bible teaches on the plan of salvation.

Then, he said this theory that I am preaching is Roman Catholicism- “you must be baptized to be saved.” He said, “The Roman Catholics believe that.” Well, suppose they do. The Roman Catholics also believe that little babies are born depraved, just like you said awhile ago. And Roman Catholics also believe in a direct revelation, just like you have been preaching the past two nights. And Roman Catholics believe in working signs and miracles, just like you are claiming. And so I have three to your one. What difference does that make?

Then to Acts 2:38. Here he said again, “Porter did not read all of the verse.” If some of you want to go tomorrow and hear the record played, you can see whether I read all of the verse. “Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” He said, “You did not read the rest of it-”And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Yes, I did. The record will show it. And furthermore, Tingley is the man who rejects it because he says, “The man who repents and is baptized has already received the gift of the Holy Ghost.” That’s what he has been contending for the past two nights, but this says “ye shall receive it as a result of it.” So he’s the man who rejects the rest of the verse.

Then to the Greek word “eis.” He said, “Used to mean in order to and with reference to.” In Matt. 26:28 he says they would receive remission because of the sacrifice that Christ made. Yes, that’s true. And in Acts 2:38 they would receive the remission of sins because of the compliance with the condition of repentance and baptism. Now, my friend indicated that the little Greek word “eis” means “because of”. I want to ask you, Friend Tingley, is there a translation on earth that translates Acts 2:38 “because of” for the little Greek word “eis”? If so, I want to read it. I gave you some awhile ago that translate it “in order to obtain,” “that you may have,” and things of that kind.

I want to read the translation that says “because of.” If he has it, let him produce it. I want to see it.

And then again, “With reference to.” Yes, it sometimes means “with reference to,” but does “with reference to” mean you already have it ? Why, my brethren wrote me “with

reference to” this debate. That did not mean the debate was already over. Not at all. Some of you will go down tomorrow to talk to your employer “with reference to” your salary. That does not mean that he has paid you everything that you are ever going to get, because you talk to him with reference to it. “With reference to” does not mean “because of,” that you already have it; so that’s simply his assertion along that line.

That covers his speech, and if I have just a few more minutes I want to get back and call attention to some things . .

Mr. Nichols: About four minutes.

Mr. Porter: About four minutes. All right; that will be just fine. Back now to some of these arguments which I gave.

Remember 1 Cor. 1:12-13. Friend Tingley, that was the first on the list. Please do not forget it as you make the head on collision in your final speech. Let’s have something about it. Give your self a tangle with that. Butt right into it. A man must be baptized in the name of Paul to belong to Paul. He must be baptized in the name of Christ to belong to Christ. Let him meet it if he can-head on, or any other way.

Then, I gave you also the statement made in 1 Peter 3:21- “Baptism doth now save us.” And my friend says, “Baptism doth not save us.” I asked him: Will you erase from the board, when you come to your speech, the statement that you do not believe ? He promised definitely and faithfully and “brutally honestly” that he would erase from the board the statement that he did not believe. It’s still on there. I’m waiting for him to erase it.

(Blackboard)

Baptism doth now save us.

Baptism doth not save us.

Friend Tingley, Peter said, “Baptism doth now save us.” 1 Peter 3:21. You do not have to take my word for it. Go home tonight and get your Bibles. Turn to 1 Peter 3:21 and read it for yourself. “Baptism doth now save us.” My opponent says, “Baptism doth not save us.” I’m still calling upon him to erase from the board the statement that he does not believe. He has made us a promise that he will do it. It’s up to him to fulfill his promise.

I also gave Galatians 3 :26-27 about being baptized into Christ, and about men being the sons of God by faith, because they had been baptized into Christ. Not a word did my opponent say about it.

I gave Acts 9:6 where Saul was told, “You go to Damascus and there it shall be told you what you must do.” I pleaded with my opponent to tell me what was told Saul that he must do. He has not told us yet. If he does not tell us in the next speech, I will tell you tomorrow night. I am waiting for him to tell us. What was told Saul that he must do? It was something, the Lord said. “When you get to the city, it will be told thee what thou must do.” I am wondering what it is. You tell this audience what it was that was told him when he got to Damascus. Something that he must do. The Lord said it would be something; so we want to find out about it-just what it was that he must do.

And, thus, we see these passages stand. My friend has not disturbed them in the least. They are right here just as well as when we began and when I introduced them awhile ago in my first speech. “Baptism is for the remission of sins,” Peter says. Jesus said, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Peter said, “The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.” And Paul said, “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” And furthermore, that Christ must be crucified for

you, and you must be baptized in His name, in order to belong to Christ. Can a man belong to Christ and not be a Christian ? Can he be a Christian and not belong to Christ ? We want to know about it. Does a man get salvation and still not belong to Christ ? He can not get salvation until he is baptized in the name of Christ because he can not belong to Christ, he can not be of Christ, until he has been baptized in the name of Christ.

My friend predicted awhile ago that I would not answer his questions; that I would pass all his arguments by. I thought he had learned Porter better than that by this time. I am certainly not here to dodge anything that he introduces. In fact, there is not a sectarian preacher on earth that can give an argument in favor of his doctrine that I'm afraid to meet. And I'm here to meet everything that he introduces. And we're waiting for that "head on" collision with 1 Cor. 1:1-13.

Thank you.

TINGLEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE - THIRD NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have my Bible open at I Corinthians the first chapter. Again my worthy opponent does not read all of the scripture; he takes it completely out of its setting and does not read the balance of the scriptures in First Corinthians. Let me read it, all of it, the part he read and the part he didn't read. "For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." That is the portion he omitted-the last of it- "the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness but unto us which are saved it is the power of God."

This is the first time that I have ever had an opponent try to prepare the way for that which my worthy opponent does not want to answer at all. Why did Paul positively say God sent him not to baptize but to preach? Note please, in this division that was in the church of Corinth various ones were saying: we belong to the school of Peter, we follow Paul, we follow Apollos and others saying, "Well we are just following Christ." Then the Apostle Paul says, "Is Christ divided? Is there any division in Christ. All ought to belong to Christ. Was Paul crucified for you? were you baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God I baptized none of you."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, why was it the Apostle Paul did not baptize but very few? You say well perhaps Paul was not the one that led them to Christ, but in I Corinthians 4:15 he says for "in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." The word translated "begotten" is the same word translated "born" in John 3:5 and in other places. It's the word that means the new birth! Paul said, "I have begotten you through the gospel" and then he says of these he had begotten, "I thank God I baptized none of you but a few, for my mission is not to baptize my mission is to preach the gospel."

"My worthy opponent said last night he was a preacher following in the footsteps of Paul, preaching the gospel of Christ. Then my worthy opponent is sent not to baptize but

to preach the gospel and he ought to thank God he doesn't baptize but a very few-if he is going to follow this method of reason. Now how is it that he begot all of them, caused all of them to be born again when he did not baptize them. If baptism is necessary to the new birth, and Paul begot them or caused all of them to be born again, then he would be under necessity of baptizing all of them, but he did not baptize any of them except a few mentioned. Therefore, it follows that baptism has no part with the new birth. It won't do any good to say that others baptized them. Paul said he begot all of them but he did not baptize all of them. He did not say that he helped others to beget them, he said he did it himself-all of them were born again by him-a very few were baptized by him and he thanked God that he didn't baptize the rest of them. Yet all of them were born again. My worthy opponent says, "You can't be born again unless you are baptized." Then Paul and my worthy opponent differ. Paul begot them, my worthy opponent says that to beget them they would have to be baptized. Paul says that he thanks God that he didn't baptize them.

What is the mission of the church? Paul says, "He sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel not with wisdom of words lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." The Apostle Paul was not sent to baptize, no minister is sent to baptize. He is sent to preach the gospel. We are preachers of grace. The Apostle Paul was sent not to baptize but to preach not with words of wisdom lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. The Apostle Paul was sent to preach the gospel of Christ. They would not accept him in the Church of Christ as a minister of that church today because he was not sent to baptize. You see, Paul was saved after Pentecost. Paul was saved before he was baptized. Paul was the Apostle of grace. Paul was the minister to the Gentiles. Yet the Apostle Paul says that Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the gospel. Here's the outstanding New Testament preacher who thanks God that he doesn't baptize many people. "Not with wisdom of words lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." It is belief in the Christ of Calvary and not in baptism that saves, it is belief not in the wisdom of words, not in baptism but in the atoning work of Jesus Christ that saves. That answers his first argument.

Back to Acts 2:38- "Then Peter says unto 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." I said it all hinged on a little preposition in Greek, "eis." It could be translated "in reference to," or "because of," or "in order to." Now, listen to this. Notice Matt. 12:41- "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas and, behold a greater than Jonas is here." They repented "eis"-in order to Jonas preaching? No. But because of the preaching of Jonas. Not "in order to" Jonas preaching, but "because of" Jonas preaching. There it is translated "because of." Here it is impossible to take "eis" other than on the basis of or occasion of the repenting. Notice again, Acts 2:38-two verbs. My worthy opponent knows grammar, so he knows the two verbs "repent and be baptized" are tied together by the conjunction. The word "repent" is in the second person, plural number, therefore it is a direct, unequivocal command-repent is a command in the Greek and the Greek "be baptized" is in the third person, singular number. Now get this further: the command to repent is in the second person, plural number-everybody should repent. And here when we come to be baptized it changes completely in the original, though the King James does not show the translation clearly in the change, it is changed to the third person, singular number. My worthy opponent knows grammar, he knows the verb must agree with the subject in number and person. Therefore the two verbs repent and be

baptized can not be joined to the same predicate, therefore I am going to read you just exactly as the original language gives it to us. I want you to get this and keep it in your mind. The word repent is second person plural, be baptized is third person singular. Therefore it means this, the correct rendering “ye”-plural; “all of you”-plural; “repent and let everyone of you”-individually, singular, “be baptized for the remission of sins.” Repentance is unto life and when we repent and we receive life then everyone who by repenting receives life, on the basis of life he receives by repentance is to be baptized. We will interpret it in the light of all the balance of scriptures on baptism. We can not take one scripture out of its setting and make it mean a certain thing contradictory to all the rest of the scriptures.

The Greek preposition eis “into” or “unto” according to Thayer’s Greek Lexicon-the highest authority in the world- says that it means “into” when the idea of place is meant, but when the idea of relation is meant it means “with reference to.” Most certainly in salvation the idea of relation is expressed. Take an illustration, Congress gives a man a medal for his bravery on the field of battle which has been the custom for a long time. Does Congress give him the medal in order for him to be brave in the future? No, because he has already been brave, so in the case of baptism. Repent for the remission of sin, a person is baptized because he is already saved. Now, for instance, simple labor, common ordinary day trade. A day laborer works for \$50 a week. He is paid for the work he has done, not in order to work in the future. He is paid because he has already worked. Therefore, a man is baptized because he has been saved not in order to be saved. A man is electrocuted for murder, not in order to commit murder, but because he has already committed murder. Same word-we are baptized “for remission sins.” Not “in order to be remitted or forgiven” but because they are remitted and forgiven.

Now in I Peter 3:21, he wants me to do some erasing. I will. I certainly will. I will be very happy to erase. (Erases bottom line from blackboard.)

(Blackboard)

Baptism doth now save us

Baptism doth not save us

(Line remaining on blackboard:)

Baptism doth now save us not

But again my worthy opponent leaves out the scriptures and the next word here is “Not”. (Adding word “Not” to line remaining on blackboard). Look in your Bible and see if it isn’t (Laughter). And on that hinges it all. He deliberately leaves it out. On purpose he leaves it out to confuse men and women who are hungry to know the way of God. “Baptism doth also save us not”- does what? I will read it to you, “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.” (Laughter). Now I would suggest to you that here’s one preacher you can’t back down. Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Church of Christ on the design of baptism; declares that baptism is emblematic. Here’s Campbell’s exact language, page 262 in Campbell on Baptism, and “Peter after having said,” quoting now, “that baptism doth save us immediately adds that it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God which proceeds from faith. But on the contrary Baptism promises us no other purification than that by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ.” Alexander Campbell

said, "Baptism promises us no other purification than that by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Which is emblematically represented by water on account of its resemblance to washing and cleansing." On page 273 of the same address, Campbell said, "The like figure corresponding where unto baptism doth also save us not indeed that there is anything in the mere element of water or in the form of placing the subject in it or in the formula used upon the occasion though both good taste and piety have come to do with the particulars but all its virtue and efficacy is in the faith and intelligence of him that receives it." "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also save us not the putting away the filth of the flesh-the washing of the outside by baptism." Not that. "But the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Now there my friend says is a baptism that saves based on Noah. Noah was saved a long time before the flood by the grace of God. Noah found favor-grace-in the eyes of the Lord. He didn't have to be saved by anybody's baptism. It states specifically "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." It's not an outside washing, it's not any external matter that saves a ~nan. The Holy Spirit put in the explanation lest people have ground for false doctrine that sends souls into hell. And the Holy Spirit makes it plain what he says. There is no cleansing, no separation, no forgiveness of sin in putting away the filth of the flesh by outward washing. That is what that phrase means-emblematic, ceremonial. Let the scriptures speak. Rom. 3:20 - "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

In II Corinthians 7:1-"Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filth and sin of the flesh." Therefore, baptism means not the putting away of sin, baptism is not the remission of sin it is not essential to salvation- "the like figure whereunto even the baptism does also doth save us" but how? Not in the forgiveness of your sins. How? He tells us what it is. He gives us the answer. Listen to this. What is the purpose of baptism? He says what it is not and, second, he gives the affirmative he tells what it is. What baptism is not and what it is. The very scripture my opponent tells us means that baptism is essential to salvation tells us these two things: (1) what baptism is not (2) and what it is. First it tells us negatively, and, second, affirmatively. Why does the Lord thus say it negatively and then affirmatively? Because he knew that beginning with the Roman Catholic Church and coming on down to the days of my opponent men would try to deny the blood atonement of Christ by adding baptism as necessary to salvation. Now we are getting down to the foundation of matters.

Coming back to first Peter my opponent wants me to answer first, baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh; that is, not the forgiveness of sin. Second, he gives the affirmative answer, "What does save us"? "But the answer of a good conscience toward God" to do what? "By the resurrection" "with reference to the resurrection"-that is what it means in the original Greek "with reference to the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now when I believed in Christ, walked down into the watery grave, was buried in the likeness of his death, raised in the likeness of His resurrection, my conscience tells me that I am satisfied. I've seen the Lord on the cross, I declared him to the world in the act of baptism-that's what it means-a figure of salvation and it is not salvation but it is wrought by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Let me again-notice please, again, "the like figure." Baptism is a figure "whereunto"-what figure? "Baptism." What is it a figure of? A figure of salvation unless some thus misinterpret it. It is not putting away filth of the flesh in the act of baptism that saves, it is

the fact that there is the answer of a good conscience and the power of salvation is the resurrection of Jesus Christ the living Lord. If I “confess with the mouth and believe in my heart that God hath raised him from the dead I shall be saved.” And I confess that faith in Christ by entering the waters of baptism. I am baptized, that is the outward washing, it is the figure of what has already transpired within me. “Baptism doth also now save us not the putting away.” I beg this audience, when you go home, read that carefully with your Bible opened over and over reading it asking God to show you the meaning of His word.

He asked me for Galatians 3:27. He said, “If you are not baptized you are not Christ’s.” Well, my worthy opponent again does not read the verses around it. He only reads in the direction that he can seem to make a point out of. I read before and after. Again he leaves out before. What does the verse just before say? “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” Now Jamison, Faucett and Brown says, “Ye did in that very act being baptized into Christ put on or clothe yourselves with Christ.” That’s what the Greek says.

When I was a lad in knee pants I wanted to get on long pants. There has always been a certain age-approximately at the age of 12-according to Roman custom it was at the age of 12. The ceremony went on in the Roman home and the boy put on a Toga Virilis-exactly, the word here. He put on a man’s clothes when he was a man. And the whole scriptures says, “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” That’s the way to become a child of God-by faith. After you become a child of God, what ought you to do? You ought to follow him in baptism and you ought to grow up and put on, grow up into Christ putting on Christ-the Toga Virilis. That Roman garment was a garment of a full grown man. Listen, Verse 24 and 25, “Wherefore the law was our school master to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come we are no longer under the law.” The law brings us up to Christ, the law leaves us in the presence of Christ. We have faith in Him and we become children of God by faith, and then we are baptized and grow up to know Jesus Christ, is exactly what it says. Now you have the responsibility-you who have been baptized-the responsibility of manhood in Christ. Labor for Him, rightly represent Him-that is a common phrase used in scripture. I Thessalonians 5:8- “But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation.” Ephesians 6:11- “Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.”

My worthy opponent is very excited about Paul. I am very thankful that I have time to get to Paul. Acts 22:6-10- the Apostle Paul was born again when he had faith in Jesus as Lord. That was 3 days before he was baptized. I will prove it beyond the shadow of a doubt. “And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell unto the ground, and I heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.” When was the Apostle Paul born again? When he saw the Lord and accepted Jesus as his Savior, believed on him as Lord or when he was baptized? Which? Now listen, that is the entire question of the debate. I hinge the debate on this one instance, as well as any of the others that we have dealt with. If Paul was saved when he saw the Lord then my worthy opponent’s position is untenable and the millions of unimmersed believers in Christ are saved and all who believed in Christ,

but who have not been baptized by the Church of Christ ministers are saved as well. (Incidentally, Ladies and Gentlemen, some of you Baptists try to join the Church of Christ and see if they will accept your baptism. My worthy opponent begs the question and will not face the facts and everyone of you know that's so.) But if the Apostle Paul was not saved until he was baptized then I am wrong. And everyone of the millions who believed in Christ but who have not been immersed are damned, and the only hope for any of us is to get into the Church of Christ and be baptized and have our sins washed away. Listen, the most competent person in the world to answer this question is the Apostle Paul and he answers that question completely and entirely in I Corinthians 15:8- "And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." Listen, when was Paul saved? Was he lost or saved between the seeing of the Lord and baptism? He believed and three days after he was baptized. I want my opponent to tell this audience during these three days time between the time he believed and the time he was baptized was he saved or lost ? My opponent said Paul heard and believed. Now listen, let him tell this audience, between the time he saw the Lord and believed and the time he was baptized was three days, let my opponent tell you what Paul was in those three days-saved or lost. Listen, what does this mean I Corinthians 15:8- "And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." It means the following wonderful facts, first the fact of his new birth, second that he was born again when he saw the Lord. "Last of all he was seen of me as of one born out of due time." It was the one person seeing another person the person-Saul of Tarsus seeing the person of the Son of God. He saw the Lord when he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" He saw the Lord three days before he was baptized. He was born again three days before he was baptized for he says that he was born again when he saw the Lord. Therefore, Paul's baptism was not essential to his new birth or to his salvation. Listen, my friends, when Paul said, "Lord, Lord, who art thou, Lord?" Jesus said, "I am Jesus." That moment he believed. A believer is saved.

Let me pause just a moment and take the balance of this time for my worthy opponent's interest tomorrow night. I draw a line straight down the blackboard and I put believers in God, unbelievers in God; Lovers of God, Haters of God; Followers of God, Disobedient to God.

(Blackboard)

Unbelievers	Believers
Haters	Lovers
Disobedient	Followers

What crowd is to be baptized? This crowd right here (Pointing to first column on board). And yet the Bible says believers in God are saved, the Bible says lovers of God are saved, the Bible says followers of God are saved everyone of these are saved. And this is the crowd he believes and I believe ought to be baptized- only he says believing, obeying if you cannot get to the baptismal pool right away loving, following, believing does no good- a man is lost if he is not baptized. One further word. If any individual here tonight can see any of these ministers of the Church of Christ and says, "I believe in Jesus Christ and I want to be baptized," there will be some time elapse before you are baptized. Suppose you die before then. Will that minister of the Church of Christ consign you to hell?

Ladies and gentlemen, these are most serious issues. Believers, lovers of God, followers of Christ the Bible says are saved. May God bless you and I thank you.

PORTER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE - FOURTH NIGHT

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come before you again to affirm the proposition which was under discussion last evening, and which has just been read in your hearing, that the scriptures teach that water baptism to a penitent believer of the gospel is essential to salvation from alien sins. Of course, the proposition just simply resolves itself into this: Is water baptism a condition of salvation from sin? I affirm that it is, and Mr. Tingley denies. And so that's the issue that's between us on this proposition tonight.

I introduced a number of affirmatives on my proposition last evening. I have just a few more that I want to introduce now, and then I shall go back to the things that have been introduced before, and reply to the things which my opponent said in his closing speech last night, and notice again some of those arguments introduced in support of the proposition, that we might keep before you just the things that are revealed in God's eternal word.

My next argument in proof of the proposition is found in the statement made by the apostle Paul in the sixth chapter of Romans, verses 3 and 4. Here the apostle said, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, note that the statement made here by the inspired apostle is to the effect that men are baptized into Jesus Christ and that they also are baptized into His death. I submit to you tonight the fact that if men can be saved without baptism, they can be saved out of Christ, because in this passage, as well as in another given last evening, Paul declares that men are baptized into Christ. I would like for my friend to tell me tonight whether men can be saved out of Christ. If men cannot be saved out of Christ, then they can not be saved without baptism, because Paul says baptism puts men into Christ. Not only so, but we also note that it was in the death of Jesus Christ that His blood was shed and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sins. We must, therefore, contact that blood to receive the benefits of the blood. Since the blood was shed in His death, we must reach the death of Jesus to share its benefits. The third verse of the passage introduced says we are "baptized into His death." We reach the death of Jesus Christ when we are baptized, not before we are baptized, and thus reach His blood and the benefits of His blood. Since we are baptized into the death of Christ, and thus into the blood of Christ, then I insist that baptism is essential to the forgiveness of sins which is made possible by the blood of the Son of God.

Then, too, this passage shows that we walk in the newness of life, or that the new life comes, after the baptism. Note that it says in verse 4, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here is a burial and a resurrection, Paul says. As Christ was raised from the dead, so we are raised to walk in newness of life. The newness of life, of course, is the spiritual life or condition in which there is forgiveness of sins; and we walk that newness of life after we are baptized-not before. According to the position of my friend Tingley, we walk the new life before baptism, but Paul says, "We are raised to walk in newness of life."

The next argument will be based upon a statement made by the apostle Paul in Col. 2:11-13. I desire to turn and read this passage from the pen of the inspired writer in which he tells us something more about what is accomplished in baptism. The apostle Paul is the writer upon this occasion, and he says, "In whom," referring to Christ, "also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Now, here is something referred to as "the circumcision of Christ"-an operation which God performs; therefore, an operation made without hands. And this operation is the cutting loose of the sins of the flesh, or the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh. I ask how and when and where is that accomplished? When does God cut loose the body of the sins of the flesh? When does that circumcision take place? Going right on, the next verse says, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." All right, then, in being buried and raised through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Jesus from the dead, we comply with that condition upon which God cuts loose the body of the sins of the flesh. And, then, the next verse declares, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Thus God forgives all trespasses when He cuts loose the body of the sins of the flesh. He does that when the circumcision of Christ occurs. And that occurs when men are buried and raised in baptism.

Then I pass to another argument based upon a matter of type and anti-type in respect to the baptism of the Israelites. In I Cor. 10:1-2, Paul said, "I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." Thus he refers to the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel as their baptism, which is typical of ours, and we turn back to the Old Testament we find out where their salvation from Egyptian bondage occurred-just when it took place. In Exodus 14:30, when they crossed the sea, Moses said, "God saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians." Thus they were saved from Egyptian bondage, from Egyptian dominion, when they crossed the Red Sea, which Paul refers to as their baptism, typical of ours. "And God saved Israel that day"-not the day before, not three days before, but "God saved Israel that day"-the day they crossed the sea. Then, beginning with the first verse of the next chapter, the 15th chapter of Exodus, we are told that after they crossed the sea they sang the song of deliverance. According to my friend Tingley, they were saved before they crossed the sea, in the type, and the song of deliverance was sung before they crossed; but in the type given by God Almighty they sang the song of deliverance after they had crossed the sea, which was their baptism.

Now, I turn back to some things mentioned last night to refer to them, and the second argument I introduced last evening, which was not noticed by my friend, Mr. Tingley, was the fact that every passage contained in God's book that mentions both salvation and baptism always puts the salvation after the baptism. To this there is not a single exception. He did refer to some of the passages when I introduced them as individual arguments, but to this particular argument he paid no attention whatsoever. Every passage mentioning both salvation and baptism in the book of God puts salvation after the baptism, as Mark 16:16- "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." I am giving these briefly because we will have more on them presently. And Acts 2:38- "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins." I Peter 3:21- "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Acts 22:16- "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." In

every one of those passages you find remission of sins, or salvation, or washing away of sins, placed after baptism and not before.

Now, then, to the speech which my opponent made and to a reaffirmation of the arguments which I introduced last evening. I want to call your attention to these things very carefully that you might see just the predicament my friend is in.

There were three passages introduced last night-Mk. 16:16; Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:27-concerning which my opponent said I did not quote all the verse. In Acts 2:38 he said I failed to quote all of the verse; and in Mk. 16:16 he said I failed to give all of the verse. In Gal. 3:27 he said I failed to read the verse before it. I insist that I gave every one of these passages: He claimed that I did not give them. I am insisting tonight that the same is true even now. In fact, last night after the debate was over, I had played back that speech of mine to see whether I had given all of those passages-whether I had given the entire verses which friend Tingley said I did not give. When the record was played back it was there easily heard and easily seen that the entire verses were quoted, and in some instances they were quoted more than one time in their entirety. My friend was entirely wrong about it. If he desires to have the record played back to him, I am sure he will find that I am stating the truth tonight.

But, now, to I Cor. 1:12-13. This was the first argument introduced last night in which Paul said, "Every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" I showed that in order for men to belong to Paul, Paul must be crucified for them, and they must be baptized in the name of Paul. In order to belong to Apollos, Apollos must be crucified for them, and they must be baptized in the name of Apollos. In order to belong to Cephas, Cephas must be crucified for them, and they must be baptized in his name. And just so, in order to belong to Christ, Christ must be crucified for us, and we must be baptized in His name, thus showing that men are not of Christ, they do not belong to Christ, unless and until they have been baptized. My friend has not touched that argument until this good hour. Oh, he said something about it, but he made no effort to reply to the argument made. He just read on a little through the chapter and endeavored to array one verse against another and thus try to offset what Paul said in this verse by what he said in another verse, which does not offset it at all. I am going to turn and read that. He said I did not read it all. Well, I read all the verses I quoted and introduced-I did not read the entire chapter. I left a few verses for him to make his quibble, and now I come to attend to his quibble.

In the next verse, Paul said, "I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had believed baptism was essential to salvation." Now, that's the position that my opponent must sustain in regard to this that Paul thanked God that he did not baptize but a few of them for fear somebody might think that he thought baptism was essential. That isn't what Paul said. He didn't say, "Lest any man should think that I believed baptism necessary to salvation." He said, "Lest any man should say that I had baptized in my own name." Certainly under the same circumstances today, I would make the same statement of the Apostle Paul. If men were calling themselves after me, would thank God that I had baptized but few, lest any should say I had baptized in my own name. Paul didn't say, "Lest somebody would think baptism was necessary to salvation."

Then, he goes on into the seventeenth verse where Paul said, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." And that proves baptism is not essential. Well, my friend, Mr. Tingley, if Paul had said, "Christ sent me to baptize," would that have proved it

was essential? That, my friends, is certainly the meaning of the argument. He promises to answer, and so I am going to expect him to answer when he comes up. He just as well to begin to answer some of these things, because tomorrow night and the next night we are on the same subject, just reversing positions that's all. And the same subject of baptism will run throughout the rest of this debate. If he does not begin to answer some of these things, then tomorrow night I will be on his heels, and I shall see that he answers, because I will put them in writing. So I want him to tell me: If Paul had been sent to baptize, would that have proved that baptism is essential to salvation? He said the fact that Paul was not sent to baptize proves that it is not essential. Well, if it does, then if Paul had been sent to baptize, that would prove that it is essential. If that's not the meaning of it, then there is no argument beneath the stars in the thing tonight. I await further developments along that line.

Does Tingley mean to say that Paul baptized without authority? That he had no authority to baptize? Why, I can make the very same statement: "I came to Birmingham not to baptize. I came to preach the gospel." That doesn't mean that I don't believe baptism is necessary, but my mission here is to preach the gospel, and not to baptize. Yet I insist that baptism is a condition of salvation; and so the argument falls flat, and my friend will have to try it over.

But he came to verse 15 of I Cor. 4 and claimed this set the whole thing aside, because Paul said, "I have begotten you through the gospel." And he said, "Paul baptized only a few of them; therefore, baptism was not necessary to their new birth, because Paul had 'born' them, so to speak, or had begotten them through the gospel." Certainly, Paul had begotten them through the gospel; and I wonder if my friend does not know that a begetting precedes a birth. I wonder if he does not know that.

All right; we come next, then, to Acts 2:38 and to the things my friend said about that. He said, "Scholars say that the Greek word 'eis' means 'in order to', 'with reference to' and 'because of'." Well, I know the scholars say the word means "in order to" and "with reference to," but I am demanding him to produce the standard lexicon today that says it means "because of". I am demanding that he produce a translation today, made by competent scholars, that translates it "because of". He says it means that, and we want him to produce the translation or the standard Green lexicon that gives it that definition-"because of". I shall expect him to do it, and we are waiting to see what he does about it.

Well, he said in Matt. 12:21 "they repented at the preaching of Jonah"- "at" is from the same word, and it does not mean they repented in order to get Jonah to preach. No, it certainly does not mean that; and it does not mean what my friend says it means. It still has the prospective meaning there. They repented at or unto or into the preaching of Jonah. It looks forward just the same as it does in all the other cases.

Then, he gave Acts 11:18 about "with reference to"-that it means "with reference to". Well, Acts 11:18 uses the same word -"repentance unto life." If baptism unto remission in Acts 2:38 means remission is already obtained, then repentance unto life means the life is already obtained. Therefore, men are saved before they repent, and they repent because they have the life already.

Then he said, "In this passage Porter knows that 'repent' is second person plural and 'be baptized' is third person singular in the Greek." And, furthermore, he said, "They can not be joined together with the same predicate." Yes, I know in the Greek shad; 'repent' is second person plural, and I know that 'be baptized' is third person singular. But he did not have to go to the Greek to get that. That's true in English. That's true in the English right

here; so he did not have to go to the Greek to find that. But here's the statement my friend made about it. He said, "Repent-(plural)- all of you. Be baptized-(singular)-everyone of you." Now, I wonder how many more are embraced in "all of you" than are embraced in "every one of you". How many more does "all of you" mean than "everyone of you"? Now, the fact is, my friend is all wrong about this-that is, his application of it. Let me give you another example. The teacher says to a class in school, "Come ye, and be examined everyone of you in the name of the state for your certificate of promotion." Now, "come ye" is second person plural; "be examined everyone of you" is third person singular. Yet, they are joined to the same predicate to secure the same result. "Come ye and be examined everyone of you for your certificate of promotion." Now, does that mean some of them were to come and others were to be examined or does it include all of them?

Well, the expression, "everyone of you," comes from the Greek word "ekastos," and we are going to see what it means. Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon says concerning it, "The singular from its collective sense is frequently joined with a plural verb". 'Ye know each one of you' is the example he gives-almost the identical expression of Acts 2:38. So Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon says that this is often connected or joined to a plural verb. My friend says, "It can not be." And, then, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, which is recognized as the greatest in the world today, says concerning this word "ekastos": "When it denotes individually, every one of many, is often added appositively to nouns and pronouns and verbs in the plural number." (Page 192 of Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon). These Greek scholars say they can be joined together, and my opponent says they can not. Now, you can take him or you can take what the scholars say about it. I prefer to stand with them.

Then, he says, "Thayer says the word means 'into' when it refers to place and 'with reference to' when it refers to relation." And he says it is "relation" when the matter of salvation is concerned. All right. Then he says, "Be baptized for the remission of sins" means "be baptized with reference to the remission of sins"; and that means you have the remission of sins already. All right; try another passage. Rom. 10:10 says "Believe unto righteousness." The very same word, and my friend says that means "relation". Then, it means "with reference to righteousness". And that means you have the righteousness already, and then believe because you have it. There's his relation. And he gave some examples. He said, "Why a man works for fifty dollars." He said that does not mean in order that he might work but because he worked. Yes, but it does mean in order that he might have the fifty dollars. He "works for fifty dollars." That does not mean he has the fifty dollars already, but he works to obtain the fifty dollars. Then he gives two other statements as examples: A man being given a medal for bravery-not in order to have bravery, but because of bravery. And a man electrocuted for murder-not in order to murder but because of murder. I know the English word "for" sometimes means "because of"; and certainly it does in those two examples. But I am asking my friend this: Friend Tingley, will you tell me if those two examples, or those two statements, were translated into the Greek, would that little preposition "for" be translated into the Greek word "eis" that you find in Acts 2:38? Now, you tell me. If you do not, you will have to tomorrow night. Come on and tell me about this. Would you translate the word "for" in those two statements into the Greek "eis" that we have in Acts 2:38 from which the preposition "for" comes? If you can not, then it is not a parallel case. And if you do translate it that way, then let us know about it. We want to know.

Then, I come to I Peter 3:21. We want to get to that hurriedly here. On the board I have

written the two statements I had last night.

(Blackboard)

Baptism doth now save us

Baptism doth not save us

“Baptism doth now save us.” And then “Baptism doth not save us.” I Pet. 3:21 makes the statement above, and my friend contends for the one below, as he signed the proposition to the contrary of that. All right; “baptism does not save us.” I asked him to erase the one that he did not believe, and he erased the one below! “Baptism doth not save us.” He said, “I do not believe that”. All right; shake hands with me and let’s stop the debate. (Laughter.) When he erased that he just as well to have taken his name from the proposition. (At this point the blackboard fell, and there was a full minute of good natured laughter while it was replaced.)

I will try not to touch the board any more.

Mr. Nichols: About seven minutes left.

Mr. Porter: Now, when Friend Tingley erased that bottom statement he just the same as took his name from the proposition, for he said, “I do not believe that ‘baptism doth not save’.” All right, if he does not believe that “baptism doth not save us,” then he believes that “baptism does save us”. If he believes that “baptism does save us,” that’s what I’m affirming; so we just as well stop the debate, because he has surrendered the whole thing. But he came along and read some and he said, “Baptism doth now save us not”. He wrote the little word “not” up there.

“Baptism doth now save us not.”

He quoted it that way a number of times, and then finally quoted the whole passage, but came back and quoted it that way again, that “baptism doth now save us not.” Now, I have seen men twist and wrest the scriptures, but that caps the climax, because, listen friend, that word “not” is on the inside of a parenthesis. “Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God” is all with parentheses. He takes it from the inside of them and puts it on the outside and connects it with the word “save” and reads it, “Baptism doth also now save us not.” Well, let me try a similar passage and just see how that will wind up. I am going to prove by that method of dealing with the scriptures that it’s a sin for a woman to do her hair up in a little knot on the top of her head. In Matt. 24:17, Jesus said, “Let him which is on the housetop not come down.” Now, then, let me read it and pause like he did with that, “Let him which is on the house (pause) top-not, come down.” (Laughter). So that would prove it would be a sin to wear your hair in a topknot. That’s just as sensible as that (pointing to the board) and is dealing with it just like he dealt with I Pet. 3:21.

Now, then, my opponent said that it should be this way, according to his application of it: “Baptism doth also now save us, but it does not save us-it is only a figure of our salvation.” In other words, Peter crossed himself. He said, “Baptism does save us” but “it does not save us.” Well! “Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh”-he said that meant not the putting away of sin. All right, then, if it does not save us from sin, from what does it save us? Peter said it saves us from something. The word “filth” in that case comes from a word that means “dirt,” and a number of translations translate it, “not the removing of

dirt from the body.” In fact, my opponent went right on along that line and made the statement that it is not the washing of the outside. That’s exactly what I contend for. It is not the mere washing of the outside. So it is not the washing of dirt from the body, or the filth of the flesh, but it is the answer of a good conscience toward God; and yet Peter says, “It saves us!” Tingley says, “It does not.”

He said, “Noah was saved before the flood.” He was not saved with the salvation mentioned here before the flood. In I Pet. 3:20 we are told “wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water”—referring to the ark. Eight souls were saved in the ark. My friend says he was saved before he ever got to the ark, before the flood ever came, or anything of that kind. He was not saved from the danger here—with the salvation mentioned here. In Heb. 11:7 it is said, “By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, and prepared an ark to the saving of his house.” So he was not saved with the salvation there before the flood.

Then to Gal. 3:26-27, “Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” I made an argument last night upon the little word “for”—“to introduce the reason”—the little Greek word “gar.” “Ye are God’s children by faith” . . . Why? What’s the reason of it? “Because as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” If you have not been baptized into Christ, then, of course, you are not the children of God by faith. My opponent paid no attention to the argument on that little word “for,” or “gar,” meaning “to introduce the reason.” Why doesn’t he come up and deal with it?

Oh, he said, “this means to put on clothes like we put on the breastplate or put on the armor.” Well, Friend Tingley, you are not in your clothes until you put them on, are you? He is not in his clothes until he puts them on. So we are not in Christ until we put Him on. We are said to put Him on in baptism. So we are not in Christ until we are baptized. If we are saved before that, we are saved out of Christ.

I must get to Paul’s case briefly. Acts 22. He read that and I thought he was going to tell us what Paul was told he must do.

Mr. Nichols: Two minutes.

Mr. Porter: Thank you. He said, “You will be told what thou must do.” So we want him to tell us what the Lord told him to do. He read on down through a portion of it and stopped before he got to verse sixteen. Verse sixteen says Ananias said to him, “And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” And that’s the thing that was told him to do. The Lord said he would be told what he must do. And so that’s what he must do to be saved. Friend Tingley said Saul was born at faith-born out of due time. Now, Friend Tingley, I want you to tell me this: If Saul was born again at the point of faith, or by faith only, and that was out of due time, then what would have been the due time for him to be born again? Now be sure and tell us that. If Paul was born out of due time, what would the due time have been? Furthermore, he said, “Paul said that he was born again when he saw the Lord.” I challenge my opponent, every inch of him from head to foot, to give me the passage that says that. It’s not in the Book; and he knows it’s not in the Book; and if it’s in the Book, let him produce it. Paul did not say any such thing. Then he said, “Was Paul lost those three days?” Well, his sins had not been washed away—verse 16 said they had not. He was not in Christ, because in Rom. 6:3, he said he was baptized into Christ. And if he was saved, he was the most miserable saved man you ever read of, for in Acts 9:9, he did neither eat nor drink for those three days. As soon as he was baptized he received food and was strengthened. If he was saved, he was

a very miserable man to be saved. And that's that.

Then he came with this statement. "Suppose a man is going to be baptized and he dies before he can get baptized?" What about it? Well, he is in the very same condition as that man who is seeking salvation at the mourner's bench and smothers to death before he gets through-in exactly the same position as a man who smothers to death at the mourner's bench before he gets through. Now, then, just let him tell us something about that.

And so that covers his speech, and I thank you.

TINGLEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE - FOURTH NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: "The Scriptures Teach that Water Baptism to a Penitent Believer of the Gospel is Essential to Salvation from Alien Sins."

Evidently I did not hear one word my worthy opponent used last night. It has been called to my attention and I want to call it to your attention. If he made this statement I can not go with him. It is that teach may mean imply. I can not go with him on that but otherwise I can go with him all the way on his definition.

My worthy opponent has found some fault with my finding fault with his method of quoting scriptures. I said last night he did not quote Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38-all of it-when he presented the scriptures in the argument. Now I, too, have consulted the record. Here is a shining example of the tactics of my worthy opponent. When my worthy opponent-according to the record-when my worthy opponent first quoted-and remember first impressions are lasting impressions-I challenge my worthy opponent to have that record produced from the start of his first speech, the first word, and let you hear he did not quote all of Mark 16:16 nor did he quote all of Acts 2:38. I leave that to my worthy opponent and the record. Later in his speech he did quote all of both verses but in the presenting of the verses, the introducing of them to you-knowing full well that first impressions are lasting impressions-he did not quote all of them. I defy him to produce that record. I objected. That is so. Later in his argument he did quote them all. I am sorry my worthy opponent did not state the facts clearly as they were. He left the wrong implication. I wanted to apologize for not having noticed that he quoted all of them later on. My worthy opponent made so much out of it there is nothing for me to do except stand for truth. His error seems to be deliberate.

Let me give you a sample of his failure to consider the context. My worthy opponent is familiar with this fact: The verses were not put into the Bible until recent times-five hundred years ago. There is nothing inspired about verses. I therefore say this in referring to single verses people get the idea that that is the complete meaning. But when my worthy opponent quoted Galatians 3:37 he purposely, deliberately ignored the preceding very short verse and that preceding verse says, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." "You are!" As many of you as have been baptized have put on "the toga virilis," the clothes of manhood, the badge of Roman citizenship. You put that on. The "toga virilis" of Christ."

Another sample. It is awfully easy for my worthy opponent to prove his point lifting scripture out of its setting. Then resorting to all kinds of sarcasm. I have tried not to resort to it. I can produce stage play too. These matters are too serious for me to resort to stage

play. I want something to stick in your mind and heart. And my worthy opponent in putting up this statement "Baptism doth not save us" did it in connection with 1 Peter 3:21 and several times he kept turning around and pointing to the board in his argument. "That's what 1 Peter 3:21 says." And he did not write down all of it. When I wrote down that word I said, "I'm not writing down all of it. I'm just going to write down the next word that is in the Bible." "Baptism doth also now save us not." That's the next word! There are other words that follow it. Did you note that tonight not once did he refer to what preceded it. Of course not. It proves my point. "The like figure whereunto even baptism." Peter says, "Baptism is a figure." And he declares it positively and unequivocally. Is that up there on the board? No! My worthy opponent wishes it were not in the Bible!

Ladies and Gentlemen, I can prove "top not come down" by using my worthy opponent's method. I have not consciously ever used that method. I do not want it. He was talking the other night about one of my "cans". He said it exploded. Well he has hanged himself on his "not" which cannot be untied. Let him hang there.

He challenged me to show you one scripture where Paul says he was born when he saw the Lord. 1 Cor. 15:8, "Last of all he was seen of me also as one born out of due time." I challenge my worthy opponent to consult any Greek authority if he desires to prove it from the original, if this is not exactly what Paul is saying, "When I saw the Lord, that's when I was born again." There's the scripture.

I gave him some questions last night. My worthy opponent followed the usual program of evasion. He refused to answer. There are certain questions there he is afraid to answer! He cries that I appeal to prejudice! There are forty million people who do not believe in immersion. I think all of them ought to. They go home to the Lord shouting the praises of God and with His name upon their lips. If the proposition is true, my worthy opponent is saying then they go to hell! He has not said that. He dare not say that. He is afraid to say that! I ask him if Methodists, Presbyterians and all pedo-baptists are lost and will they go to Hell?-Moody, Finney, Sankey, Billy Sunday, Wesley, Whitfield, Luther and all of those are they in hell? I demand that he tell this audience. If they are in hell then my worthy opponent is right and only the church of Christ are to be saved. I dare him to say that to this audience.

I ask him what baptism saved? He will give another evasive answer. He will not come and meet it fairly and squarely. I have answered his questions fairly and squarely that he asked me. I have not knowingly ignored or side-stepped one. I plead with him to be as fair. What baptism does he accept? Will he accept one whom I baptize without re-baptizing them? He got again facetious and refused to answer fairly and squarely. He knows and every member of the church of Christ knows, every one that has ever been connected with the church of Christ knows that ministers of the church of Christ will not accept the baptism of Missionary Baptist, Christian and Missionary Alliance and my worthy opponent (your honored representative that you have brought here from Arkansas to debate with me) he refuses to stand up and say, "That's so." You young ministers of the church ought to make him say that's so because you have been preaching it all over the country. I challenge him to answer those questions fairly and squarely.

My opponent asked me whether or not I would accept Mark 16:9-20 as the word of God. I do! Moffat, whom my worthy opponent used as an authority, denies the passage and leaves it out, puts it in special brackets with a special note. Westcott and Hort, two of the best authorities, call the passage in question. The American Standard Version, the Revised Version, all call it into question. The passage is in question as to authenticity

probably more than any other portion of the scripture but I do accept it-the entire passage-as the word of God. Now, my worthy opponent accepts only one verse of it. He will not accept healing, he will not accept handling snakes, he will not accept speaking in tongues, he will not accept laying on of hands. My worthy opponent lifts a verse right out and said, "Do you accept it?" I do! I accept it all! And if verse 16 is true today then all the portion is true today.

My worthy opponent asked me to deal further with Acts 22:16. I am happy to do so. I have not time to go back and retrace the steps like my worthy opponent. He gets in a squirrel cage and goes round on the same rungs continually. I answered Mark 16:16 last night. I answered Acts 2:38 last night. I answered every other scripture he gave including this one. But I will just suggest two or three things about this one to refresh your memory. Acts 22:16- "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord." (1) Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:8 that he was born when he saw the Lord. Now, (2) in John 3:5 Jesus says you must be born again. (3) The word born used in 1 Cor. 15:8 is "beget" or "bring forth"-it's the same word. (4) John 1:13- "Which were born not of blood nor of the flesh nor of the will of man but of God." (5) John 2:29- "If ye know that he is righteous ye know that everyone that doeth righteousness is born of him. I John 3:9, I John 5:1, (6) I Pet. 1:23- "being born again." Paul says that word (the same thing) happened to him when he saw the Lord. (7) Now listen, "Last of all he was seen of me also"-he was born ahead of time. He was born just like the Jewish nation will be born when Jesus comes-as assuredly they will be. Listen: If a man is born when he sees the Lord-is he? Paul plainly says he was seen and "I was born when I saw him." What happened when he saw Him? He fell on his face. What else. He cried, "Lord, Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" What else? He had cried previously, "Who are thou, Lord?" He said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest?" Now here he says, "I was born out of due time." He is not talking about his first birth-Paul was a man up in years, thirty-five years old probably. He was not talking about being born of the flesh. My worthy opponent left that alone. Tries to ridicule me and asks me to give the scripture and last night I quoted it over and over and over. Paul says he was born when he saw the Lord and that can mean nothing but salvation.

Listen, I can take any great sinner when they see the Lord in His glory, see His face, see how wicked they have been, if they have been touched by the Spirit of God like the apostle Paul- there is great sorrow. Now, I will deal further in a few moments in this speech or in the next if I do not get time to, with the picture as in the sixteenth verse.

My worthy opponent last night-this slipped my attention so I bring it in-quoted Luke 7:30 to prove that baptism is essential to salvation. "But the Pharisee and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves being not baptized of him." Now my worthy opponent introduced that passage. Once again if he had read the verse before, my worthy opponent would have been far wiser. This refers to John's baptism. Evidently my opponent believes that baptism was necessary to salvation before Pentecost for he is quoting before Pentecost dealing with John's baptism to prove baptism is essential to salvation in this day- after Pentecost. I'm not doing that. My opponent introduced that last night and I want him to face that.

I will show you one. Listen, if the terms of salvation are such now, they were that before Pentecost. The program and plan of God in its great underlying principles does not change. If these things produced salvation before Pentecost, before Christ, the same things will produce salvation after. The same things in this day will produce salvation. My worthy

opponent did this introducing. I did not. I am simply going in, looking around seeing where he gets himself. Now if a man was saved before Pentecost as my worthy opponent quotes as proof for this debate if he was-remember I am answering him and every scripture he gives. Not one have I left out or will I leave out. My worthy opponent quotes this if baptism is necessary for salvation in this age, my worthy opponent believes it was necessary in the age before and yet, I will show you one who was saved without baptism-John's baptism or any other baptism. Luke 23:42-43 "And he said unto Jesus"-now this is in the age that my worthy opponent quoted last night to prove his proposition- "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. Then said Jesus unto him verily I say unto thee, Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." My worthy opponent says baptism is essential to salvation. He quotes scripture referring to John's baptism to prove his point that baptism is essential to salvation. If baptism is essential to salvation I will agree with him that it must be before Pentecost as well as after Pentecost. God's way of salvation does not change. The way men were saved before is the way they are saved afterward. The Old and the New Testament agree on that matter. The scripture:"By faith Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness." If we are saved that way before, I believe we are saved that way afterward. Upon the cross the dying thief had faith in Jesus as Christ and Jesus said he was saved. My opponent says he is damned because he has gone over there on that side the fence and quoted that scripture. It's my worthy opponent or my Lord and I will accept my Lord. Remember my opponent quoted Luke 7:30 to prove his point and I am only using his scripture.

Now, my worthy opponent also dealt with Acts 10:43 and I want to deal with it a little further. Now if baptism is essential to salvation it denies and contradicts Peter who says in I Peter 1:23 "Being born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." And again this same Peter says in Acts 10:43, "To him gave all the prophets witness through his name that whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." It does not say, "Whosoever believeth in him and is baptized shall receive remission of sins." And then at the close of that sermon on salvation-not a word said about baptism in any form much less being essential to salvation-there follows Acts 10:44, "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word." This is after Pentecost, Ladies and Gentlemen. Here are people after Pentecost, here are people that I believe beyond the shadow of doubt to any reasonable mind, any reasonable doubt at all to any thinking or unprejudiced person that these were saved before they were baptized-saved without baptism-and baptism was very reluctantly administered to them.

Listen to this: It does not say the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word and were baptized." But it shows that Cornelius was saved before he was baptized for here is what it says, Acts 10:46, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." "What was I to withstand God," says Peter. These people were saved, the third person of the trinity had come upon them. Every last one of them in that room that believed on Christ received the Holy Ghost-God from heaven witnessing -and then Peter said, "What in the world was I to argue against God." He saved them without baptism.

Acts 8:37 Phillip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus is the Son of God." Now Philip said to this eunuch that if he believed he would be saved and there was water. Listen to this record of Luke. There Philip baptized the eunuch after he confessed his faith in Christ and he was bap-

tized not in order to be saved but because he had been saved.

If baptism is essential to salvation it denies and contradicts the plain words of John- "These are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God and believing you might have life through his name." Then, that's written also before Pentecost.

Listen to I John 1:9. I would like to have my opponent deal with this. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the children of God therefore the world knoweth us not because it knew Him not now are we the sons of God it doth not yet appear what we shall be but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him for we shall see him as he is. Little children let no man deceive you, he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil for the devil sinneth from the beginning For this purpose the son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil." When the love of God is poured upon an individual God says their nature is changed, their being is changed and the devil is destroyed out of their heart and life and they are children of God. Not a mention of baptism at all. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin because his seed remaineth in him"-because he is born of God. Paul said he was born of God when he saw the Lord. These others said they were born of God before they were baptized.

Listen. I John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Doesn't say a word about baptism. Now, my worthy opponent, quoted four verses that refer to baptism and salvation or have salvation in them and said that the only instance-but my worthy opponent ignores the fact of these scriptures that I have already given you. For instance in Galatians, "Ye are children of God by faith" and then you put on grown clothes of manhood, baptism, the "togo virilis." You put on the "togo virilis" of Christ. For instance in the scripture which I have just given-Cornelius' household. They were saved; the Holy Ghost fell on them; and then Peter very reluctantly baptized them. Salvation came before baptism.

Then he called my attention to Romans 6:3-4. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we ought also to walk in newness of life." Now there's that preposition into again, meaning, with reference to. The original Greek translation reads "so many of us as were baptized with reference to Jesus Christ were baptized with reference to his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism." Now that's exactly what it means when we come to the tenth chapter of I Corinthians. What do we find? Here's exactly the setting forth of relationship, Paul tells us: "Moreover brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea and were all baptized unto Moses." Did that save their souls? That was physical salvation from Egyptian bondage. I want you to get this further. There is the same preposition "eis"-unto Moses. What does it mean? They were already saved, they were delivered by the passover, then God took charge of them and had the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night. Then the "baptized unto Moses" came after their deliverance from the Egyptians. Get it, Ladies and Gentlemen, they were immersed and the cloud covered them and there was a wall of water on either side and there they gave the world a symbolic picture that they had accepted the leadership of Moses. His scripture proves my point! They were saved by God miraculously before they went into the sea. And God by His mighty deliverance came between them and the Egyptians. Now was there any change of leadership

after baptism into Moses? Were they not under the leadership of Moses on the Passover night? They were baptized into Moses not in order to accept his leadership for he had already been appointed their leader and they had accepted his leadership and the baptism in the sea did not add to nor take from the relationship they had to Moses. The baptism declared the relationship.

My worthy opponent dared me to produce a scholar. I'll trot one out. I want to make this clear: H. T. Anderson, perhaps the greatest scholar and preacher that the disciples of Christ -the church of Christ ever had, said, "The real translation of 'for' in Acts 2:38 occurs 119 times in the New Testament" and Anderson translated-probably my worthy opponent's greatest scholar-translated the Bible two times (the whole New Testament rather) and he tried to make the word mean "in order to" and he was honest enough to admit that he found it "in order to" only eight times out of 119. That's the church of Christ's greatest scholar that said that. Now that's an authority from the church to which he belongs. If he wants authorities, we'll trot them out.

Listen my friends. I wish my opponent would deal, for instance, with John 1:11-12, "He came unto his own and his own received him not but as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God even to them which believe on his name." I'd like to have him tell this audience what is meant in John 3:5, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit." His preachers are going all over the country saying that's water baptism. I want him to stand up here and say so. And then we will operate on him like we did on I Peter.

Sin is the problem that men have. How in the world can an individual have a new heart-heaven or hell is the destiny and it's the most important question that faces man. If my opponent is right, every believer in Christ that has not been immersed is damned. This debate deals with a great fundamental issue. Is a man saved by faith or is he saved by baptism. If a man believes in Christ is a man saved before he is baptized? Certainly God would leave us in no doubt about this important question. He tells us the awfulness of sin in Rom. 3:23, then he said "We are justified freely by His grace through faith in His blood." Not one word of baptism. Salvation is not anything outward but it is inward. It's not of the body but it's of the inner being. I John 6:1- "He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself."

Col. 1:27-"In whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles which is Christ in you the hope of glory."

My opponent asked me can a man be in Christ without being baptized. Well, how does Christ get into a man or how does a man get into Christ? Here's the answer. Eph. 3:17, "That .Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Rom. 10:9-10, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus." My worthy opponent says, "This isn't so. You've got to confess with your mouth, believe in your heart and you still aren't saved. If before you get to the creek you die and are damned and go to hell." That's what his proposition says. He has not the courage to face that matter and say that is so. But that's what his proposition says. The Bible plainly teaches that any who do not have this complete, dramatic regeneration within them, irrespective of forms and ceremonies, is lost, is damned, is eternally lost. Salvation is by faith in Jesus Christ and by this alone before baptism.

John 3:36- "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Baptism is a declaration of a fact. I have already called your attention to Gal. 3:27. That tells us what it is. A policeman wears a uniform not to be a policeman but because he is a policeman. A Christian who is a child of God by faith is baptized

not in order to be a Christian but because he is a Christian.
I thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

THE LAST TWO SPEECHES ARE MISSING