

*"God Is Looking For Good Men" Continued from page 1*

God didn't have to use a man. He could have made the rain stop or start as He wanted, but He wanted to use a man to proclaim God's purpose; God's thoughts; God's motives; God's desires! The eyes of the Lord had roamed to and fro and had found one whose heart was perfect toward Him. This is the one that the Lord wanted to show Himself strong through!

"The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit" (James 5:16-18). Elijah didn't just decide one day that it ought not to rain for three and one-half years. He did "all these things at thy word." It was the will of God for this drought to happen and yet God waited for a prophet to pray effectually, fervently, and finally, earnestly.

"Earnestly". . . honestly . . . to pray with worship, to pray to God, to supplicate—and worship, involves due recognition of the One to Whom all glory belongs. Notice that Elijah bore the burden of his own humanity and yet he prayed earnestly. And he obtained an answer. Elijah prayed with worship, humbly presenting his supplications; he prayed the will of God!—And that's what God was waiting for! And God said, "Now, go and tell the king that there will be no rain until you say so."

"And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain . . ." Again he was praying the will of God. And yet he prayed seven times—he prayed till the answer came! And notice Elijah's posture: "he cast himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees" (1 Kings 18:42). This is the posture of a Hebrew woman as she gives birth. After one contraction she doesn't just get up, go home, and forget about it.

HEAR ME!! God wants to involve you in the fulfillment of His will. He wants to so much that He often sits by and WAITS FOR US TO GET ON LINE with what it is that He wants to do. He sometimes actually WAITS FOR US TO PRAY HIS WILL so that we are engaged and involved in what happens. He wants to prove Himself strong on our behalf so His glory is demonstrated to the world.

Send all articles and contributions for the publication of the AV Newsletter to:

AVP  
P.O. Box 61  
Madera, California  
USA 93639-0061

For additional copies, \$1.00 each, call  
(559) 673-3233

Send contributions for the continued support of Apostolic Missions to:

Apostolic Missions  
1085 W. Freeway  
Vidor, Texas  
USA 77662-4617

Thank You For Your Support!

**God Is Looking For Men—Galen Gregg**

During World War II there was a famous poster with a picture of a man with white hair and beard, dressed in red, white, and blue, who pointed at the beholder with a stern look and proclaimed, "Uncle Sam wants you." Well . . . God wants you, and He wants to show His power, goodness, and grace to the whole world through you.

"For the eyes of the LORD run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of [them] whose heart [is] perfect toward him" (2 Chronicles 16:9). God is ACTIVELY seeking men and women through whom He can accomplish His work.

In 1 Kings we have the story of a man named Elijah. Arguably, he is the greatest "displayer" of God's power and grace (aside from Jesus) in all of history. God was desiring to "show himself strong" to Israel. God wanted to turn their hearts from Baal toward Him. God needed a man "whose heart was perfect toward him." In light of God's stated purpose, it is interesting to note the following: In 1 Kings 17:1, Elijah states there would be no rain "according to my word." Was he on an ego trip? Then, in 18:36, when he is praying, he says, "I am thy

servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word."

These two things seem contradictory until we understand that Elijah's word and God's word had reached the point where they had become one and the same—his "heart was perfect towards" God.

Suppose for a moment that you are in charge and you have to choose an individual that will be used in this way and on this occasion. Do you want to use someone who is just remotely interested in the situation? Would you choose someone who is more or less just willing to go along with what you have in mind? Or would you want to latch on to someone who was very fervent and animated about having what you want to come to pass?

Let's continue this line of reasoning a bit longer. Now you have this individual whose heart is steadfast in his or her desire to see your will come to pass, but you understand that bringing about your will in the situation will adversely affect even your man for the job. How will you keep this individual engaged in the situation? Are you merely going to tell this man what will come to pass and let him watch it happen around him? Or wouldn't you rather make this individual an actual participant in the process? How can you make this prophet a participant in the very process that will bring suffering in his own life?

**INSIDE THIS ISSUE**

<b>God Is Looking For Men</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Richard Williams &amp; Baptism</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Catholic-Protestants</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evolution of the Trinity Doctrine</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Can Your Soul Sing?</b>	<b>7</b>

**APOSTOLIC VOICE PUBLICATIONS**

AVP  
P.O. Box 61  
Madera, California  
USA 93639-0061  
(559) 673-3233

**BOOKS & BIBLE STUDIES**

**APOSTOLIC VOICE PUBLICATIONS, INC.**

**Board of Directors**

E. W. Wheeler—President  
 Galen Gregg—Secretary  
 Dennis Garza—Treasurer

**STAFF**

E. W. Wheeler—Editor-in-Chief/Publisher  
 Dennis Garza—Editor  
 Kiva Panggabean—Assistant Editor  
 Mike Klann—Project Manager  
 Galen Gregg—Legal Department  
 Taruli Guerrero—Secretary

**APOSTOLIC MISSIONS**

**Board of Directors**

E. W. Wheeler—Chairman/Founder  
 Jim Lee—Secretary  
 John Bullock—Treasurer  
 Steve Kelley—Kamiah, ID  
 Gary Howard—Tulsa, OK

**Board of Advisors**

Steve Stoltzfus—Las Vegas, NV  
 Ron Garrett—Glendale, AZ  
 Phil White—Burbank, CA  
 Dennis Garza—Madera, CA

**Apostolic Missions**  
 1085 W. Freeway  
 Vidor, Texas  
 USA 77662-4617

**BOOKS**  
***An Apostolic View of Grace***  
**by Elder E.W. Wheeler**

***The Young Sabellius (A Historical Novel)***  
**by William Chalfant [Call 1-913-773-8318](tel:1-913-773-8318)**

***After the Way Called Heresy* by Thomas Weisser—\$12.00**  
***History of Baptism* by Thomas Weisser—\$8.00**

***Against Tertullian:***  
***A Compilation of Rare Theological***  
***Writings Unmasking the Errors of the Trinity***  
**A new book by Thomas Weisser—\$10.00**

**BIBLE STUDIES**  
***The Acts 2:38 Bible Study*—\$2.00**  
***Baptism in Jesus' Name Bible Study*—\$2.00**  
***Keys to the Kingdom Bible Study***  
**(Basic Bible Interpretation)—\$2.00**

**BOOKLETS**  
***Man in the Shadows* by Galen Gregg—\$5.00**  
***Holiness as a Principle*—\$6.50** Book-  
**let & Cassette—\$12.00**

**To Order Call: [559-673-3233](tel:559-673-3233)**



**Mission Statement**

**Since our first publication in the early eighties, our mission has been to provide "doctrine and instruction in righteousness" to the churches in the Philippines (2 Timothy 3:16). By request, we are expanding our circulation, trusting that God will bless and use it for the benefit of His kingdom.**

**Can Your Soul Sing?—Jerry Trevino**

*Psalm 71:23 My lips shall greatly rejoice when I sing unto thee; and my soul, which thou hast redeemed.*

A study was done in an endeavor to learn about the natural song a bird sings. Some scientists took the egg of a red bird and separated it from the mother. They incubated the egg and then hatched it and nurtured the young bird. They began to introduce new birds to this red bird and expose it to the different songs of various species. The red bird would not sing the song of the blue bird or any others it was exposed to. Then the scientists brought in the mother red bird and she began to sing. At the moment the mother bird sang, the young red bird that had been separated from her began to sing that same song. Something deep within the young red bird recognized the song and nature constrained it to join in the chorus.

There was a time when churches regardless of denomination had a lot of common ground. Morals, standards, and methods were pretty much mainstream. Another thing that the religious world shared was its music. However, diversity seems to have pervaded religion in every aspect imaginable and with this diversity, many different forms of music have been introduced into the church world.

It seems that the songs of old had a deep meaningful tone to them. Their words and melody were often born out of troubling times or deep appreciation for God. In the days the great hymns were written, the music industry was not a thriving force in the market place. Thus, the temptation to write for the sake of making it on a chart was not there. People seemed to write out of devotion to God and a desire to exalt Him and express their love for Him. Today the story is altogether different. Men and women are no longer writing with the cause of devotion, but in the hope of promotion. If they are to survive they must make it on the charts and sell CDs. Songs about the blood and sacrifice and intimacy with God just don't sell. The slow meaningful melodies do not satisfy the masses. So our writers of today have turned to the world to borrow beats and rhythms that work. In doing this, much of our modern Christian music is missing something. What they lack in substance, they make up in syncopation. And where they fail to appeal to the soul, they make up in appeal to the flesh. As long as something is felt, they are happy. But what is it we are feeling? Is it merely the spirit within us being moved because our flesh is being excited by the style of music it is being exposed to? Or are our souls being touched?

David, in the verse above, said his lips would sing *and his soul*. In his worship the physical response was enjoined with the soul's response. Let me ask you this: when you're worshipping to a certain style of music, can your soul sing? Does something reach down into your being and constrain worship? Or are you merely responding to a beat that moves your flesh to action? To praise God with our physical faculties is one thing, but when the soul is touched and its chorus joins our physical praise, it is altogether another thing.

Just as the red bird would not sing to the sounds of other birds because the songs did not strike a chord in its being, in like manner, that's how I feel when I am exposed to certain types of Christian music. Some things that have been introduced into modern Pentecost just don't appeal to the soul. They get response and get people to act in worship, but God is not in it. Often we feel pressured to worship because of where we are and who we are with. However, if our soul can't sing to the music, then we need not force our flesh to participate. I just can't worship to this world's style and melody; it doesn't evoke the song that was born in me at an old-fashioned altar. Go ahead and sing your song, modern church world, it doesn't chime with the Holy Ghost in my soul. And I shall not join you until you sing the songs of Zion that bring down the presence of God. Then, and only then, will that song burst forth from my heart, and then my soul also shall sing unto the Lord.



## **How Did the Catholic-Protestant Come About?—William Chalfant**

We ought to make it clear from the start that there are many fine and wonderful people involved in the Catholic-Protestant movement. But where did this movement originate? And what does its origin mean? History should tell us some things about the origin and the development of the Catholic-Protestant movement.

Having been raised in that movement (I attended a Protestant church), I was astounded, when, later in life, I began to study the origins of the Catholic-Protestant movement. And I have found that for the sincere student of history, the origins of the Catholic-Protestant movement are laid bare by the facts of history.

For example, we understand that the origins of Christianity itself involve a background of Judaism and the worship of the God of Israel. It is clear that the church assembly evolved from the synagogue assembly. It is clear that the idea of monotheism evolved from the teachings of Moses and the prophets. Every effect has a cause. Jesus was a Jewish rabbi, and His teachings were founded in the Old Testament Scriptures. He was a monotheist through and through. The man Jesus would have accepted no variations to pure monotheism, the worship of one, solitary, individual, God (Mark 12:28-30 KJV).

Of course, Jesus shed much more light upon the teachings of the Old Testament, and introduced something far greater: (1) the baptism of the Holy Spirit; and (2) the founding of the fantastic New Testament church. But the origins of Christianity are set in the abundant soil of Jewish Old Testament teaching, as elaborated by the Master. Jesus did not come to destroy the Law or the writings of the prophets, but rather He came to fulfill them (Matthew 5:17 KJV). While we (for the most part) are Gentiles according to the flesh, you can no more take the Jewishness out of the origins of Christianity than you can take the spots out of a leopard. I thank God for the liberty we Gentiles have in the church. I am certainly not advocating any loss of the liberty that we Gentiles have in the church! I am just saying that the origins of Christianity are set in concrete, and they forever have a vital influence over what we believe and teach. The concept of One God was not compromised or destroyed by the incarnation and the coming of the Lord to earth! This idea is lost upon most Trinitarians and their concept of a multi-personal Godhead. However, many of them are waking up to the correct view of the Godhead.

What about the Catholic-Protestant movement? What about its origins? A careful study of the Catholic-Protestant movement will show that it was born in the fires of Greek philosophy. All of the “architects” of the Trinity, or the Logos teaching, as it was known in the second century, were men who were either on the periphery of the old apostolic church, founded by the apostles and their disciples, or else they were considered heretics by those who were in the apostolic church. Isn’t that strange? All of those who developed this fundamental, defining concept embraced by the Catholic-Protestant movement, were already outside of the contemporary orthodoxy, or at least on the edge of it when they developed it!

Let me give some examples: Irenaeus (c. AD 130-202), claims to have been a disciple of Polycarp (c. AD 69-156), who reportedly sat at the feet of the apostle John, taught a far different concept than that of John and the apostles concerning the Godhead. Irenaeus sided with the Montanists in Asia Minor, who were causing disruption and division by their false prophecy and teaching that the Holy Spirit was a “third divine Person.” This was the concept of the Godhead that Tertullian, another “architect” embraced. Irenaeus despised those who were against the new-fangled “Logos” teaching, calling the orthodox “Alogi” (“against the Logos”). Those who were against the Logos teaching of “two divine Persons” and later, “three divine Persons,” included the apostolic orthodox bishops of Rome (men like Soter, Eleutherus, Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus) who, during the period of AD 165-222, stood tall against the doctrinal teaching of the Catholic movement, which was attempting to introduce multiple divine Persons into the Godhead teaching of the church. Victor and Zephyrinus were in fellowship with Noetus, who also opposed the new-fangled teaching of a multiple-person Godhead.

The following men are seen as “architects” of the Trinity teaching: Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Origen, and Novatian. Their writings are revered by scholars and students in the Catholic-Protestant movement. These are their spiritual ancestors. These “acclaimed” architects of the Trinity teaching were almost all admittedly influenced by Greek philosophy. Thus, the Catholic-Protestant movement was “infected” from the very beginning. It must repudiate this “infection” to be considered “apostolic.”

Webster’s International Dictionary defines the Trinity concept in this way: *The union of three persons or hypostases (the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost) in one Godhead, so that all three are one God as to substance, but three persons or hypostases as to individuality.*

No early apostolic Christian leader or Roman bishop (up to the time of Bishop Urban, who followed the last Roman apostolic bishop Callistus in AD 222) ever used such Trinitarian terminology to describe the glorious Godhead or God in Christ. The origins of this prime teaching of the Catholic-Protestant movement are entangled in the Greek philosophy of the first and second centuries. They must be rejected.

Philo of Alexandria, a Jewish philosopher-priest, influenced many of the “architects” of the Catholic-Protestant movement (i.e., the Trinity doctrine). Philo (20 BC-AD 50) so differentiated the Logos (the Word) from God the Father that he “personalized” the Word (the Logos) as a separate semi-divine or divine Person. He called the Logos the “archangel,” “the second god,” the “demiurge” (an intermediary creator between God the Father and creation). He began his philosophy as a “revision of Plato’s theory of ideas” (Harry Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy*, 1948). Philo’s brother, Alexander, was a rich Jewish banker and shipping magnate. He loaned money to King Agrippa, and was the business manager of Antonia, the respected sister-in-law of the Roman Emperor Tiberius.

Philo was steeped in the culture of the Alexandrian Jews. He was known and respected by the Romans and Greeks of his day. His work on the individual, separate personality of the Logos was influential in the development of the Trinitarian concept by the “architects” of the Trinity. His desire was to bring about a “synthesis” between the Jewish Bible and Greek philosophy. This was especially critical in the concept of the Godhead and the Logos. It only remained for Christian philosophical students, who abandoned the idea of the absolute Oneness of God, to personalize the Word of God and identify Jesus as a separate, divine Person. They thus misinterpreted the incarnation. Thank God there are those today who will not abandon the idea of the Oneness of God, but will rather lift it up!

Philo wrote, “When Scripture says that God made man in the image of God, it means he made him in the image of the ‘second God,’ who is his Logos (Word).” Philo used allegory to accomplish his “wild” interpretations of Scripture. In his teaching, the “Logos” was the “Angel of the Lord” (a conception even sadly held by some apostolics today, who would even divinize the “Angel of the Lord”!), rather than make whichever angel of the Lord it is one of God’s angelic creatures (Hebrews 1:7 KJV).

Adolph Harnack wrote, “The philosophical Christology arose . . . at the circumference of the Church, and thence moved gradually to the center of the Christian faith.” This, then, describes the origin of the Catholic-Protestant movement. It is unfortunately founded upon a false philosophical concept of the divine Godhead. This affects its entire existence, and corrupts its theology, including even its concept of salvation.

To give you an idea of how a false concept of the Godhead can affect other doctrine, Harnack wrote (*History of Dogma*), “The incorporation of the Logos Christology and the fading away of eschatological apocalyptic hopes went hand in hand.” A false concept of the Godhead affected the Catholic-Protestant views on the Endtimes and on the coming of the Lord! It has leavened the whole lump — all three measures which they have made!

Harnack incisively accused the framers of the Logos Christology, “by means of a theological formula unintelligible to (the laity . . . they have) put the laity with their Christian faith under guardians.” And so a false Christology will put one under an erroneous priesthood without the liberty of the Holy Spirit.

The origins, then, of the Catholic-Protestant movement are besmirched by this introduction of a false teaching on the divine Godhead. This teaching has been a characteristic of the Catholic-Protestant movement. Throughout its history it has been most intolerant of anyone who dared to question the doctrine of the Trinity. Many honest souls were put to death by zealous leaders of the Catholic-Protestant movement, who thought they were doing God a favor. The Spanish Inquisition is but one example.

The origins of the Catholic-Protestant movement are based in a hybrid mixture of Scripture and Greek philosophy.

Adin Ballou wrote (*Primitive Christianity and Its Corruptions*), “(The new Platonic Christology and theology) . . . after long, rancorous, and complicated controversy . . . became the orthodoxy of the general church, by decree of the Council of Nicea, AD 325.” Then persecution of Oneness Christians became outrageous. Oneness Christians lost their meeting places, and were forced to either die or be baptized into the “Trinity.” The origins and history of the Catholic-Protestant movement are bloody. Who can deny this?

Unless it was a later interpolation by a pious Catholic, the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, earlier reportedly wrote: “All things are three, and thrice is all: and let us use this number in the worship of the gods . . .” Plato, Aristotle, Numenius, Plotinus, and Philo are fathers of the Catholic-Protestant movement.

Rufus Jones said it well (*The Church’s Debt to Heretics*): “The early Apologists, Justin Martyr, Aristides, Minucius Felix, Tatian, Irenaeus, and Tertullian . . . were at one with their predecessor, Philo . . .” The origins of the Catholic-Protestant movement are mired in Greek philosophy. The Protestants kept the Trinity doctrine of their Mother when they departed from her. Why did they not more thoroughly investigate the origins of the Catholic-Protestant movement? The Protestants rejected such doctrines as transubstantiation, veneration of relics, confession to the priest, purgatory . . . , but they embraced the Trinity teaching! It is a doctrine that is a hybrid teaching, including both pagan and Christian origins.

And so we finally ask: How did the Catholic-Protestant movement come about? Men (and women) neglected and rejected the plain teaching of the Word of God: “Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord!” Jesus said it was the first of all commandments.

## The Evolution of the Trinity Doctrine—D. S. Garza

The Trinity doctrine of one God in three persons has become the standard by which Catholics and Protestants explain the nature of God. But the truth is that Trinitarianism evolved over time and was still being formulated well into the fifth century.

Credo defining Trinitarianism were created by men who were fighting, among other things, the spread of Arianism. Arius, the founder of this rapidly growing movement, did not believe in the deity of Christ. Athanasius (AD 296 - AD 373), who was an ordained bishop, theologian, and author, assisted at the Council of Nicea by debating against Arianism. One of his writings (*Against the Arians*), argues for the full deity of Christ, contending that Jesus Christ was co-equal and co-eternal with the Father.\*

In an attempt to defend the divinity of Christ, the Nicene Creed partially developed the Trinity concept in the third century; the Athanasian Creed expanded on these false ideas resulting in Tritheism. The Athanasian Creed was ascribed to Athanasius, but some believe it to have been composed in the fifth century by somebody else.\*\* Regardless of its origination, the author(s) did not describe the God of the Bible. Dr. Rick Cornish writes, "Athanasius died in office at the age of seventy-five. But his views of the Trinity were still not fully developed or accepted by all Christians." Neither was it the majority position for many years. Finally, whether anybody could understand it or not, Athanasianism became orthodoxy. L.L. Paine (*The Evolution of Trinitarianism*), states that "Trinity, generation, consubstantial . . . terms invented and made current coin by Greek philosophers and theologians, are still the familiar watchwords of orthodoxy."

In the days of the apostles, a simple scriptural explanation of God and Christ sufficed (1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; Jn. 10:30). After their deaths, and many debates later, so-called theologians complicated matters by making the revelation of the Unity of God an impossible challenge to explain. Even though the Athanasian Creed defined God for the masses as, "One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance," it's no wonder that not all Trinitarians understand or explain the doctrine of the Trinity in the same way.

James Forrest writes that "Protestants do not doubt that many doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, having no authority from Scripture, must have crept into existence, at times, subsequent to the Apostolic age." He also states that the "doctrine of a Trinity of persons of the Godhead . . . had a similar origin." Forrest continues, "I think that they formed no part of primitive Christianity, but were slowly, and step after step, introduced among its principles, during the second, third, and succeeding centuries." He also states that in review of the three creeds (Apostles [so-called], Nicene, and Athanasian) of the churches of Rome and England, that "they distinctly indicate a gradual change of opinion from the simplicity of the Gospel to the complex system of Trinitarianism . . . in its boldest and most complicated state."

To quote the Oxford Companion of the Bible: "The developed concept of three co-equal partners in the Godhead found in later creedal formulations cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the canon." I appreciate the reluctant admission that it cannot be clearly detected; I submit that the reason it is not detected is that the subject is not even alluded to. William Penn writes, "Know ye my friend. That the Trinity was born above three hundred years after the ancient Gospel was declared; it was conceived in ignorance, brought forth and maintained by cruelty."

\* Dr. Rick Cornish—Five-Minute Church Historian

\*\* The Book of Common Prayer

## William Richards and Baptism—Thomas Weisser

Among the ignored Baptists in history, William Richards (1749-1818) stands out as a defender of truth concerning baptism. The idea that baptism in Jesus' name died out sometime after the first century and then revived in the twentieth century is simply wrong. Jesus declared that He would personally build His church in Matt. 16:18, "upon this rock I will build my church." He didn't take a hundreds-of-years break from construction and then start rebuilding. If what the Scriptures say about Christ is true, this void in history is an impossibility. With all the power the Lord Jesus Christ has, how could the powers of hell stop Him from His self-assigned task?

The celebrated eighteenth century Baptist historian, Robert Robinson in his *The History of Baptism* says this, "It is observable, there is no mention of baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost [in Acts]. Peter exhorted the Jews of Jerusalem to repent and be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ. Philip baptized the Samaritans in the name of the Lord Jesus. Peter commanded the believers in Caesarea to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Many Christians [in the 18th century that Robinson knew of] taking it for granted, that the apostles thoroughly understood the words of the Lord Jesus (Mt. 28:19), and supposing the form of words of local and temporary use, administer baptism in the name of Christ, and think themselves justified by the book of the Acts of the Apostles." William Richards corresponded with Robinson and was one of the many who baptized in Jesus' name at that time.

Richards pastored a church in Lynn (today King's Lynn) on the east side of England. He had extensive correspondence with many in the UK as well as with people in the United States. His influence extended far beyond the city where he pastored.

He stood for the basic truths of believer's baptism to be performed by immersion. Also, that it is necessary for all who can believe.

He supports baptism in Jesus' name for the remission of sins as the early church did.

"This ordinance (baptism) appears to have been originally observed for the purpose of putting on Christ, or that the persons baptized might thereby take upon them his name: hence we read of being baptized in, or into the name of the Lord Jesus, and of putting on Christ in that ordinance" (Acts 8:16; Gal. 3:27).

"That it (baptism) represents the Believer, or Subject, as assuming a new name, even that of CHRIST, or a Christian: hence the converts were baptized in or into the name of the Lord Jesus, and are said to put on Christ in this ordinance. This is an important idea, and well adapted to keep us in mind that Christ is our Lord and Master, and that we ought, above all things, to obey and follow him, even through evil as well as good report."

Concerning baptism for remission, he says this; "That it (baptism) represents the Remission, or washing away of his sins, as a privilege which the convert, or believer, is now entered into the enjoyment of: accordingly Peter says to the convicted Jews, 'Repent and BE BAPTIZED every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins,' and Ananias says to Paul, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord' (Acts 2:38; 22:16)."

Richards was one of many during his time who took a stand for the necessity of baptism in Jesus' name by immersion for the remission of sins.