**YM’s DEVIANT TEACHINGS By Chin Aun Quek**

**(2013.10.13 Board of Ministers Meeting, Singapore)**

**Session 2**

**Baptism:**

**(A) Does Baptism in a dug-out pool have any efficacy?**

YM answered to the question whether baptism in a dug-out pool has any efficacy. This was spoken in 19/5/2013 at a seminar in Kaoshiung, Hebrews **01** **(63:16-63:44)(mp3.4.1) (65:10-70:05)(mp3.4.2)**[

*(Summary of mp3.4.1 and 3.4.2)* *YM says that during the Cultural Revolution, people were locked up in jail. During that time, they were baptized in dug-out pools. When they were released, some people in the church condemned these people for deviating from the truth, saying this is heresy. YM quoted the incident of Acts 16, when the jailer wished to commit suicide after the earthquake. Paul preached to him, and subsequently, the bible records that the jailer brought them home and Paul baptized them. The assumption YM made is that since the baptism was at night, the city gates would be closed. How then would they have left the city to be baptized? Therefore if we look at the Cultural Revolution and see those who have been baptized in the pool, we should not condemn them and say that they are wrong. Rather, God should be able to accept their baptism. We can take this as an exception rather than the rule, since these churches have gone back to baptism in living water, and we should accept them.*

**Analysis:**

First, the truth is only one. You cannot compromise it because you are in a special situation. You may think that we can change the truth under a special situation, thinking that it doesn’t matter if you conduct baptism in a dug-out pool because God will surely have compassion since you are not sinning willfully and you have not thrown away the truth nor your faith, just that the external environment has made it difficult to obey the truth wholly. However, God will not be happy with such doings as you have changed the biblical baptism.

Second, if during that time, you really cannot go to the river to conduct baptism, then don’t be baptized. Do not change baptism. In this way, God will have compassion on you since He knows that you insist on the true biblical baptism and do not dare to change the baptism. Baptism is strictly to be done in rivers or seas. We do not compromise this even for those who are severely ill.

Third, how can YM, just for the sake of comforting them, defend their deviation from true biblical baptism? He forces the issue regarding the jailer into this. Luke did not say that Paul went out of the city to be baptized and come back. Although YM says that this is just a reference, he only uses this to support his argument that under special situations, you can waive baptism in a river and can conduct baptism in a cistern.

One who believes in the baptism preached by our church will not explain like YM did. Instead, he will direct those who were once baptized in a cistern to be baptized in the right biblical mode, just like Paul instructed the Ephesians to receive the Lord’s baptism. Although the baptism of John similarly came from God, it was only the baptism of repentance. We should receive the baptism of Jesus.

YM says that up to today, these people still conduct baptism in living water and there are still miracles. This may happen, but it does not mean that in the past, baptism in a cistern was correct.

In 2013, between June and July, I was in Adam Road church conducting the China Members’ Fellowship. There was a sister from China who came to visit her relative. I heard that YM was in China attempting to unite the churches not affiliated with the north or the south. I asked this sister if this was true. She said that she knew this but that the Elder that YM seeks to associate with had already gone against the truth, conducting baptism in a dug-out pool. She asked, why does he still want to unite with them? So I thought even a young girl like her understood this .

Next, we look at an extract from RAWLS’ blog regarding YM teachings on Song of Songs**《雅歌》台北講座的三大[否定], 06/23/2013**

1. There is one particular passage from YM that upsets me the most. He says, “In the past the frequent testimonies of water turning into blood repulsed me greatly. What is this testimony for? After listening to it once or twice, after three times I get very agitated inside. What has our church changed? God has not changed in this particular sign and wonder. Is the relationship that Jesus has with you just like this?”
2. The precious blood of Jesus and His redemption when seen in baptism is vividly portrayed before us, even if it is repeatedly shown to us. Should such repeated signs repulse you? Shouldn’t the Holy Spirit witness to the blood, water and Spirit that work during baptism itself? When you see a vision of the precious blood during baptism, this is out of the usual – should it repulse you?

**Analysis:** I believe that perhaps YM meant to say that some believers just like to take a look if they can see the water turn into blood. If you build your relationship with the Lord just based on visions, then this is not good.

We do not encourage believers to go to baptism just to see visions. However, we will not be repulsed if people bear testimony that water turns to blood. A vision is not something that you will see just because you want to. Since God allows a person to see the vision, to testify that baptism in living water has the efficacy of the Lord’s blood, why are you repulsed if you hear about it? Unless this is a false testimony or has gone against the teaching of the Scriptures?

**Holy Communion:**

**(A) Can a Christian from another church can partake the Holy Communion in our church.**

**(2012.09.09, BaldwinPark.Q&A2.)(13:45-16:35)(mp3.5)**

*YM says, “This is a direction in which we could research further, that is whether a Christian from another church can partake of the Holy Communion. Many visitors come for our services during Holy Communion and when Holy Communion is served, others beside him are served and he is not. This breaks his heart – although you are usually so friendly to him, during Holy Communion, you suddenly treat him as an outsider. This is a very awkward situation. Can they really not partake in the Holy Communion? I say this is something we can research into further. In the Bible, you have verses that support and are against such a person to partake Holy Communion. At this juncture Bro Chu interjected and stressed, Pr Yang is only suggesting a research possibility, not stating his support for it ”*

**Analysis:** YM and Brother Chu emphasize that YM says we can discuss this further. They think there is no problem making such a statement. To me, it is a problem. A person from another church has not received proper biblical baptism. How can he partake of the Lord’s holy supper? If a person who has not been baptized in our church can partake in the Holy Communion, then our church’s baptism for the forgiveness of sins would not be absolutely necessary. Every time during Holy Communion service, the person administering it would announce that those who have not been baptized in our church should not partake in it. If one truly believes in the pure doctrines of our church, he would not raise this to be discussed as it would go against the baptism for the forgiveness of sins. If someone raises this up for discussion, it shows that there is deviation in his faith. This is just like the general Christian world outside – as long as you believe in Jesus and receive baptism in a Christian church, your sins are forgiven and you are a child of the Lord. Although you have not been baptized in this church, you can receive Holy Communion in this church. However, our faith is not so. If you have not been baptized into our church you cannot partake our Holy Communion as your sins have not been washed away. This is something that does not require discussion unless you have deviated in your faith. For example, if you are a preacher and you raise this question – can a preacher marry two wives? I did not say that I agree to this but I just raise this for discussion. How would you view me as a preacher then?

From what YM himself said, we see he has already deviated from the view that our three sacraments are absolute. Although he does not claim to deny it, he views that these sacraments are not a must.

**(II) AFTER BAPTISM, ONE HAS THE HOLY SPIRIT, SO PRAYNG FOR HOLY SPIRIT AND SPEAKING IN TONGUE IS ONLY GRACE UPON GRACE**

YM holds that once you are baptized, the Holy Spirit is in you, so receiving the Holy Spirit evidenced by tongues-speaking is only grace upon grace. This is a deviation from our fifth article that believes that receiving the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues. is the guarantee of heavenly inheritance.

Extracted from RAWLS**[加足馬力]前先[認清方向],** dated 20/4/2013.

* YM continues to preach on the pulpit that when you believe and are baptized, you already have the Holy Spirit. RAWLS used the example from the “God of Every Man” spoken in April 2013 where YM says that why is it that today we are so afraid to admit that we have the Spirit of God in us especially when our sins have already been forgiven? Why is it that you don’t dare to believe that God’s Spirit is in you? If you do not dare to believe that God’s Spirit is in you, then that would equal to the fact that you do not dare to admit you are part of the body of Jesus Christ. Every one of us has got God’s Spirit in us because you have been saved from sin and God’s Spirit is in you. But you still have to pursue for the promised Holy Spirit. This is so clear. Why has everything become so complicated today?
* This is RAWLS’ critique: Even after YM speaks his own views, he adds on by saying that you still have to pursue the promised Holy Spirit. But when you believe, you have the Holy Spirit. This is in contradiction to the beliefs of the True Jesus Church. The fifth article of faith of the True Jesus Church maintains that receiving the Holy Spirit is for the heavenly inheritance and should be guaranteed by the speaking in tongues.

 In 14/12/2012, YM wrote an essay entitled “Washing of feet is not to have a part with Christ, and also a treatise on the Holy Spirit”. I have attached it in Appendix 3 for you. It is a pretty long.

*1. I have said it again and again and I will once again repeat this. When we talk about the Holy Spirit, nobody denies the article of faith, which says speaking in tongue is evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit. In HBL, there are some people who say that receiving the Holy Spirit need not be evidenced by speaking in tongues. This has nothing to do with YM.*

*2. The crux of the argument is this.*

*a. YM claims that the Holy Spirit lives in a person who has been born again through baptism. Secondly, this person must continue to pursue the baptism of the Holy Spirit as evidenced by speaking in tongues.*

*b. A few believers has interpreted this as such: Since we already have the Holy Spirit in us, why must we still pray for the Holy Spirit? Isn’t this way of thinking the same as in 1932? When you receive baptism, you already have a part with Christ. So why must you still have your feet washed?*

*c. Why is it that when we talk about resurrection we will not be stuck at this point? Baptism allows us to be raised in our body and spirit (Rom 6:1-5)? When we receive the Holy Spirit, it will cause our mortal bodies to resurrect (Rom 8:11). Receiving the Lord’s body and blood lets us be raised on the last day (Jn 6:54). Nobody has ever asked the question: since I have received baptism and received the Holy Spirit, I can be resurrected. Why must I still receive the body and blood of Christ to be resurrected?*

*d. When we talk about eternal life, no one gets stuck: When a person is baptized, he receives eternal life (Mk 16:16). One who receives the body and blood of Christ receives eternal life (Jn 6:54). When we receive the Holy Communion in the Spring spiritual meeting, why do you receive Holy Communion again in the Autumn spiritual meeting? Since we receive eternal life in Spring, why must we receive eternal life again in Autumn?*

*e. When we receive the baptism, we already have the Spirit living in us. But ee still have to receive the Holy Spirit and speak in tongues. This is grace upon grace and strength upon strength, resurrection plus resurrection, eternal life plus eternal life and Holy Spirit plus Holy Spirit.*

*3.If someone really denies that speaking in tongues is evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit, then there is a point of contention. Has anybody proposed this in actuality?*

*4. This is YM’s summary to this question. If somebody continues to say that YM proposes that receiving the Holy Spirit is not evidenced by speaking in tongues and denies receiving the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues, and has gone against our doctrine of the Holy Spirit that has been taught all these years, then I can only mourn for you.*

**Analysis**:

1. Firstly, YM clearly explains that the Holy Spirit lives in a person who has been baptized and is born again, but this person must receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the speaking in tongues as evidence.

- He also repeatedly explains that he does not deny tongue speaking as evidence of the Holy Spirit.

-He testifies about the number of people in Paris and African churches, who receive the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues.

2. So where has YM deviated?

-The problem is that he views receiving the Holy Spirit as evidenced by tongues is not an absolute requirement.

-He does not object to praying for the Holy Spirit and receiving the Holy Spirit by tongues speaking but he does not think it is an absolute necessity.

3. There are seminars held in three places where we can see from his explanation that he does not reckon that praying for the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues is an absolute necessity.

The first seminar is in 9/9/2012 in Baldwin Park.

**(A) YM views that praying for the Holy Spirit, receiving the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues is only grace upon grace.**

**(2012.09.09.Baldwin Park, JobQ&A Part1.)(39:10-41:22)(mp3.6)**

*-YM says that traditionally, we say that one who speaks in tongues is one who has received the Holy Spirit. Jesus is in him, and he is in Jesus. Yet he still has to partake the Holy Communion. Why? This is to allow Jesus to live in him and he in the Lord, so that he can be resurrected on the last day. ..*

*-One who does not speak in tongues, when he partakes the Holy Communion, will Jesus be in him? Jesus will. If Jesus is in him, is the Holy Spirit in him? One who does not speak in tongues can through the Holy Communion allow Jesus to be in him. Jesus said that one who takes my flesh and drinks my blood, I am in him and he in Me… You definitely cannot deny this fact. You cannot deny that one who does not speak in tongues has the Holy Spirit in him, has the Lord in him.*

*- Some may say, since you say this, then we do not need to pray for the Holy Spirit. This is the crux of the matter. Look at this – one who already has the Holy Spirit in him, why does he need to partake the Holy Communion? This is called grace upon grace. After you are baptized you become part of the body of Christ. The body of Christ cannot be without the Holy Spirit. You become the temple of the Holy Spirit, it’s impossible you don’t have the Holy Spirit, you surely do have.. But you must further have grace upon grace.*

**Analysis**:

1. Praying for the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues is grace upon grace. This is not a wrong saying. Speaking in tongues is a grace that God gives.

- Speaking in tongues, however, is an absolutely necessary grace upon grace. If speaking in tongues is merely grace upon grace and without it you can enter the Heavenly Kingdom since you already have the Holy Spirit in us, then itis a deviation from our basic beliefs.

2. This is the same belief as other churches. They do not deny speaking in tongues. They also pray for the Holy Spirit and speak in tongues.

-However, they say that speaking in tongues is only a gift, grace upon grace. This is not what everyone must absolutely pray for.

-Having it is grace while not having it is alright. Because when you believe in the Lord, you already have the Holy Spirit in you

- tongue speaking is only a gift and merely grace upon grace.

3. The Bible says that receiving the Holy Spirit is the guarantee of the heavenly inheritance (Eph 1:13-14)

-while speaking in tongues is the evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:4-5;2:1-4).

-Therefore praying for the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues is an absolutely necessary grace upon grace.

- but to YM, it is only grace upon grace, not an absolutely necessary grace upon grace. This is where he has deviated.

**(B) YM says that if you do not speak in tongues, you can also enter the heavenly kingdom**. **(2013.05.19. Kaoshiung, Hebrews 02)(94:27-95:45)(mp3.7)**

*Since I have already made so many errors, let me now give you another error. We say that if you do not speak in tongues, you cannot enter the heavenly kingdom because you don’t have the Holy Spirit. Isn’t this so? Is that really so? Why do I think about this question? Because last month, in the Paris student spiritual convocation, I see 12 year-olds coming forward to pray for the Holy Spirit. I asked them what they wanted to pray for. All of them wanted to pray for the Holy Spirit. I asked them why they wanted to pray for the Holy Spirit for and they all said to enter heaven. I said, you want to enter heaven so early? I told them not to be afraid. You can go to heaven right now! Don’t keep on thinking you do not have the Holy Spirit, you can’t speak in tongues, you cannot go to heaven. I tell you, no matter when Jesus come…now we are having lessons, and Jesus suddenly comes, you all don’t have the Holy Spirit, all go to hell, and our few teachers go to heaven, I tell you, . We teachers will also not go to heaven. We will tell Jesus that we do not want to go to heaven – how can these lovely children go to hell?... How can we go to heaven by ourselves? So I say, don’t worry, be absolutely assured...*

**Analysis:**

1. Firstly, since YM knows that this is an error, why does he not change? Why does he not correct himself instead of constantly erring? If he mentioned “error” as an ironical statement, then it clearly shows that he has deviated in the truth we believe in.

2. Secondly, we encourage all believers to pray for the promised Holy Spirit and speak in tongues as this is the guarantee of our heavenly inheritance. YM encourages them to be assured that they can enter heaven without speaking in tongues.

3. Thirdly, his essay dated 14/12/2012, very clearly states that

1) The Holy Spirit lives in a person who has been baptized and is born again.

2) But this person must receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues.

-However, on19/5/2013, in the Paris Spiritual Convocation, he taught the children that they can enter heaven without the speaking in tongues.

4. What he has written in his essay and what he actually teaches are very clearly not in agreement. Isn’t this self-contradictory?

= We can see that he says that when one receives baptism, he has the Holy Spirit. Praying for the Holy Spirit and speak in tongues is not only grace upon grace but is an absolute necessity. That is the reason why he said that without speaking in tongues, one can enter the heavenly kingdom.

**(C)** **YM says that he does not deny the efficacy of praying for the Holy Spirit, but he doubts its necessity.**

**(20130623Taipei, 歌詠從思愛成病到乳香崗的全然獻上1)(55:00-56:10)(mp3.8)**

*Many things, as I think about it, feel a little odd. I do not deny its efficacy but I somewhat doubt its necessity. For example, praying for the Holy Spirit. We say that the Holy Spirit is promised, isn’t that so? We say that God will give you the Holy Spirit. Is that not right?... I have not spoken wrongly, have I? …Since the promised Holy Spirit will be given to you, I’m thinking, someone says, yes, I’m going to wants to give you this, and you are happy, and then, you keep knocking at his door every now and the, give me! Give me! And I say, yes I’m going to give you, but why do you keep knocking on my door? We even plead so earnestly, give me! Give me! Hence I feel it’s funny, eventually it feels funny to me. We spend a lot of time pleading, we are not conversing, between us and God, there is no loving exchange.*

**Analysis:**

1. Prayer is a communication and an exchange with God. But if one has not received the promised Holy Spirit, all the more he should pray to receive.

-We will not doubt the necessity of praying earnestly for the Holy Spirit since the teaching of the Lord is: How much more will the heavenly Father gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask?

-Didn’t the Lord use the parable of the loaves and the parable of the unjust judge, to teach us that in the face of rejection, we should not give up but should instead pray earnestly?

2. Yet YM doubts the necessity of praying for the Holy Spirit since it is a promise.

3. Isn’t such a saying a deviation from the Lord’s teachings? The Lord promises the Holy Spirit but it is not gotten automatically. You have to pray and ask Him for the Holy Spirit.

-The Lord’s instruction was for the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem to wait for the promised Holy Spirit. The disciples did not just sit down by faith and wait for the Holy Spirit.

-By faith, they prayed in one accord patiently. They did not come every now and then to pray to the Lord. Rather, they earnestly prayed until the tenth day, the Day of Pentecost, when the promised Holy Spirit finally came upon them.

4. With regards to praying and receiving the Holy Spirit, YM calls it grace upon grace., without the speaking of tongues, you can also enter heaven., hedoes not deny its efficacy but doubts its necessity. Such statements have already deviated from our church’s basic beliefs.