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Abstract

This thesis presents the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines for the first time. It traces the origins, development and current state of this movement. This work will attempt to supply that information, and do so in a manner that recognizes the vital roles of the Filipinos. It argues that schism within the movement was unavoidable due to historical and cultural predispositions of the Filipinos when combined with the paternal methods of the missionaries, and the schismatic nature of Pentecostalism. Important leaders are examined and presented with heretofore-unpublished details of their lives and works, including missionaries and national leaders such as Diamond A. Noble and Wilde Almeda. Some of the many organizations are studied from the perspective of schism and success, and a summary of the entire movement is offered with an analysis as to why people have migrated into it and within it. It attempts to present a way of understanding Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines through the examination of schism; understanding that may contribute to a global understanding of the Oneness movement, or even of Pentecostalism as a whole.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction & Methodology

1 Introduction

Oneness Pentecostalism, in contrast to the larger Trinitarian portion of classical Pentecostalism, suffers from a dearth of academic material about it. Whereas Pentecostalism in general has benefitted from a scholarly examination since the 1950s, serious, focused study of Oneness Pentecostalism probably did not begin until David Reed’s doctoral thesis at Boston University in 1978, which was not published for another twenty years as In Jesus Name – The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals.\(^1\) Reed, as a former Oneness Pentecostal, studies the movement from a blended emic/etic perspective. Talmadge French wrote the first extensive emic (insider) work in his Wheaton College Graduate School Master’s thesis, which was published as Our God is One in 1999.\(^2\) French’s more recent doctoral thesis at the University of Birmingham, UK, was published as Early Interracial Oneness Pentecostalism in 2014.\(^3\)

There is no known academic research that focuses on Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, or for that matter, any other country outside of the United States, although Thomas A. Robinson’s ‘Oneness Pentecostalism’ appears as a chapter in Michael Wilkinson’s Canadian Pentecostalism.\(^4\) This lack becomes most apparent in scholarly attempts at quantifying, describing or analyzing the movement. For instance, The New

\(^1\) David A. Reed, In Jesus Name (Dorset, UK: Deo Publishing, 2008).
International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements’ (2003) entry on ‘Philippines’ by W. Ma devotes 550 words to The Assemblies of God and mentions Trinitarian organizations with as few as 4 churches, but about the sizable Oneness movement there only says, “Although the United Pentecostal Church maintains a ministry in the Philippines, it is difficult to obtain any information, as the church is not affiliated with either the PCEC or PJM.”5 (Philippine Council of Evangelical Churches or Philippines for Jesus Movement) Thirty words about a movement that arguably represents close to 2% of the population of the country does not do justice to any examination of Pentecostalism. There is also no mention of the approximately 120 other Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines, including the Jesus Miracle Crusade that claims 1.5 million members. This is just one example of how Oneness Pentecostalism has been overlooked in the Philippines, and possibly throughout the world. This is not to suggest that there are sinister motives for overlooking the movement, merely that standard methods of research might not be sufficient to obtain information on Oneness Pentecostalism. Ma is correct that the United Pentecostal Church (UPC) is not affiliated with either the PCEC or PJM.6 Most Oneness groups do not affiliate with ministerial associations or councils. There are two reasons for this. The first is that many Oneness Pentecostals are very standoffish toward other denominations, even other Pentecostals. This probably stems from the Oneness majority (Essentialist) view

5 Ma, ‘Philippines,’ Burgess, Stanley M, and Eduard M Van Der Maas, eds., New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003), 201-3; Talmadge French, Our God is One, 251. Ma cites 1999 statistics showing 2,357 local churches and close to 130,000 members in the Assemblies of God in the Philippines. French’s book of that same year shows the United Pentecostal Church in the Philippines with 2,568 churches and 144,497 constituents.

6 Throughout this study, the United Pentecostal Church (UPC or UPCI) generally refers to the international organization with headquarters in Hazelwood, MO, and the United Pentecostal Church Philippines (UPCP) always refers to the national organization in the Philippines, the United Pentecostal Church (Philippines), Inc. Within the Philippines, the designation is often blurred, as many sources simply use “UPC” with the understanding that it refers to the Philippine organization.
that salvation requires baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, as well as Spirit baptism
evidenced by speaking with tongues. (The use of the term “Essentialist” throughout this
work only serves to distinguish those Oneness Pentecostals who believe water and Spirit
baptism are essential to salvation from those who do not “non-Essentialists”. It is not
used in a philosophical or methodological way.) Another reason is that even if they
wished to join such ecumenical bodies, they could not comply with the statement of faith.
For example, the PCEC Statement of Faith (B.) states that the “PCEC believes…One
God eternally existing in three distinct Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”\(^7\) Such
wording is exactly what Oneness Pentecostals reject as unbiblical and contrary to their
most sacred belief about the identity of God. Understandably, the feeling is mutual and
most Trinitarian Pentecostals do not associate with Oneness Pentecostals. Even Oneness
Pentecostal scholars have encountered difficulties obtaining a clear picture of the extent
of the movement. For example, Talmadge French, who has published the most extant
data on the movement globally, discovered only 29 separate Oneness organizations in the
Philippines, and estimated another 50 independent churches.\(^8\) The global Oneness
Pentecostal movement is quite divided. The closest thing even approaching its own
associative body is the Apostolic World Christian Fellowship (AWCF), which only
represents about “135 Apostolic organizations” worldwide.\(^9\) The left hand certainly does
not know what the right hand is doing. As a result, many researchers, if they are even
aware of the movement’s existence, believe that Oneness Pentecostalism is worthy of
little more than a footnote. The movement within the Philippines is just as divided. It has

\(^7\) Philippine Council of Evangelical Churches website, [http://www.pceconline.org/about/faithstatement.htm](http://www.pceconline.org/about/faithstatement.htm) (accessed 20 October 2015).

\(^8\) French, *Our God Is One*, 281-283.

been beset from its earliest days by schisms that have divided organizations, local churches and even families. It is on the subject of those schisms surrounding the history of the movement that this thesis is, in large measure, concerned.

This research proposes to fill the gaps that exist in historical information and current statistics regarding Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. It is primarily historical and uses mostly qualitative methods that include a combination of semi-structured interviews, existing written histories and document analysis. The research surveyed leaders and members of various local churches in different parts of the Philippines and among the Filipino diaspora. It uses a more hands on approach in the search of information rather than a reliance on usual sources that fail to take into account the actual status of Oneness Pentecostal organizations and local churches.

This research discovered that the scope of Oneness Pentecostalism has been underestimated in the Philippines. It shows that the movement is considerably larger than has been assumed, which has significant implications for researchers of global Pentecostalism, and Christianity in general.\(^1\) However, it must be understood that obtaining numbers for organizations is fraught with the peril of uncertainty. Although care is taken to report accurately, in the final analysis figures are arrived at from other sources. In some cases, the websites of organizations have provided the numbers of congregations. Where possible, leaders of organizations have been approached for information, and some have complied. It cannot be assumed that figures are accurate just

\(^{10}\) Walter J. Hollenweger wrote concerning the Assembleias de Deus of Brazil, “Quite apart from the difficult problems of obtaining accurate statistics…the growth of the Assembleias de Deus is unparalleled in recent church history and its significance for theology and the ecumenical movement is not to be underestimated.” *The Pentecostals* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 79. His comment about the difficulty of obtaining accurate statistics certainly applies to the current research, and while the size of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines falls well below that of the AdD, its growth is also significant in the understanding of the Oneness Pentecostal movement worldwide.
because they are published.\textsuperscript{11} An online article about the Apostolic Faith Church in Hawaii, an organization with fewer than ten congregations, gave the total membership number as 144,000.\textsuperscript{12} When questioned about this directly, the head pastor responded, “144,000…Revelation 14:1-4. The question always asked how many members do you have? That’s our answer…one body, one church, etc.”\textsuperscript{13} This was the most extreme case of over inflating the number of members found during this research, but it points to the importance of confirming numbers when possible, and certainly when there is cause for doubting them. Church leaders tend to overestimate the numbers of their works. Some missionary sending organizations give missionaries specific instructions on how to make their reports look better. Some missionaries have been known to visit other works not affiliated with their organization and take photos that appear in their next report, implying the work is their own. Some organizations arrive at membership numbers by calculating total attendance at only their largest services such as Easter and Christmas, plus all the family members who do not attend church, and everyone who has ever visited the church. However, this research also discovered that most churches in the Philippines do not count children in their total membership number. Churches belonging to one large organization might even purposely underestimate attendance because of organizational policy of requiring monthly offerings based on the number of adult members.

The research attempts to discover and record the little known histories of pioneers, foreign missionary and especially national, who were instrumental in the development of the movement. This research also examines the numbers of participants who actually

\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix A for figures of Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines.
\textsuperscript{12} \url{http://www.encyclopedia.com/article-1G2-3274100057/apostolic-pentecostals.html} (accessed August 2014.)
\textsuperscript{13} William Han Jr. email 21 August 2014.
speak in tongues and how often, giving a base for comparing with the general Pentecostal and Charismatic population as shown in the Pew Report of 1996. There has been a staggering amount of schism within this movement. This study will attempt to identify the causes for schism by focusing on the historical and cultural predispositions of the Filipinos, the actions of American missionaries in the Philippines and human behavior leading to schism. These factors will be compared with the findings of David Barrett’s research on schism in Africa, and the implications for an understanding of schism using examples found in the Bible.

1.2 Methodology
This research begins by taking the experiences of these and others, “as they are and offer an interpretation.” It also proceeds with the assumption that there are often two or more versions of each event. Even if only one side is recorded here, there is the knowledge that there are, or were, other versions, even if they are not documented. Unless evidence is found to the contrary, the stories discovered are assumed to be the truth according to the source. In spite of the undeniable influence of the American missionaries upon the early formation of the movement, this study does not presume upon the superiority of the organization or the missionary. This is a true attempt to discover, recapture and preserve the “histories from below.” It presumes the indispensability of the Filipino, the indigenous worker, and seeks to identify him and her, and recognize their

---

accomplishments. It seeks to, as much as possible, read “between the lines” without fabricating illusions to fill the gaps. That is, it seeks to discover the History of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines more fully than has already been recorded from the Western missionary point of view, taking that view into consideration but not relying entirely upon it. It is an attempt to discover the unwritten history of the Filipinos who are, or were, significant participants in this movement and without whom this movement would not exist in its current form. Hopefully this important history is communicated in a way that will be available and understandable to those within the movement who seek to understand where they have come from and how they arrived at where they are, as well as to the academic community who wish to study it.

It must be acknowledged that there exists a significant time lapse between the actual events being investigated and the interviewing many of the witnesses to those events. The passage of time must be taken into account when forming judgments based upon much later testimony of those who may have been there. With this in mind, effort was made to triangulate testimony wherever possible. This involved, on more than one occasion, comparing an account written decades ago about an event that happened decades earlier, with an interview of a witness during this research. In some cases more than 50 years had elapsed between the event and the interviews of witnesses who were there. Of course, it cannot be helped. It is indeed fortunate that this study is taking place while some witnesses are still alive. And it has been possible in some cases to interview more than one witness to a specific event.

This work is approached from a historical perspective that rests somewhat upon works that are more or less autobiographies of the people involved. One reason, as was pointed out above, is that there are virtually no historical sources available other than those written from autobiographical points of view. The present research will be the first academic history of the movement, which leads to the second reason. This is the history of a movement, but the movement is not a disembodied idea. The movement is made up of individuals. All of these individuals have their own story. Their combined stories are the history of the movement. That biography can be considered as serious history is becoming increasingly more accepted. Jonathan Steinberg, Professor of Modern European History at the University of Pennsylvania, asks, “Why has biography become respectable as a form of research?” and answers, “Biography established itself, I think, because the social science models left out the power of human personality.”

History professor Daniel Snowman also examines “…the latest trends in the field…” of “…whether historical biography can be considered a serious contribution to history…” He points out the reservation to biography by some academics that, “by focusing on the life of an individual, the writer can hardly embrace the wider historical picture.” But he says that good biographers have a “capacity to slip almost imperceptibly between the micro and macro, allowing each to reinforce the other.”

Lawrence Goldman, the outgoing editor of the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (and incoming Director of the University of London’s Institute of Historical Research) puts it well: the aim of the ODNB, he says, is to enable the

---

21 Daniel Snowman.
22 Daniel Snowman.
reader not only to learn about a life from the past but also to understand that person’s place in the history of their age.\textsuperscript{23}

Addressing the tendency of researchers to become emotionally attached to “…the subject of their research…” Snowman says, “…maybe all good historians experience a degree of emotional identification with what they write about; certainly, studies of the past are poorer when clothed in such a way as to distance the reader from the ‘feel’ of the subject matter.”\textsuperscript{24} The detail that is offered in this work will hopefully help the reader to understand why those whose lives are examined here made some of the decisions they made, decisions that helped to shape the movement under investigation. Susan Ware, General Editor of the American National Biography “argues that one of the best ways to understand history is through the lives of history’s major and minor players – and this means being as inclusive as possible about who is included.”\textsuperscript{25} Ware goes on,

Biography has always been one of the best ways to look at and learn about broader themes in… history. You can use an individual life as a window on wider developments…it provides a personal connection to the big themes and events. Biography is a field of history that people love to read, and students love to learn about history through that frame…I think history really does often come alive for people by studying the lives of individuals.\textsuperscript{26}

Cornell University professor Nick Salvatore writes, “Biography is a form of historical writing,” that provides “a valuable perspective.”\textsuperscript{27} While the current study is not primarily a biography, it must utilize a biographical approach in an attempt to tell a large part of the story, the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. This approach,

\textsuperscript{23} Daniel Snowman.
\textsuperscript{24} Daniel Snowman.
\textsuperscript{26} Susan Ware, “Understanding History.”
relying upon biographical/autobiographical sources and interviews with participants in its history, such as it is, suggests that the work must take on a more historical or descriptive form, both to present what has not heretofore been presented, and then to find its meaning.

The emic/etic paradigms influence both the sources and methodology of the present work. As Allan Anderson points out, the “insider (emic) paradigm makes academic reflection quite different from those outsider (etic) paradigms that might not admit to the influence of divine agency…”28 The emic perspective benefits as a result of the researcher or writer understanding the subject from within. That they can see from within opens up to them a micro view not easily discernible from elsewhere. There are shades of differences from within that are more difficult to be seen from without. All the colors of the inside spectrum are more brilliant and apparent when viewed up close and at hand. The challenge of this paradigm is the possibility of over sympathizing with the sources and the subject, and the potential failure to see them objectively. One result of over sympathizing is the reluctance to include important information in the body of the research that might be hurtful or disappointing to the sources. The emic researcher must therefore recognize the bias inherent in this position, and work to view the sources and subject more carefully while appreciating the advantages of seeing within, and possible disadvantages of not seeing from without. The etic observer on the other hand, can see the shape of the subject from the outside. The etic researcher has the advantage of moving distance relative to the object of investigation. One can move far from the object and view the whole in relationship to its surroundings. Or one can move close enough to focus on a smaller portion and examine it, as it were, through a magnifying glass. But no

matter how close one gets to the outside of a phenomenon, and how expert they may
master its outer form and fabric, their view is still from the outside. They are still ‘other’.
There are nuances within that are difficult, if not impossible, to understand by the
outsider. Thus, the etic researcher better serves his or her purpose in the pursuit of
knowledge if they will admit to certain limitations, and must work diligently seeking to
understand that which is the subject of the research. Their knowledge of what is actually
on the inside can only come from two possible sources: outside observance and analysis,
or someone/something that has been on the inside. Etic knowledge then is limited by
interaction with sources from within, or others who have examined inside sources, and
any transparence or semi transparence in the outside ‘wall’ of the object being
investigated.

Transparency varies from object to object. Oneness Pentecostalism is more
opaque than the larger movement it separated from in the early twentieth century. One
eexample of this can be seen when comparing the archives of two of the larger
organizations respectively, the Assemblies of God (AG) and the United Pentecostal
Church International (UPCI). The AG maintains an online site that provides hundreds of
thousands of pages of digitized publications pertaining not only to the AG, but the entire
Pentecostal movement. The Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center provides the site,
iFPHC.org, to the public at large without cost.29 The UPCI offers nothing remotely
similar to the online public. As a result, the AG online archives have more materials
about early Oneness Pentecostalism in general than any Oneness Pentecostal archives
that are currently accessible online. It is hoped that someone within the latter movement
will move to rectify this situation sooner rather than later. More recently Gary Garrett has

29 https://ifphc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=home.main
developed an archive of papers and materials dealing especially with early Oneness Pentecostalism but it is still very limited and most of the papers are not freely available online.\(^3\)

The opaqueness of Oneness Pentecostalism might be attributed to several factors. First, the smaller size relative to the broader, overall Pentecostal movement would naturally produce fewer scholars from within. Likewise the smaller movement would attract fewer scholars from without. Another limiting factor might be a certain apprehensiveness in making sources available, as mentioned above, because of a perceived anti-Oneness bias on the part of those from without who might want to research the movement. Deserved or not, a certain defensive posture tends to be taken by those who have been most severely criticized as being a cult. It remains however, that the Oneness Pentecostal movement is basically as old as modern Pentecostalism in general. Both are slightly over 100 years old. It is time therefore for Oneness Pentecostalism to clearly present itself to academia, which after all, has not been its enemy.

Finally, this research seeks to understand the following questions. What is the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines? What is the movement, where did it come from, and who made it what it is today? What part does schism play in it? Is that schism positive, negative or neutral? In seeking to answer the main questions of where this movement came from and how schism figured in its development, it will take the path of discovering and preserving the histories of some of those who contributed significantly to Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. This begins in Chapter 2 with a brief introduction of 20\(^{th}\) century American Pentecostalism from which the Oneness movement sprang, followed by a review of the significant schism caused by the emergence of Oneness

---

Pentecostalism. This will demonstrate that schism was part of the movement from its earliest days as well as give a concise introduction to the subject of Pentecostalism and Oneness Pentecostalism for the uninitiated reader. The Philippines portion of Oneness Pentecostalism will also receive an introductory glimpse in this chapter through a look at the Survey of Religious Migration, which offers significant new information and naturally leads to a discussion focused entirely on the Philippines in the following chapter. Chapter 3 looks at Filipino history and culture in an attempt to understand how it may have influenced the movement, and possibly contributed to schism within it. It will also look at the earliest Pentecostal penetration among Filipinos and in the Philippines. This chapter ends by showing one of the earliest effective conversions of Filipinos to Pentecostalism was in Hawaii. This leads to the Hawaiian connection with Oneness Pentecostalism in the next chapter. Chapters 4-6 narrow the examination to only the Oneness branch of the movement, primarily following a historical narrative based on individuals and not necessarily in a strict chronological order. Each of these chapters examines the history of this movement through the lens of schism. Building on the discussion in Chapter 3 of Hawaii as an important waypoint for Pentecostalism as a whole, Chapter 4 examines the beginnings of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism, beginning in Hawaii, and includes some representative biographical sketches. The beginnings of schism within the movement in the Philippines will also be seen in this chapter. The presentation of the first known Oneness Pentecostal in the Philippines and the first Oneness baptisms directs the discussion toward the coming of the first non-Filipino Oneness missionary in Chapter 5 which will also look at some of the ingredients of successful organizational work as the movement picks up momentum. Most attention in
this chapter is given to Carlos Grant because he was the first successful Western Oneness missionary in the Philippines and founder of two organizations which experienced such schism that they resulted in at least 30 separate Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines. As in the previous two chapters, Chapter 6 will continue the history of the movement and of schism, and introduce the largest Oneness organization in the Philippines as being wholly autochthonous. The theme of schism builds throughout the study and seems to explode in this chapter, which lays the groundwork for an understanding of schism in the succeeding chapter. Thus Chapter 7 focuses on an examination of schism, looking for causes and understanding beginning with various schisms throughout Old Testament and New Testament history. Because nothing of depth is to be found regarding schism of religious groups in the Philippines, David Barrett’s study of schism in Africa is carefully examined for clues to understanding the study at hand. What is to be found in this chapter ultimately leads to a rather unusual approach in the Conclusion. The Conclusion will highlight what has hopefully been learned throughout the entire presentation concerning the emergence of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, and the forces that helped to form and were formed by the ever-present schism.

1.2.1 Sources

Sources for this research are extremely limited. Language is no barrier to this research in the matter of source materials, because the few sources that do exist are in English. This research has discovered no Filipino language, or Tagalog, sources for the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. There are also no known etic or outsider
sources about this movement. No scholarly work has been presented on this subject as a whole. The only academic works on Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism are two Master’s Theses. One was done in 1986 by David R. Banta at the Angeles University Foundation graduate school, but it is of very limited use to this research. Banta’s thesis is rather short, with its conclusions and recommendations appearing on pages 105-106, and its narrow focus can be discerned from its title- *The United Pentecostal Church in the Philippines and Its Implications to Community Development: An Evaluation.*\(^3\) The other, by Enrique A. Zaragoza for the Graduate School Pangasinan State University, and entitled *The Pastors’ Spouses Involvement in the Church Activities in The Apostolic Church Of The Lord Jesus Christ International Philippines Inc., A Case Study*, has basically the same limitations as the Banta thesis.\(^3\) Sam Smith has done an excellent job of documenting the parts played by Wilde Almeda and members of the Jesus Miracle Crusade during the Sipadan hostage crises in the year 2000.\(^3\)

There are three very useful sources that can be considered primary, only because individuals involved in the very beginnings of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism authored them. The first and least extensive was written by Urbano Aventura sometime around 1965 in the form of a letter of less than eighteen hundred words. It first appeared in a small, self-published, 55-page book, *My Philippines*, by Roberta Dillon in Bremerton, Washington about 1965. Roberta Dillon had served as a missionary with her husband for the UPC in the Philippines only shortly, from October 1959 until having to be airlifted to

---

\(^3\) My thanks to the kind staff at Angeles City University Foundation Library, and especially Amor C. Martin, Library Director and librarians Mariel D. Farrol and Mrs. Hernandez for their gracious help in locating and making available Banta’s thesis.

\(^3\) I am indebted to Enrique A. Zaragoza for giving me a copy of his thesis.

the United States in early January 1962 due to her contracting a severe form of polio which eventually caused her death in 1966. Aventura’s letter formed a separate chapter entitled *MY TESTIMONY* and is found on pages 52-55 in Dillon’s book. An analysis of the content reveals that it had probably been written at Dillon’s request, either to include in her book or to submit as part of a positive report to UPC Headquarters regarding their work in Mindanao. There might have been an added incentive to provide a positive report due to differences between Dillon’s husband, Arthur, and Carlos Grant, the senior UPC missionary in the Philippines at the time of their service. This gives rise to the possibility that Dillon might have edited the letter. However, the grammar in the letter is so substandard and does not match that of the rest of Dillon’s book, leading to the conclusion that Dillon probably did not edit the letter but printed it just as it was in the original. The letter was reprinted from Dillon’s book with major grammar changes, in the UPC Philippines’ *Celebrating 50 Years of Apostolic Liberty* in 2007.\(^{34}\) It is important to note that although Aventura’s letter could be considered a primary source, and it was written by a Filipino pioneer of the movement, it was not written for a Filipino audience, nor was it written until more than a quarter of a century had elapsed since some of the important happenings the author described. Nonetheless it remains the source for the earliest record of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism in existence. It is a copy of a copy. The original letter may no longer exist. That such an extensive movement depends on such for its earliest history painfully demonstrates the lack of primary source material and

\(^{34}\) Irene Chavez, Sheenie Hesite, eds. *Celebrating 50 Years of Apostolic Liberty* (Philippines: United Pentecostal Church (Phils.), Inc., 2007).
is an example of the difficulties of this research. Supplementary to Aventura’s *Testimony* is another letter he wrote to Arthur Dillon in 1965.\textsuperscript{35}

The second source, like the first, was written by a Filipino and entitled *My Concise Personal Testimony* by Diamond Noble. It is only slightly longer than Aventura’s testimony, containing about 2,800 words. Also, like Aventura, Noble writes (most likely in 1970) about his conversion that occurred some 26 years earlier. Both Noble and Aventura write about events in a chronological order. In a departure from Aventura’s style, Noble seems to be writing for a Filipino audience. The fact that Noble writes in English demonstrates that he is either targeting the more educated class of Filipinos, a distinct possibility seeing that he was well educated himself, or that he is writing for a broader audience than could be addressed in either Tagalog or his local dialect. Noble’s *Testimony* was supplemented by more than a score of letters written by him between 1947 and 1985.\textsuperscript{36}

The third source has an almost uncanny resemblance to the first two in that it recounts events that occurred almost 25 years before it was written. But that is where the similarity stops. Rather than being primarily a personal testimony, although it contains this also, this work is entitled *History of the Philippine Church*, is written by an American missionary and is 88 pages in length. The author, Carlos Grant, is one of the most significant persons discovered in this research because he is the trunk from which many organizational branches can be traced. Grant’s *History* has been added to by his

\textsuperscript{35} Urbano Aventura, letter to Arthur Dillon dated 21 December 1965, a copy of which was provided by Dillon’s son, Andrew Dillon to the researcher 30 May 2015.

\textsuperscript{36} Diamond Noble’s, letters 1947-1985, made accessible by his widow and daughter, and allowed to be copied by the researcher on site at Umingan, Pangasinan on 17 November 2015.
war diary and personal photo album. It seems like a foolhardy task to create a history from two short testimonies and a missionary’s recollections. These are dead men’s tales. But they are more than that. They are the hints of history. They are the visible which proves the invisible. Indeed, if that were the extent of material the task would be hopeless, but there is more. There are obscure primary sources such as census information, military induction papers, travel records, newspaper reports, periodicals, original photographs with writing on the back or titles and dates on the front, and personal letters and cards. None give a complete picture, but many offer one more piece of information to help add color or perspective.

The dearth of source material for this subject forced the research to lean heavily upon personal interviews and correspondence. Of tremendous value are the living acquaintances and relatives of those who have died, who are willing to help clear up haziness or shed light on darkness. At this stage, sixty years removed from the beginnings of the movement, there are not many left alive who can answer questions. Fortunately there are a few. Effort has been made to contact those few. Personal interviews have provided information that is available nowhere else. Phone calls, emails, and other forms of communications have all served to re-connect a network that is now widely separated by time and distance, and often ideology.

There are other books written by missionaries or former missionaries that have been examined, especially trying to find the details and dates of historical events, and the names and actions of the Filipinos to whom this history belongs. Most of the written sources must be considered as hagiographies. While they may not have been intended as

37 Carlos Grant, *Military Secrets*, containing his diary during his time of service in the Philippines during WWII, and photo album were provided by Grant’s nephew, Ron McCall.
autobiographical, that is the perspective from which they were written. Anderson cautions that it is “…necessary to critically examine the presuppositions of existing histories.”

Although what has been written about this movement hardly qualifies as histories, this study has attempted to follow that principle in the examination of all material. Until the current research of the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, no books concerning this movement have been written about others as the subject. All the historical type books written by missionaries were written about events surrounding their own lives and ministries, some of them even beginning with their births. Even the limited primary sources from Filipinos are mostly personal testimony and history. Those books that were written about organizations have all been written from the organization’s point of view and are almost exclusively about those organizations. At times an organization is willing to alter the facts in order to tell the story that serves it best. This can be seen in the *Foreign Missions Insight* (Hazelwood, Missouri: Foreign Missions Division, UPCI, 1997, 1999, 2002), in the articles about the UPC in the Philippines as follows. “Since its founding in 1957 by Elmer Buckmiller and Arthur Dillon…” However, the first and only UPC missionary in the Philippines in 1957 was
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Carlos Grant. It was Grant who performed the first baptisms under the banner of the UPC, and it was he who organized the UPC in the Philippines. After Grant resigned from the UPC it appears there was an effort to erase him from its history. There was, fortunately, a change in this policy of ignoring Grant by 2007, when the UPC Philippines published its 50th anniversary book, which acknowledged the work of Grant as founding missionary. This also affects the organizational periodicals that occasionally have short reports from various fields including the Philippines. Nonetheless, articles appear in these periodicals such as *Pentecostal Herald* and *Forward* of the UPCI, and the *Pentecostal Outlook* of the Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ. Many missionaries report to their supporters in monthly or quarterly letters that often contain helpful, if biased information. All of the sources mentioned here, and others used in this investigation, have been examined sympathetically but not blindly. In this research, sources have been gathered together, compared, analyzed and presented to those interested in the History of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines.

### 1.2.2 Survey of Religious Migration and Interviews

The survey that will be reviewed and analyzed in Chapter Two was entitled ‘Survey of Religious Migration’, and was designed primarily to track where Filipino Oneness Pentecostals originated in a religious sense. In other words, from which religions did Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines migrate. In many cases this could be considered initial schism. Other information is presented from the survey that will be helpful to further research into Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. Surveys were printed on letter size (either 8 ½ x 11 inches or A4) paper. The survey and all responses were in
English. From February 2013 to December 2015, 1,006 individual surveys were collected from Filipinos who attended various Oneness Pentecostal churches of several different organizations. This number included 43 personal interviews conducted by the researcher. For the most part, surveys were given by the researcher to various pastors and distributed by pastors of local churches among their membership. Pastors collected the completed surveys and gave them by hand to the researcher. Pastors were provided also with participant information that included an introduction to the research, a request for help and information regarding confidentiality, processing, recording, compensation and withdrawal from research. A copy of the participant information form is provided as Appendix E. This information form is entitled “Participant Information and Consent Form: *Migrating to the Edge: The History of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines*” because that was the original title of this research. The research later developed into an examination of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism through the lens of schism. A statement of consent was also provided for participants, a copy of which appears as Appendix F. In a few cases surveys were distributed and collected directly by the researcher during his attendance at a smaller church or family meeting. The researcher personally examined the surveys and eliminated any duplicates. Survey information was entered into online survey software that provides data protection, analysis and reporting.42 Entering the survey information into the digital format also allowed a second opportunity to eliminate possible duplicates. A copy of the survey is located in the Appendices as Appendix D.

Most interviews conducted by the author used the Survey of Religious Migration as a pattern. All interviews were conducted in English. Although all interviewees were conversant in English, a few interviews were assisted by the attendance of a translator.

---

who could rephrase the questions and answers into and from the local dialect. The questions on the survey were asked in the general order of the survey, allowing for flexibility to follow the course of the conversation. The interviewer took extensive notes during the interview, using a notebook computer. Most interviews were also recorded in audio or audio/video format and saved on a protected device. Some of the interview recordings were transcribed. In most cases the notes taken during the interview were sufficiently complete that the researcher could use them without referring to the recordings or transcripts of the interviews. Because the survey questions were used to conduct the survey, the survey itself was completed by the interviewer on behalf of those who were interviewed. The interviews contributed to the research by adding 43 surveys to the total. More importantly, historical information was discovered during interviews that could be discovered no other way. Some interviews led to the discovery of other people who had important information to share. Some individuals were interviewed multiple times as indicated in the list of Personal Interviews that can be found in the Bibliography. An example of a transcribed interview is located in the Appendices as Appendix G.

1.2.3 Limitations

The current research both benefits and suffers from the emic/etic research views. The researcher is inside the overall Oneness Pentecostal movement, which allows understanding of Oneness Pentecostal nuances, sympathetic examining of primary sources, of which there are only a few, and general agreement with the goals of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. The possible handicaps of being an insider are mitigated by
acknowledging the relationship to the movement being studied, by becoming acquainted with the larger Trinitarian portion of the movement through examination of related source material and correspondence with its members, and by an honest attempt, aided by the kind help of the thesis supervisor Allan Anderson, to be objective. On the other hand, the researcher is not a Filipino, which means he must view the subject, at least on occasion from some distance. Fortunately, the outsider limitations, while offering the necessary distance to view the Filipino movement objectively, have been lessened by extensive travel within the Philippine Islands, and the friendship and help of many sympathetic Filipinos, both in the Philippines and among the Filipino diaspora.

Personal interviews and contemporary correspondence, as crucial as they are to this research, are limited by three factors. First is the need to discover which living persons have information to contribute and how to contact them. Most of those who were alive in the late 1940s and 1950s, and who played a significant part in this history, have died. Those who remain are not easily found. When they are found, they are widely separated by distance. Most are in the Philippines, which is made up of over 7,000 islands. Fortunately, key persons have been found on seven of the larger islands, Leyte, Luzon, Mindanao, Negros, Cebu, Bohol and Panay. Other Filipinos contributing to knowledge of the early history are in the United States and Canada. The difficulty of distance has been partly addressed by travel to six of the seven islands mentioned. One key individual was located on Leyte Island, but was willing to meet with the researcher on Negros Island. Once individuals were located, other avenues of communication, such as telephone calls, emails or messaging through online social networking sites have been helpful. In total, the researcher has visited the Philippines 18 times since 1997, spending
a total of 259 days in that country, and has referred to notes made from the beginning. During this formal research, he has travelled there 4 times, spending a total of 80 days dedicated to research, and visited several locations including Metro Manila, Baguio City and Pangasinan on Luzon Island; Bacolod, Fabrica, Sagay and Victorias on Negros Island; Iloilo City and Antique Province on Panay Island; Davao City on Mindanao; Cebu; Bohol, six islands in total. Additionally, he has met and interviewed Filipinos in the United States, Canada and Norway, and has been in contact with others in Hong Kong, Italy and the Middle East.

The second limiting factor in personal interviews is the language/culture barrier. Although all of those interviewed spoke English, there were words and phrases used by them that the researcher found difficult to understand, and expressions the researcher used that the Filipinos had difficulty with. Just because two or more people speak the same language does not mean that the same thought processes are used in communicating that language. Older people, in particular, tend to use the local vernacular rather than either English or the national Filipino language, Tagalog. Thus, even if a foreigner were able to learn Tagalog, it would not guarantee they would be able to converse with people scattered throughout the Philippines. And, if one were the most amazing polyglot and could converse in all of the “55 languages and 142 dialects” in the Philippines, it would not prevent cultural misunderstandings.\(^{43}\) To overcome any possible language difficulties or cultural misunderstandings, the researcher depended upon knowledgeable Filipino intermediaries, who sometimes rephrased the question in English, or into the local dialect, and aided in accurate communication.

The third limitation found in both personal interviews and other forms of communication is the Filipino trait of trying to please. As mentioned in Chapter Three of this work, the concept of saving face is a major component in this culture.\textsuperscript{44} A Filipino will go to great lengths to avoid causing disappointment, or saying something that might cause another to lose face. The researcher must be aware that some information might be offered because it is felt that is the information the researcher is anticipating. Therefore, neutrality in seeking information is desirable in order to obtain facts that are not colored by expectation. Patience also is a virtue when researching this subject. Attempting to obtain a quick answer may result in incomplete or skewed information. Sometimes one must allow the thread of conversation to unwind at its own pace. The interviewer must refrain from placing words in the mouth of the interviewee. Care must be taken in posing a question, and there must be allowance for empty space to be filled by the one who has the information to offer.

As would be expected of a mostly emic paradigm, research such as this is approached from an inescapable bias. Although there must be a certain caution in researching history, the Pentecostal insider should not be tentative in his knowledge of God. If he states that he is, he is confused about his methodology or he is an outsider, in which case he is confused about his identity. This research recognizes the normative tendencies of the researcher, which has the potential to be beneficial or detrimental to this research. To grasp the benefits and avoid the detriments of the normative leanings, there must be recognition and incorporation. Incorporating bias into the research, while it must be done carefully, brings an inside knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of the movement that does not have to be discovered before writing. Recognition of bias is

\textsuperscript{44} Chapter Three, 3.1.
important in order that the researcher can remain aware of the experiences and culture that influences the way he or she perceives the research. It is also important that the audience be made aware of these things in order to better understand the perspective of the research. Openness is productive in such situations, so that suspicion on the part of the reader can be reduced, helping both the researcher and those who review the work. As much as the above limitations will allow, the goal of this research is historical objectivity.

In light of the above, it bears mentioning that the researcher approaches this work as a long time member of Oneness Pentecostalism, a pastor and evangelist of more than 40 years, who is not unaware of its shortcomings, and whose extensive travels have exposed him to missionaries and nationals in different organizations in many countries. He ministered at various churches and events of the United Pentecostal Church Philippines (UPCP), including district conferences for all eight existing districts in 1997, and ministered there occasionally for the UPCP in the following years. He had a unique relationship with this organization in that his invitations always came from the Filipino leadership and not from the non-Filipino missionaries. In 2008 he was the founding chairman of the Worldwide Pentecostal Fellowship Philippines (WPFP) until 2010, and remains an honorary chairman of that organization. Because of his experiences in the Philippines, the researcher is sympathetic toward the Filipino and desires for the Filipino voice to be heard. But without these experiences this research would not have been undertaken. Allan Anderson wrote that “…biases and presuppositions always influence the writing of history, and the writing of Pentecostal history is no exception.”

As an insider of Oneness Pentecostalism, and a sympathizer of the Filipino contribution to that movement in the Philippines, this research will no doubt be influenced by the biases and

---

45 Allan Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 5.
experiences of the researcher. But that is the subjective nature of all research, and cannot be entirely avoided. Anderson also said, “…it is impossible to write a value-free account of the past; it is always a selective and subjective interpretation of it,” and that most of Pentecostal history has been written from a “white American perspective, adding their own particular biases of denomination, ideology, race and gender.”

While the ideology has been admitted, this research has studiously attempted to avoid the biases of denomination [inasmuch as it applies to particular organizations within the Oneness Pentecostal movement], race and gender.

1.3 Gender Issues

Elizabeth Brusco has challenged those who research Pentecostalism to “keep the women up front”. The current investigation attempts to address the contributions of women, but probably not to the satisfaction of every stakeholder. For example, the history of Pentecostalism in the Philippines brings women to the fore, literally, by beginning with the inimitable Lucy Leatherman. However, while much was discovered about this indomitable woman in the course of this research, most of it remains outside this work, and must be saved for presentation in another manner and at another time. From the outset, women have played a vital part in the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines and their involvement is noted throughout this work. Although there is a brief examination of the gender issue in Chapter Five, and biographical sketches of two women in Chapters Four and Five, it must not be assumed that the existence and importance of women is ignored outside of those sections. It should be understood that
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46 Allan Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 5.
the history of this movement is the story of all Filipinos – women, youth and men. Other than to recognize the contributions and importance of each wherever they fit into this discussion, there will be no attempt to write, or ignore, the history of one particular gender. Nor will this research try to examine or judge Filipino culture through a Western feminist lens. This research is not about women, nor is it about men. It is about a ‘movement’ called Oneness Pentecostalism, and specifically how it developed in the Philippines and among Filipinos. The term ‘Filipino/s’ as used in this work should not be considered sexist, or to exclude women. Similar to the way ‘hermanos’ is used in Spanish to refer either to men as ‘brothers’, or to both sexes, as ‘brothers/sisters’, ‘Filipinos’ should be understood as referring to both men and women. If women are exclusively referred to, the term ‘Filipina/s’ may be used, or simply ‘woman/women’. It should be apparent to anyone familiar with Pentecostalism, that ever since the Holy Spirit was first poured out in the Upper Room in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, the congregation has always included “the women” as in Acts Chapter one, verse fourteen. The ratio there of women to men is not known because it was not mentioned in the Acts account. It was not mentioned because it was not an issue. What was mentioned is that “the women” were part of Pentecost from the beginning, and that one of them was “Mary the mother of Jesus”.

1.4 Defining Oneness Pentecostalism

Oneness Pentecostalism, the term which has become the most popular designation for the movement…is known also as the Apostolic Pentecostal and as the Jesus’ Name movement, all being equally acceptable common self-designations. From its inception the movement has, indeed, remained “without the camp,” as an enigma, and as a Pentecostal antagonist to the broader movement, experiencing both imposed and self-imposed isolation from the religious mainstream. This has
been due largely to rigidity in its deviations from the classical doctrine of the Trinity and its soteriology.\textsuperscript{48}

Talmadge French thus describes the Oneness movement and points to the two main points of difference between it and the more numerous Trinitarian Pentecostals; that is, the doctrines concerning the Godhead and what is commonly called within Oneness ranks, “the plan of salvation.” Concerning the former, David K. Bernard, perhaps the most prolific writer from within the Oneness Pentecostal movement\textsuperscript{49} has consistently stated the Oneness doctrine “in two affirmations: (1) There is one God with no distinction of persons; (2) Jesus Christ is all the fullness of the Godhead incarnate.”\textsuperscript{50} In another place he elaborates,

\begin{quote}
What is the essence of the doctrine of God…the doctrine we have labeled Oneness? First, there is one indivisible God with no distinction of persons. Second, Jesus Christ is the fullness of the Godhead incarnate. He is God the Father—the Jehovah of the Old Testament—robed in flesh. All of God is in Jesus Christ, and we find all we need in Him. The only God we will ever see in heaven is Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Although Bernard does not focus in this place on the soteriological implications of Oneness theology, they arise from the foundational message of the absolute oneness of God revealed in Jesus Christ. The soteriology mentioned by French is not as universally accepted among Oneness Pentecostals as is their opposition to “the classical doctrine of the Trinity.” Reed states fairly that “the three doctrines that constitute foundational Oneness theology” are “the oneness of God, the centrality of Christ and the name of

\textsuperscript{48} French, \textit{EARLY INTERRACIAL ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM}, 3.
Jesus, and the paradigmatic praxis of Acts 2:38.” A simplistic definition based solely on the words “Oneness Pentecostal” would be those who believe and experience Holy Spirit baptism evidenced by speaking with tongues and hold to the absolute oneness view of God which excludes the traditional view of the Trinity. Or to use the wording of Bernard in his “two affirmations,” it could be said that Oneness Pentecostals are those who believe and experience Holy Spirit baptism evidenced by tongues and believe that “there is one God with no distinction of persons, and that Jesus Christ is all the fullness of the Godhead incarnate”. While this may help to clarify, on a very basic level, how Oneness Pentecostals view the Godhead, and that they resemble, or are among, classical Pentecostalism in their strong belief in evidentiary tongues, this is also a simplistic definition that fails to address the fact that water baptism by immersion in the name of Jesus is normal among this movement. This is because, as Reed has pointed out, there is a strong foundational belief on “the centrality of Christ and the name of Jesus.” This is why the name Oneness Pentecostal cannot, at a glance, adequately describe the movement it identifies. Reed is also correct in pointing out “the paradigmatic praxis of Acts 2:38.” While Oneness Pentecostals probably universally use In the final analysis Oneness Pentecostalism in general includes many various beliefs, some of which are at odds with others in the same movement. In An Introduction to Pentecostalism (2004), Allan Anderson embraced “an inclusive definition” for Pentecostalism as a whole, while mentioning Walter Hollenweger’s “threelfold classification” which was “Classical Pentecostals”, “Charismatic renewal movement”.

52 Reed, In Jesus Name, 3.
and “Pentecostal or ‘Pentecostal-like’ independent churches in the majority world”. By 2013, Anderson offered four classifications for Pentecostalism, while admitting, “Defining anything is a hazardous exercise.” Anderson’s classifications include the following four major types and subtypes.

1. Classical Pentecostals
   a. Holiness Pentecostals – three works of grace
   b. Finished Work Pentecostals – conversion and sanctification happen simultaneously
   c. Oneness Pentecostals – reject the doctrine of the Trinity
   d. Apostolic Pentecostals – both Oneness and Trinitarian, referring to the form of leadership only (This last is confusing to many Oneness Pentecostals in North America and the Philippines, who commonly use Apostolic Pentecostal as their favored term for self-identification. This will be revisited in Chapter 2.4.)

Anderson follows this first general classification with the explanation that they all believe in subsequentialism, which means that Spirit baptism is a separate experience subsequent to conversion. This is not true, however for most Oneness Pentecostals who view salvation, sanctification and Spirit baptism as one simultaneous work of grace. Anderson addresses this view briefly in An Introduction to Pentecostalism.
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55 Anderson, Ends of the Earth, 5-7.
56 See Chapter Two, 2.4.
57 Anderson, Introduction, 192.
2. Anderson’s second classification is Older Church Charismatics, which are not the concern of this research simply because a negligible amount, if any, would hold to Oneness theology.

3. Older Independent Churches which, in the case of Oneness Pentecostals, includes the True Jesus Church of Chinese origin.

4. Neopentecostal or Neocharismatic Churches, usually independent churches which might include Oneness churches or organizations.\(^{58}\)

   Obviously, as the name implies, Oneness Pentecostalism cannot be as inclusively defined. The broadest possible definition would include all groups that would fall into the broader category of Pentecostalism, with the qualification that they reject the Trinitarian explanation of God in three persons. The diversity within this group is greater than most would imagine. Just within the Philippines, there are those like the True Jesus Church, of Chinese origin, that keep Saturday as the Sabbath; the Philippine Ministerial Association who view baptism as not essential; and the very large Kingdom of Jesus Christ Name Above Every Name who hold to a Oneness theology and baptize in Jesus’ name, but no longer emphasize Spirit baptism and do not consider themselves Pentecostal, although they have all the hallmarks of overall Pentecostalism.

   In the style of Hollenweger’s earlier “threefold classification” and Anderson’s later four classifications, this work would like to suggest two classifications of Oneness Pentecostals. While acknowledging the difficulty of these definitions, and allowing for some overlap between the two, and from without, they will be as follows. First are those who see Acts 2:38 as essential. Therefore, not only does this first category of Oneness
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\(^{58}\) The classifications given here are severely abridged from Anderson’s, and have been adapted to the Oneness Pentecostal application. See Anderson, *To The Ends of the Earth*, 5-7 for his complete explanation.
Pentecostals believe in a strict monotheism, and baptize in Jesus’ name, but they also see this baptism, as well as Spirit baptism, to have salvific power and to be the required steps to experience spiritual rebirth.\(^{59}\) This first group will include Anderson’s first, third and fourth categories of churches and organizations that subscribe to the above theological tenants. This group might also be referred to as Essentialists.

The second classification among Oneness Pentecostals includes those who reject the doctrine of the Trinity and baptize in Jesus’ name, but do not view water baptism and/or Spirit baptism as essential for salvation. Usually, among this group of Oneness Pentecostals, when one does not view Spirit baptism as essential, neither will they view water baptism as essential. This classification can be referred to as non-Essentialists. The United Pentecostal Church International was a merger in 1945, of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ (PAJC), which represented the first category (Essentialists), and the Pentecostal Church Incorporated (PCI), which, by and large, were from the second category (non-Essentialists).\(^{60}\) A subgroup of this second classification might include those like Anderson has included in his third group, “who have links with classical Pentecostalism”, in this case, Oneness, but may no longer view themselves as ‘Pentecostal’, even though they may exhibit Pentecostal like characteristics.\(^{61}\) Unlike Anderson’s third group, however, none of these can be considered “Older Independent Churches”, although they are probably very independent. While the effort will be made to identify all of the above groups, the historical section, and most of the results from the

\(^{59}\) For more on this subject, see Chapter Two, 2.5.

\(^{60}\) The PAJC here mentioned should not be confused with the Philippine Apostolics of Jesus Christ, also known as PAJC.

\(^{61}\) For instance, Apollo Quiboloy’s group, Kingdom of Jesus Christ Name Above Every Name, has roots in the UPCP, continue with lively worship, belief in healing, baptism in Jesus’ name, modified Oneness view of the Godhead, but no longer consider themselves Pentecostal. See Chapter 6.1.2.
survey, applies primarily to the first category, Essentialists. There are three basic reasons for this. First, the researcher is a part of this category, and had developed connections with many leaders within it. Second, many of the groups in this category are related, and thus the trail is somewhat easier to follow. Third, even as Oneness Pentecostals are more difficult to research than the larger Pentecostal community, so is non-Essentialist Oneness Pentecostalism harder to investigate than the Essentialist portion. That is because they are smaller, there are fewer sources, and they tend to be rather defensive toward those within Oneness Pentecostalism who are Essentialists.

1.5 Conclusion – Goals

Hopefully, this research will change the way Filipino Oneness Pentecostals view themselves and give them increased confidence in their contribution to worldwide Oneness Pentecostalism. It may suggest new ways of researching the distinct movement of Oneness Pentecostals and change the way researchers and others view them and interact with them. It is hoped that this research will provide the incentive and perhaps some pattern for similar research of Oneness Pentecostalism in other countries of the world, and thus be the beginning of a more comprehensive look at this enigmatic movement.
CHAPTER 2

Genesis

2 Introduction

Much has already been written about the North American beginnings of Pentecostalism from the Topeka outpouring under Charles Fox Parham to Azusa Street under William Seymour and beyond. This is not to suggest that there is nothing left to be discovered from this era of Pentecostalism, as the recent work by Talmadge French shows. The handling of this subject in the present chapter, however, will acknowledge the abundance of work already done and will therefore be primarily a brief summary of what can be found in existing research in order to introduce the main focus of this paper. It is offered for those who may be new to the subject or have not availed themselves of the profusion of scholarly work already available. Those works cited in this portion should be studied for a much broader understanding of this subject. Most importantly, for this research, the earliest schisms in the Pentecostal movement, which prefigure the abundance of schism in Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, can be seen from Azusa Street onwards, as is found in this chapter. Toward the end of this chapter appears a preview of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines through the lens of the survey developed for this research. It will answer some basic questions about the movement and give a basis for comparing it with the Trinitarian branch of Pentecostalism in the country.

62 Talmadge L. French, EARLY INTERRACIAL ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM: G. T. Haywood and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1901-31) (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publishers, 2011), 1,2,7. French has included significant new findings in what is likely the most exhaustive research done on G. T. Haywood and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World by any scholar. See, for example, his section on ‘The Life and Leadership of J. J. Frazee’ 147-151. This monograph is from French’s PhD. Thesis, University of Birmingham, England 2011, and is also available from the Research Archive, University of Birmingham, UK. Available at: http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/2869/7/French_11_PhD.pdf.
2.1 Pentecost Before the Twentieth Century

Although present day Pentecostalism is often seen as beginning at Topeka, Kansas or at Azusa Street, Los Angeles, it has been shown that there were many recorded instances of speaking in tongues before the turn of the twentieth century. These were the precursors to the more widely publicized outpourings in the early twentieth century. Assemblies of God historian William W. Menzies said, “In the United States, between 1850 and 1900, there were at least 11 episodes of speaking in tongues,” and described these as “isolated and episodic.” But North America was not alone in experiencing outbreaks of tongues. Great Britain saw this phenomena as early as the 1820s and South India in the 1860s. Neither were the tongues episodes limited to the nineteenth century. Anderson mentions a movement in Finland speaking in tongues in the late eighteenth century. At about the same time, Shakers in England and America experienced glossolalia. Catholic Jansenists and Cathari of France in the seventeenth century spoke in tongues. There are other recorded instances of post-Acts tongue talking throughout history and, one supposes, many cases that were not recorded. The point is that the Pentecostal experience is not something that was discovered or re-discovered only in the twentieth century.

66 Anderson, Introduction, 86.
69 See, for example, Anderson, Introduction, 19-27.
2.2 Charles Fox Parham and William Seymour

The first day of the twentieth century saw an outpouring of the Holy Spirit evidenced by glossolalia, or speaking in tongues at Charles Parham’s Bible school in Topeka, Kansas. The significance of this is that most classical Pentecostals, including Oneness Pentecostals with whom this work has to do, believe that tongues is the evidence of the baptism or infilling of the Holy Spirit. Charles Parham is credited with formulating this evidentiary doctrine, although he believed it to be xenolalia that would enable recipients to preach in foreign languages supernaturally without studying or learning the language. Parham is considered by many to be the ‘Father of Pentecostalism.’ This view is not unanimous, however, with others crediting William J. Seymour. To view either of these men as the founders of the movement is generally an American centric view that would not be shared by all.

*The Century of the Holy Spirit*, as Vinson Synan’s 2001 book of that name puts it, began, literally, on that first day of the century at the Topeka Bible School. J. Roswell Flower, the founding secretary of the Assemblies of God, felt that Agnes Ozman’s infilling on that day at Topeka was “the touch felt round the world.” But as well publicized as this, and Parham’s succeeding revivals were, and though it reverberated

---


throughout much of the United States, it was not the shot heard round the religious world. That distinction was reserved for the Azusa Street revival under William Seymour, a one-eyed, African American who had been a student of Charles Parham’s in Houston, Texas. One wonders what might have been the ultimate destiny of twentieth century Pentecostalism had it not been for Azusa Street. Even if the movement under Parham had gained enough momentum to lift off, as it were, from terra firma and circle the globe, Pentecost would most certainly have a different face today without the involvement of the child of slavery. Though Parham taught Seymour in Houston, Texas, and then supported his going to minister in Los Angeles, albeit reluctantly, Parham’s later personal problems and racial views would have severely limited the reach of Pentecostalism.73

From Parham came the initial evidence theology, at least within modern Pentecostalism, which was to become the distinctive doctrine of classical Pentecostals. Parham also gave a tremendous gift in William Seymour, though he later renounced him.74

Seymour’s involvement instantly made Pentecostalism a racially integrated movement with tremendous impact upon the African American population to this day, and with great acceptance around the world. Though Seymour himself had not yet received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, that did not hinder him from preaching it as an experience that would be evidenced by speaking in tongues. He was invited by a small group, who had been expelled from their church by what their pastor considered unbalanced teaching, to come to Los Angeles and preach in their small Santa Fe Mission. Seymour’s message was that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was available in this day and

---

74 Anderson, Introduction, 40.
age, and that speaking in tongues was the evidence of that baptism.\textsuperscript{75} For preaching this, he was locked out of the Mission and resorted to having prayer meetings in homes. Very shortly after the lockout, several people, including Seymour himself, received the infilling of the Spirit, speaking with tongues. That evening of April 9, in 1906, was the beginning of Passover. Outgrowing the small house on Bonnie Brae Street where they had been having meetings, they rented a building on Azusa Street and the rest is Pentecostal history.\textsuperscript{76} But it is a history that continued as it began, with lockouts and schisms as well as spiritual and theological growth.

2.3 Toward the Edge

Parts of Pentecost, which was already considered a radical or fanatical fringe by almost all established religion when it began, continued to migrate toward the edge. Keep in mind that many of those who became involved in the Pentecostal movement had already been teetering on the religious edge. Reed wrote of the dispensational premillennial vision of early Pentecostals “…that positioned the Pentecostal band to be a special company of believers on the razor’s edge between the close of this age and the Return of Christ.”\textsuperscript{77} (Emphasis added.) This was not a place for those who were comfortable with their religion. This was the edge of known religious experience. This was Pentecostal praxis, which attracted some and repelled others. Should it be surprising that some of those who were attracted thus far should seek to go a little further?

It wasn’t long therefore, before a new boundary pusher tested the line. William Durham was a Baptist pastor from Chicago who received the Holy Spirit baptism at

\textsuperscript{75} Synan, \textit{The Century}, 46-7.
\textsuperscript{76} Robeck, \textit{Azusa Street}, 60-63.
\textsuperscript{77} Reed, \textit{In Jesus’ Name}, 114.
Azusa Street in 1907. He didn’t agree with Seymour and Parham that sanctification was subsequent to salvation. He began to teach that sanctification occurred at conversion and continued to work throughout the life of the believer. This became known as ‘the finished work of Calvary,’ or simply as the ‘Finished Work’.\(^{78}\) Then, while Seymour was away, Durham taught this at Azusa Street and was having great success. Seymour returned and locked him out of the Azusa Street Mission in much the same manner as Seymour himself had been locked out of the Santa Fe Mission. This issue highlighted what was, perhaps, the first clear division in the young movement.

2.4 Saved, Sanctified and Spirit Filled – An Expansion

During the eighteenth century, John Wesley, influenced as he was by Pietism, began to teach a ‘second blessing’ doctrine that he called ‘sanctification’.\(^{79}\) Thus, Wesley and Methodism expanded on the theme of salvation and Christian experience. It began with the one event of being saved and made it into a two-event progression of being saved and then sanctified. This teaching informed the Holiness movement in the United States in the years leading up to the Azusa Street revival so that most of its early leaders, including Parham and Seymour, strongly believed that being ‘saved’ and ‘sanctified’ were two very separate and distinct experiences. When people began to be baptized by the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues, these same leaders then believed this to be a third separate and instantaneous event which led to the popular phrase ‘saved, sanctified and Spirit filled’ and which meant that the Christian experience was expanded again, this time to three crisis events. Those with a Holiness background, which included Parham and the

\(^{78}\) Anderson, \textit{To the Ends of the Earth}, 51.
preachers he influenced, felt strongly about this, so strongly, that they believed sanctification was an essential step before receiving the Holy Spirit baptism.

Though many Pentecostal holiness groups continue to embrace this three blessing approach, the majority of Trinitarian Pentecostals, including the Assemblies of God, reduced the three blessings to two events by combining salvation and sanctification (as per William Durham), and by teaching that Holy Spirit baptism is a second event evidenced by speaking in tongues and intended, not for salvation, but to empower the believer. Essentialist Oneness Pentecostals have distilled everything (salvation, sanctification and Holy Spirit baptism) into one event. Anderson also points out that “Some Oneness Pentecostals see the baptism in the Spirit with the evidence of tongues as part (with baptism in Jesus’ Name) of the salvation process; they have collapsed the three experiences into one.” Although the term ‘Oneness’ has always been used exclusively of their theology of God, it could also be used to describe their soteriology. Oneness Pentecostals not only believe in one God, most of them (the Essentialist branch) also believe being saved, sanctified and Spirit filled is all wrapped up in one instantaneous experience. However, while they believe that salvation and sanctification occur at Spirit infilling or Spirit baptism, they sometimes refer to separate steps to salvation, generally expressed as “repentance, water baptism and Spirit baptism,” which may occur at three different times.

Durham’s ‘finished work’ theology therefore, is today embraced by most Trinitarian and Oneness Pentecostals alike, but with serious differences in terminology and application. Whereas both streams see sanctification occurring at conversion, they

---

describe conversion (salvation) in starkly different terms. For instance, though both agree that the New Birth, as described by Jesus in John’s Gospel (3:1-8), occurs at conversion, most Trinitarian Pentecostals believe that the New Birth need not include Holy Spirit baptism. Most Oneness Pentecostals believe the New Birth must include Holy Spirit baptism.

To most Oneness Pentecostals, who often use the self-designation ‘Apostolic’ or ‘Apostolic Pentecostal’ because they feel it identifies them with the doctrine and experience of the original apostles, there is no difference between the terms ‘being born of the Spirit,’ ‘being filled with the Spirit’ and ‘Holy Spirit baptism.’ To be ‘indwelt’ by the Spirit is to be baptized by the Spirit. To them, this is one and the same experience, and it occurs at conversion and is essential for salvation. Trinitarian Pentecostals typically separate being ‘born of the Spirit’ which occurs at conversion from ‘Holy Spirit baptism’ which is subsequent to, and not essential for salvation. Therefore, they teach that everyone who believes is ‘born again’ by the ‘renewing of the Holy Ghost’ and ‘indwelt by the Holy Spirit’ without experiencing Holy Spirit baptism and speaking with tongues. Being baptized in the Spirit is differentiated from the text of 1 Corinthians 12:13 which reads, “by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body”.

G.T. Haywood stated in 1913, before people started being re-baptized in Jesus’ name, and before the formation of the Assemblies of God: “If we are brought into the body by the new birth, then we conclude that the new birth and the baptism of the Holy
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82 French, EARLY INTERRACIAL ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM, 1, 2, 7.
84 Assemblies of God General Presbytery 2010, 1, 12.
Ghost are synonymous.” This became the overwhelming view of Oneness Pentecostals. It should be noted that not all Oneness Pentecostals believe Holy Spirit baptism is essential for salvation. The Apostolic Church of Pentecost of Canada (ACOP) views this experience as subsequent to conversion, just as most Trinitarian Pentecostals do. Furthermore, the ACOP are Calvinistic in their belief of eternal security, which they refer to as believing in ‘eternal life.’ Through time this organization, though keeping ‘Apostolic’ in their name, laid aside their insistence upon Oneness theology and baptism only in the name of Jesus Christ, so that, even here, it appears the soteric value of Holy Spirit baptism seems linked with the typical Oneness view of God and essentiality of water baptism in Jesus’ name. In other words, those who believe Spirit baptism is salvific are more inclined to view water baptism the same way. Although the doctrinal difference between the one-step experience and the two or three separate steps does not get as much attention as the Oneness-Trinitarian debate and its attendant differences in baptismal formula, the salvific implications alone would be cause for a great divide.

2.5 The New-Issue

Talmadge French argues “The finished work issue actually served as a catalyst necessary in the emergence of Oneness Pentecostalism”, and Allan Anderson agrees that the Oneness view “was possibly the unavoidable outcome of the Christocentric ‘Finished Work’ theology of William Durham.” Although Durham did not live long enough to see Jesus’ name baptism referred to as the ‘New Issue,’ he may have been exposed to it as early as 1912, when Andrew Urshan spoke to him and Frank Ewart about it. According to
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85 Talmadge French, Our God is One: The Story of the Oneness Pentecostals (Indianapolis, IN: Voice & Vision, 1999), 61.
86 French, Our God is One, 49; Anderson, Introduction, 50.
Urshan, “I was trying to show it to Durham and Ewart in L.A. in 1912 but they tried discouraging me to even mention it.” Urshan’s letter to his son, which has never been published, deserves to be analyzed. It begins-

Dear Nathan-

This is to say that your conference broadcast was specially enjoyed. Keep preaching with great emphasis the deity of our Lord, with the kingdom of God and the blessed name of Jesus – Acts 8:12 and 28:30-31.

You spoke of the discoveries on God’s Map (The Bible) that some discovered this treasure in 1914, but your younger (then) dad discovered it in 1910. I was trying to show it to Durham and Ewart in L.A. in 1912 but they tried discouraging me to even mention it. I tried to show it in 1910 to G. T. Haywood, he was rather friendly about it.

This I write for your further information. I boast in the Lord for this and thank Him now my son is preaching it all over U.S.A. Of late you are more closing your messages with Acts 2:38. Good for you and using songs on the name of Jesus – Keep going son – You are on right track.

Exactly what did Urshan “discover” in 1910? He tied it in with what “some discovered” in 1914, which was re-baptism in Jesus’ name coupled with the Oneness (Christocentric) view of God. He shared this with Haywood, with whom he was quite close, in 1910, saying that Haywood was “rather friendly about it.” But when he showed it to Durham and Ewart in 1912, “they tried discouraging” him from even mentioning it. Of course, Durham died shortly after, and Ewart went on to embrace the New Issue. This letter, written in Urshan’s latter years, confirms Douglas Jacobsen’s statement that “There is evidence that Oneness views had been circulating in certain parts of the Pentecostal movement before [1913]…” It also reiterates Urshan’s much earlier record, given in

87 Andrew Urshan, letter to his son, Nathaniel A. Urshan, 9 November 1964. Courtesy of Nathaniel Paul Urshan.
much greater detail in his periodical, *The Witness of God*, published in 1923 and republished in his autobiography in 1967. In it, Urshan states,

> This Truth became so important to me, that I was influenced by God to spend the little money I had on hand then, to publish a little leaflet on the New Birth and also to have printed on our baptistery tank: Acts 2:38. I then began to baptize new converts INTO THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST: which is the ONE NAME of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost. AMEN! Remember, this happened in 1910, when no one did this baptism, that I knew of. 89

The Oneness view of God and baptism in Jesus’ name became the “New” issue as opposed to the issue of Durham’s own ‘Finished Work’ view of sanctification. His assistant, Frank Ewart became one of the earliest and main proponents of Jesus’ name baptism and was probably the first man in Los Angeles to be purposely re-baptized in the name of Jesus Christ and to begin consistently baptizing that way.

The practice of baptizing in the name of Jesus Christ seems inevitably linked with the Oneness view of God. Within a few hours of Canadian evangelist R.E. McAlister preaching about singular baptism in the name of Jesus Christ at the Arroyo Seco camp meeting of 1913, a young minister named John G. Schaepe, who had spent the intervening hours in prayer, ran through the camp declaring that God had revealed Oneness and that baptism must be administered in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. 90 It is telling that Fred Foster’s Oneness Pentecostal history actually begins with this story of McAlister’s message at Arroyo Seco, 91 as did David Reed’s comprehensive study entitled “In Jesus’ Name” *The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*, something that a
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Trinitarian Pentecostal history would never do. It is also interesting that there was a book released in 1913, awkwardly entitled *What is “The Name”? or The Mystery of God Revealed* that stated the only scriptural formula for baptism was in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The author, William Phillips Hall, not a Pentecostal, wrote:

The writer believes that, after fully reading, the reader of this book will conclude that a revolution in the Church’s teaching regarding the interpretation of the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Personality of the Triune God, is not only possible, but right at hand!  

A revolution indeed! It shook the fledgling Pentecostal movement and is still shaking it. It is possible that some of those present at Arroyo Seco in 1913 may have been aware of Hall’s book. Frank Ewart wrote in 1947 that he was aware of another book by the same author, *A Remarkable Biblical Discovery or The Name of God*, which had been released by the American Tract Society in 1929. Ewart corresponded with the author after reading the latter work. Ewart does not mention the 1913 book, and it is not known whether or not it had an influence on the emergence of the Oneness movement. If it did, it came three years after Urshan claims to have “discovered it” in 1910.

Henri Gooren called the New Issue “one of the earliest and most devastating Pentecostal schisms…” It caused a rift in the newly formed Assemblies of God that saw “156 of the 585 ministerial membership” departing from the organization. Those numbers did not include those like G. T. Haywood and others who were non-AG
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92 Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 1.  
96 David A. Reed, *In Jesus Name*, 164. Also D. A. Reed, “Oneness Pentecostalism,” in *NIDPCM*, 938.
members. Just as there were great numbers of preachers who converted to the finished work point of view, a significant number of preachers and saints felt strongly enough about baptism in the name of Jesus Christ to be re-baptized. Most of these had either already seen or went on to accept the Oneness view of God. And just as most (but not all) Oneness Pentecostals see Holy Spirit baptism as being essential to salvation, so do they see baptism in Jesus’ name as soteric. So the ‘New Issue’ involved more than a baptismal formula. It went to the heart of theology and probed the nature and the name of God.

Whereas Holy Spirit baptism hearkened back to Acts chapter two, Oneness Pentecostals felt the ‘New Issue’ went all the way back to Deuteronomy 6:4 and the greatest of all the commandments. “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD” is also known in Hebrew as the Shema, and is at the root of Judaism.

It could be said that with the emphasis upon Holy Spirit baptism as essential, and insisting upon using the same words spoken by the apostle Peter on the Day of Pentecost in water baptism as also being essential, that Oneness Pentecostals are the most Pentecostal of all Pentecostals. Reed suggests they are “more characteristically Pentecostal than most Trinitarian Pentecostal bodies.” And, “doctrinal departure aside”, Edith Blumhofer also admits that “Oneness proponents were more zealously restorationist, more doggedly congregational, and more Christocentrically spiritual – in short, in some important ways more essentially Pentecostal than the mainstream.” In a similar vein, Douglas Jacobsen, in examining the Oneness theologies of Andrew Urshan
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97 French, *Early Interracial Oneness Pentecostalism*, 107. French’s wording “Many of the non-AG ministers, Black and White, were present, including Haywood…” indicates there may have been a considerable number of non-members at the meeting.
98 Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 82.
and G. T. Haywood, “the two most prolific and articulate theologians of the [early Oneness] movement”, writes that, “In a certain sense, the Oneness theologies of Haywood and Urshan were also more distinctively pentecostal than anything that preceded them; at the very least, they were less dependent on previous forms of Christian theology.”

Likewise, Grant Wacker wrote “…that the large Oneness faction, which largely broke away from the main body of Trinitarian Pentecostals in the mid 1910s, represented one of the movement’s deepest theological instincts.”

The reasons for this, Oneness Pentecostals themselves would suggest, is the strict adherence to the experiential pattern (praxis), and the teaching of the apostles (doxa), which occurred on the Day of Pentecost as seen in the account given in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the fifth book of the New Testament. The term ‘Pentecostal’ is derived solely from this occasion. ‘Pentecost’ comes from a Hellenistic term given to the Jewish feast of Weeks, fifty days following Passover. It is known in Judaism today as ‘Shavuot’, and celebrates also the giving of the Law by God to Moses on Mt. Sinai fifty days following the original Passover in Egypt. Acts 2:1 is the first place in the Bible where this term, Pentecost, was used. It is used twice more, Acts 20:16 and First Corinthians 16:8 in reference to the feast celebrated in Judaism. Believers in the New Testament were never referred to as ‘Pentecostals.’ Therefore, the only reference in the Bible that ties ‘Pentecost’ with the experience of Spirit baptism, is found in the second chapter of Acts. Specifically, it was the event that occurred in Acts 2:1-4 that has labeled an entire religious movement.

And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were
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all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.\textsuperscript{102}

Although early Christians were not identified by the term ‘Pentecostal’ within the New Testament, the experience that occurred on the Day of Pentecost was being used as an identifier by the time Paul the apostle went to Ephesus. When he arrived there, as recorded in Acts 19, Paul found “certain disciples” and asked them “have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?”\textsuperscript{103} The global Pentecostal movement almost universally embraces the second chapter of Acts as the doctrinal basis for Holy Spirit baptism and tongues as initial evidence, but they do not generally embrace the first instances of Christian water baptism found in the same chapter as the doctrinal basis for baptismal formula. That is, almost all Pentecostals use Acts 2 to validate their doctrine of Holy Spirit baptism, drawing from verses 1-4. Likewise, they point to verses 5-11 to reinforce tongues, and verses 12-13 to validate ‘spirited’ worship. They use the beginning and most of Peter’s message from verses 14 on, to tie Holy Spirit baptism with the Old Testament prophecy of Joel chapter two, and even the climax of the message in verses 38 and 39, to underscore the availability and promise of Holy Spirit baptism. All of this is ‘Pentecostal’ by virtue of the experience and the message occurring on the Day of Pentecost. However, in spite of Trinitarian Pentecostals using the first Biblical instance of Holy Spirit baptism and speaking with tongues as the foundation of their identifying doctrine, they do not use the first instance of water baptism found in the same chapter, in the same message, preached by the same apostle, as the foundation of their teaching on water baptism. If Oneness Pentecostals therefore, are “more characteristically Pentecostal than most Trinitarian Pentecostal[s]”, it is because (they would claim) they

\textsuperscript{102} Acts 2:1-4.  
\textsuperscript{103} Acts 19:1-2.
wholeheartedly embrace the entire experience and message of Acts chapter two, including Peter’s command to “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” Furthermore, while most Trinitarian Pentecostals teach the experience of the Day of Pentecost, i.e. Holy Spirit baptism evidenced by speaking with tongues, as available and promised to all, they do not teach it as essential to salvation or part of the new birth experience. Most Oneness Pentecostals, on the other hand, teach the Day of Pentecost experience and message as not only available and promised to all, but as a necessary part of the New Birth and essential to salvation. This is what makes them, at least in their own estimation, the most Pentecostal of all Pentecostals.

It should be understood that what separates Essentialist Oneness Pentecostals from the broader Pentecostal/Charismatic movement is not merely semantics. It is not simply that the baptismal formula is more primitive. They not only believe that baptism should be administered only in the name of Jesus Christ, but that baptism is for the remission of sins and is therefore salvific. This is why the term ‘Apostolic Pentecostal’ is the most popular self-designator among Oneness Pentecostals. They believe that by following the apostle Peter’s words on the Day of Pentecost to “repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,” that they are following the original apostolic and Pentecostal pattern.

104 Acts 2:38.
105 French, Early Oneness, 7.
2.6 The Evolution of Pentecostalism

Within the past century, Pentecostalism has moved from the dirt-floor brush arbor and tents of the small towns, and the vacant old buildings on the wrong side of the tracks, into some of the largest arenas and most modern buildings available. It has gone from interracial gatherings to ethnocentric movements and back to multiculturalism again. It has graduated from ridicule to respect and from rejection to acceptance. Like ‘Spreading Fires – The Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism’ has blazed around the world like a wildfire out of control, or at least one that cannot be controlled by men and organizations. To be sure, schism has continued to divide the entire Pentecostal Movement and Oneness Pentecostals have not been immune. In fact, with their history of moving toward the edge, and the resulting rejection that has come from doing so, they may have suffered even more schism than other Classical Pentecostals. This cannot be known for sure without being specifically researched and that is not the purpose of this work, except as it pertains to the Philippine Islands. Perhaps the division has also served as a method of multiplication for Oneness Pentecostalism. This will be investigated in chapters four through six of this work. Perhaps those who feel strongly enough about religious issues to step away from familiar and comfortable surroundings will also feel strongly enough to share their faith with others. Whatever the cause, Pentecostalism has come a long way from Azusa Street.

The enormous growth has not been without problems. So long as Pentecost was the little church on the wrong side of the tracks, despised and rejected by the larger religious community, there was slight chance of blending in to the spiritual landscape its forerunners did everything to escape. The early Pentecostals aptly earned the derisive title

'Holy Rollers’. Their worship was wild and at times unrestrained. It was often the very loudness of their praise and the antics they displayed as they were ‘lost’ in the Spirit that drew the crowd. It was when this was noised abroad, just as it was in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, that the crowds came together. The hand clapping, arms raising, and body swaying to the music was practiced in Pentecostal churches long before it became the norm at rock concerts. Pentecostal worship has become popular. Popularity has a price.

In North America, where the Azusa Street revival was birthed, today’s carpeted aisles, padded pews, state of the art audio-visual systems and air-conditioned buildings are designed to be inviting and comfortable. Meetings have become ‘seeker friendly’ and non-threatening. Sanctification, which was possibly the single most distinguishing characteristic of those who made up early twentieth century Pentecostalism, has become a less visible issue. Standards of sanctification that were the norm for most of the movement in the first half of the century – no television or movies, no drinking or smoking, uncut hair and feminine apparel for the women, no make-up or jewelry – have been jettisoned to make room for more passengers on the ship. In many cases, at least in North America, the movement that was started by outcasts and the dispossessed has become home to its share of the middle class. There is an upward mobility inherent in a religion that welcomes the poor and dysfunctional members of society, delivers them from crime, drugs and alcohol, puts their broken or troubled marriages back together and teaches them how to be good stewards and live good lives. Some of those same people who were broke when they came into Pentecost became accustomed to the good life and perhaps a little less sympathetic to those who were like they used to be.
If sanctification was the identifying trait of those who started the Pentecostal movement, speaking in tongues was without a doubt the Pentecostal distinctive once the movement got started. It was that experience, above all, that linked Pentecostals with the Acts 2 experience and gave them their name. The Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking with tongues was first poured out in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. It was natural that those people who experienced the same Holy Spirit baptism, and spoke with tongues, would use the term ‘Pentecostal’ to identify themselves. Recent statistics, however, indicate that only about one-third of Pentecostals in the United States speak with tongues at least weekly, and worrisomely, 49% say they never speak with tongues.\textsuperscript{107} If the Pentecostal movement continues to evolve in this manner, will they be justified in being known as Pentecostal? And does the inclusion into the definition of Pentecostals of those who do not speak with tongues, but manifest other charismata or lively worship, broaden the parameters too much?

2.7 Oneness Pentecostalism Within the Developing Global Pentecostal Theology

Presumably, Oneness Pentecostals would have a much higher rate of members who speak in tongues than is apparent within the Pentecostal/Charismatic movement as a whole. Membership in most Oneness Pentecostal churches is contingent upon Holy Spirit baptism evidenced by speaking in tongues. By considering Holy Spirit baptism as part of the new birth, and essential for salvation, rather than subsequent to, and not necessary for salvation, they have embraced a pneumatology that is crucial to the Christian experience. While agreeing with most other Pentecostals that Holy Spirit baptism is for

empowerment, they continue to maintain that it is also essential for entry into the kingdom of God. This insistence, as well as their equally dogmatic assertion that water baptism is salvific and must be done only in the name of Jesus Christ, is perhaps, more than anything, even their view of the Godhead, what makes Oneness Pentecostals so difficult to tolerate by those outside the movement. These same factors have contributed to the isolation of Oneness Pentecostals, their aloofness towards others and unwillingness to join with ecumenical bodies.

Oneness Pentecostals, even more recently than their Trinitarian counterparts, have begun to develop an academic community. Whether or not this will have a conciliatory influence on the movement remains to be seen. Like other Pentecostals, the Oneness believers have also come up in the world. Those in the United States, at least those in mainly white churches, tend to be socially conservative and outspoken proponents of such issues as lower taxes and the right to bear arms, and critics of the welfare system, social healthcare and crime. Some of the positions they take in the political arena are at polar opposites of the positions of those they are trying to reach, especially in urban areas. How will these tensions work themselves out? Which way are the Oneness Pentecostals going?

In recent years, theologians from within and without the Oneness ranks have contributed to the understanding of Oneness Pentecostalism. One such is Amos Yong who, in his 2005 work The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh, devoted one out of seven chapters to the Oneness/Trinity issue. Yong, a Trinitarian Pentecostal, treats Oneness theology respectfully and posits three reasons why, he suggests, it should not be
disregarded. Because his views have significant implications for Oneness Pentecostalism, and beyond, they are worthy of attention here.

1. “The Oneness voice prevents trinitarianism from falling into tritheism” and “reminds Trinitarians that Christianity is a monotheistic faith.”

2. Differing “from any kind of Arianism, with its subordinationist Christology, and from any kind of Unitarianism that denies the divinity of the Son,” Oneness Pentecostal theology is a “unique articulation of both the divinity of Christ and the strict unity of the Godhead.” It includes a theology of the name that fits well with the Jewish and “ancient near Eastern conviction about the revelatory character of names.” Also “…gathering in the name of Jesus [marked] the early Jewish followers of the Galilean. [H]ealing and, more importantly, salvation are received in the name of Jesus. Baptist into the name of Jesus thereby solidifies in practice this revelatory and saving work of God.”

3. “This leads to the unexpected but important contribution of Oneness Pentecostalism for Christian theology in the world context: the bridges it affords to the Christian-Jewish and Christian-Muslim encounters. [T]he potential Oneness Pentecostal contribution toward the interreligious conversation should not be underestimated.”
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is not burdened by the doctrine of the Trinity” and “the discussion can proceed apart from the difficult matters surrounding the complex Trinitarian claims.”

2.8 Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines: A Preview through Survey

Among other things, the Survey of Religious Migration shows where Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines originated in the religious sense. It is presented here to give a sense of where these people came from, and as a preview of the movement whose history will be examined in the following chapters. A copy of the survey is Appendix D at the end of this work. As can be seen in Appendix D, the survey sought information on 35 different points including date, name, date of birth, contact information (for pastors and leaders only), gender, church or organization name, position held in organization, church location, length of time in church/organization, former religions/organizations, date of Holy Spirit baptism, when last spoke in tongues, if and when baptized in Jesus’ name, any previous baptisms, mother’s religion, father’s religion, maternal grandparents’ religion, paternal grandparents’ religion, date of first family member’s conversion to Oneness Pentecostalism, motivation for conversion, bible school attended, name/gender of first contact with Oneness Pentecostalism, name/gender of first pastor, name/gender of person with greatest impact on ministry (for pastors and leaders only), and if the participant had any additional historical information to share.

All reported figures are based on the number of respondents that actually answered any particular question, and will be rounded to the nearest percentage point. Some comparisons are valid between the results of this survey, and that which was contracted by the Pew Forum in their 2006 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals (hereafter
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the Pew Survey). In that survey, Pew used TNS Philippines who collected surveys between May 6 and May 29, 2006. Pew asked 44 wide-ranging questions dealing with religious experiences and beliefs, affiliations and demographic characteristics, moral values and social attitudes, personal and social outlooks, and political views. The Pew report was much broader than the survey designed for this research, which was primarily designed to trace movement into and within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. The Pew Report sample size was 1,000 general public (with a margin of error of 3%), 309 Pentecostals (with a margin of error of 6%), and 433 Charismatics (with a margin of error of 5%).113 At 1,006 responses from Filipino Oneness Pentecostals, the Survey of Religious Migration response rate is significantly higher than the number of responses of Pentecostals and Charismatics combined in the Pew survey. To provide clarity in distinguishing between the Survey of Religious Migration conducted for this research and the Pew Survey of 2006, the Survey of Religious Migration shall be referred to as the King Survey or King Research. The researcher has reviewed the results of this survey and feels that it should fall within the margin of error for Pentecostals in the Pew survey, that is, a margin of error of 6%. That means that while care was taken to be exact in reporting figures, it can be assured that all figures given from the King Survey are easily accurate to within 6%. From close examination of original survey forms and comparison with digital data entered into the online program, and because the survey was carefully conducted by the author rather than an external survey company, it is more likely that the error of margin is within two percent.

In the King Survey 58% of the respondents were female and 42% were male. (The Pew Report gender of Pentecostal respondents in the Philippines was identical.

Perhaps this adds credibility to the King Survey.) All surveys counted in the results were from Filipinos. Of the 989 people who responded to the question of which country the survey was completed in, 827 (84%) were located within the Philippines. Respondents in the Philippines were from numerous cities and towns, and were found on 11 of the most populous islands. Those who responded to a location of city or province included, from the Luzon Island group-376 (including 261 from the Metro Manila area, Luzon other than Manila-96, Masbate-7, Palawan-2, and Mindoro-1), the Visayas Islands-367 (including Negros Occidental-286, Bohol-65, Panay-6, Cebu-4, Samar-3, Leyte-3), and Mindanao-64. The 16% of respondents that were among the diaspora included 6% from North America (72 responses from Canada and 14 from the United States), 4% from Europe (31 responses from Norway, 3 each from Germany and Italy, and one each from Austria, France, Ireland and Spain), 2% from Asia Pacific (11 responses from Hong Kong, 2 each from Australia, Taiwan and Thailand, and one each from Japan and Palau), and 1% from the Middle East (8 responses from Saudi Arabia, 4 from the United Arab Emirates and one each from Israel and Jordan). Respondents were from 287 unique local churches representing 23 different countries. Only one local church, the headquarters church of International Oneness Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ in Talisay, Negros Occidental, contributed more than 10% of the total survey responses. They completed 144 surveys, or 14% of the total. Fifty-two separate Oneness Pentecostal organizations are represented in the survey. The largest organizational contribution has been from the UPC (both UPCP and UPCI) at 38% of the total respondents from 134 different local UPC churches.114

114 This includes the UPC Philippines, UPCI in North America and UPC churches in various countries, some of which are nationalized. To make things somewhat confusing, some ministers in various countries are licensed with the UPC Philippines but not the UPC in the country where they pastor. There is an
The researcher was not present at every location where surveys were completed or collected. Other than the information forms that were distributed with the surveys, it is not known how thorough any verbal instructions may have been. In some cases the survey was printed on two separate pages and stapled together. In other cases the survey was printed on both sides of one piece of paper. Some of the surveys that were printed on both sides were only completed on one side, implying the possibility that some participants were not aware there were questions on the other side. Not all respondents answered every question. The response rate varied from question to question. Many questions were left blank. The reasons might include: 1) The participant was uncomfortable with the question; 2) The participant did not know the answer to the question or was unsure; 3) The participant did not understand the question. There may be other reasons why certain questions were not answered, but this analysis will not attempt to determine the cause of unanswered questions. Although more than a thousand surveys were completed and collected, it may not represent every part of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement. Surveys were collected mostly from those that the researcher had some indirect contact with, usually through a pastor or organizational leader. A small minority of respondents completed the survey online rather than using the paper form. The survey results are probably an accurate representation of the portion of the movement believing in the essentiality of water and Spirit baptism, of which the researcher is a part, and which is by far the largest portion of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. In retrospect, had the King Survey questions more closely mirrored the Pew Report of 2006, it would have provided a valuable comparison between Filipino Oneness Pentecostals, ongoing question of whether license issued by the UPC Philippines will be recognized by the UPC in other countries.
and the general Pentecostal and Charismatic population of the Philippines. As it is, the only information that can be compared with Pew is the rate of religious migration, and the frequency of speaking in tongues. Even these questions were posed differently, so that the comparison is limited. The Pew report provided information on Pentecostals and Charismatics separately. Pew uses the term “Pentecostal” to “describe individuals who belong to classical Pentecostal denominations…” Only the figures given by Pew for Pentecostals, not Charismatics, will be used for comparison with the King Survey. This is because Pew’s definition of Charismatics is much broader and there are less similarities between Charismatics and Oneness Pentecostals than there are between Pew’s “Pentecostals” and the Oneness Pentecostals surveyed for this research. Comparison between King and Pew is beneficial for two reasons. First, the similarity of results of both surveys lends credibility to the King Survey. Secondly, it allows for a basis for comparing two key elements of Pew’s Pentecostals and the Oneness Pentecostals, namely change of affiliation and frequency of talking in tongues.

The King Survey establishes that the overwhelming majority of those within the Oneness Pentecostal movement (79%) migrated from another religious organization. The greatest migration was from the Catholic Church (59%), which is not surprising. This is very much in keeping with the numbers discovered by the Pew Survey of 2006. Pew determined that 74% of Pentecostals in the Philippines “have not always belonged to their current religion.” This was the highest rate of “Changes in Affiliation” among any


of the ten nations examined in the Pew report. It was 14 percentage points higher than the next highest nation, Brazil. According to the Pew Survey then, at least among the countries involved, Filipino Pentecostals have the highest rate of religious affiliation change among Pentecostals in the world. How should the higher rate of affiliation change among Filipino Pentecostals be viewed? The historical and cultural considerations that will be studied in the following chapter may shed some light on this. The Pew study found that 66% of Pentecostals had converted from Catholicism, 6% from another religion, and 1% from no religion. Twenty-six percent were lifelong Pentecostals. The following chart compares changes in affiliation between Pentecostals surveyed by Pew in 2006 and Oneness Pentecostals surveyed in this current research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Affiliation</th>
<th>Pew Research Pentecostals</th>
<th>King Research Oneness Pentecostals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Surveyed</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>718*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Affiliation</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly Catholic</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Religion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong members of their religion</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (*number of respondents that provided information for this data)

The current research conducted for this study (King Research) reveals 59% of Oneness Pentecostals converted from Catholicism, and 20% from another religion. In all, 79% of Oneness Pentecostals converted from another religion, as compared to the PEW research showing 74% of Pentecostals with changes of affiliation. The 21% of Oneness Pentecostals were lifelong members of their religion as compared with 26% of Pew’s
Pentecostals, a difference of 5%. In the King Survey, the 20% of Oneness Pentecostals who migrated from a non-Catholic religion included 5% from Trinitarian Pentecostal/Charismatic, 4% from Baptist, 1% Seventh Day Adventist, 1% Aglipayan, 1% other (Mormon, Iglesia ni Cristo, Jehovah Witness), 1% non-Christian (Muslim, Buddhist, Spiritista), and other Protestant groups making up less than .5% each combined for 7% of the total. The chart below gives the exact numbers along with percentages.

King Survey of Oneness Pentecostalism: Prior Religions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinitarian Pentecostal/Charismatic</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aglipayan</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Mormon, Iglesia ni Cristo, Jehovah Witness)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Christian (Muslim, Buddhist, Spiritista)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Oneness Pentecostals</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>*718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*number of respondents that provided information for this data*

Next to Catholicism, more Oneness Pentecostals migrated from Trinitarian Pentecostal or Charismatic organizations than any other identifiable group, as seen in the chart above. (The broad category of Protestant, from which 6.5% migrated, includes at least 15 other denominations.) Because both Trinitarian and Oneness Pentecostals practice healings, spirited worship and speaking in tongues, the most obvious reason for changing from one to the other would seem to be doctrinal. As far as is known, no figures exist that demonstrate migration from Oneness Pentecostalism to Trinitarian Pentecostalism, so no
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comparison can be made between the two. Of course the argument could be made that some transfers are made simply because of moving to a location where a Oneness church is closer, and that might apply in isolated cases, especially where the member is a relatively new convert who has not been made aware of the differences between the two Pentecostal sectors. But it doesn’t take long in Oneness Pentecostalism, and presumably in the Trinitarian section, before a member becomes aware of the differences between the two groups. Just over 11% of Oneness Pentecostals migrated through at least two other religions before becoming Oneness Pentecostal. Some migrated through numerous different denominations before becoming and remaining Oneness Pentecostal.

### 2.8.1 Speaking in Tongues

Using the language of traditional Pentecostalism, the King Survey asked when the respondent “last spoke in tongues.” The following possible answers were provided, and 530 responded to the question, (with percentages in parenthesis): Within past week (57%), within past month (24%), within past year (15%), I have not spoken in tongues since initial baptism of the Spirit (3%), and I have never spoken in tongues (2%). Though not identical, the Pew Report asked the question: “How often do you speak or pray in tongues? Would you say, more than once a week, once a week, at least once a month, several times a year, less often or never?”

Pew reports 34% of Pentecostals in the Philippines speak or pray in tongues weekly or more. Forty-five percent said “Never.” In fact, the Pew Survey showed that Pentecostals who speak in tongues on at least a weekly basis in nine of the ten countries surveyed were in the minority. The essentialist fervor
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of Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines is striking when compared with the other Pentecostals surveyed by Pew in the Philippines. The 34% found by Pew to speak in tongues at least weekly might rightfully be compared to the 57% of Oneness Pentecostals who say they last spoke in tongues within the past week. An even more noticeable difference might be seen between the 45% of Pentecostals in the Philippines that Pew reports never speak in tongues and the 2% of Oneness Pentecostals who indicated they have never spoken in tongues. A closer examination of those in the King Survey who have never spoken in tongues reveals that most were recently baptized in Jesus’ name – 7 after 2010, 3 after 2000, and 1 in 1999. This would indicate that they were recent converts and possibly still seeking Spirit baptism accompanied with tongues. At least one answered, “Not yet.” It must be remembered that the overwhelming majority of those who submitted the Survey of Oneness Pentecostalism belong to the majority part of the movement that views Spirit baptism as essential for salvation. It would be interesting to compare how an adequate number of non-Essentialist Oneness Pentecostals would answer the question of frequency of speaking in tongues. It could only be determined that 14 of the respondents to the survey were from non-Essentialist churches. Of the 9 that answered the frequency of speaking in tongues question, the answers were- 2 within the past week (20%), 6 within the past month (60%) and 1 within the past year (10%). The number of responses from non-Essentialists cannot be considered adequate to draw conclusions.

Asking the birthdate of a respondent allowed the comparison of frequency of speaking in tongues between different age groups. Four hundred ninety-five responded to both the tongues question and the date of birth. Of these, 26 were of the ages 18-19, 160
were from 20 to 29 years of age, 118 were between 30-39 years old, 77 were between 40-49 years, 79 between 50-59 years and 28 were from 60 and 69 years old. However, with only 7 of these in the ages of 70-89 it was not felt adequate for a fair representation of those two decades. Of the others, those in their twenties experienced a higher percentage (66%) of speaking in tongues within the past week. Among 18 and 19 year olds it was 46% (26 respondents). Those in their twenties 66% (160 respondents), thirties 59% (118 respondents), forties 56%, fifties 48% and sixties 57%. Combining those that speak in tongues weekly or monthly, shows a steadily declining figure from the youngest to the eldest groups thus: 18-19 years 88%, twenties 86%, thirties 83%, forties 77%, fifties 73% and sixties 68%. This might show a lessening of spiritual response with advance in age, but it must not be overlooked that 18 and 19 years olds had the lowest rate of speaking in tongues within the past week (46%) and the highest rate for within the past month (42%).

2.8.2 Motivation for Becoming Oneness Pentecostal

The question was phrased thus: “What motivated you to become part of Oneness Pentecostalism? Choose all applicable answers. May be more than one.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation for Becoming Oneness Pentecostal</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a personal healing.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I witnessed a healing.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended a home Bible study.</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended a church service.</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents took me to church as a child.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify).</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Motivation for Becoming Oneness Pentecostal
A text analysis of “Other” words shows greatest occurrences of the following: Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost 16, Bible and Church both at 13, Jesus and School both at 11, Life 8, and both Pastor and Truth at 7 each. Seeing that two thirds of the responders were motivated by attending a church service, the words “Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost, Bible and Church” most likely referred to a spiritual or revelatory experience at a church service. The spiritual is explained by feeling. It is of the heart. The doctrinal is cerebral and Word based. Thus, we see that Oneness Pentecostalism’s greatest draws are what is found experientially by receiving or witnessing a healing, and the feelings experienced by attending a church service, often including being touched or moved by the Spirit, or receiving Spirit baptism. These elements are shared by the wider Pentecostal movement, and are identified by Hollenweger in the beginning and ending of The Pentecostals as “enthusiasm”, which he defends as possibly being “a wholly legitimate form of preaching…”

Secondary to the experiential is the doctrinal, which can be seen in that more than one-third of responders indicated they were motivated by attending a home Bible study. Others mentioned attending a Bible study at school or a campus ministry. Here Oneness Pentecostals might be differentiated from Trinitarian Pentecostals by including Spirit baptism as a doctrinal essential and not only as an available experience. Their emphasis upon the doctrines of the Oneness of God and Jesus’ name baptism further adds to the movement being identified as doctrinal or Scriptural based. A lengthy interview with Tony Gallemit illustrates this point. Gallemit’s mother had migrated from Catholicism to Lutheranism, then Aglaypayan, UCCP and Methodist, in that order. Gallemit himself was a Catholic sacristan, probably due to the influence of his father, who had remained a
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Catholic during his wife’s spiritual journey. Tony’s mother was in the isolation ward of
the hospital with the other TB patients. He said, “I knew she was dying.”121 A pastor
from the Assemblies of God came to the hospital to pray for her. Tony said, “I hated the
Assemblies of God because I am a Catholic…I am a Catholic sacristan. I should not be
easily converted.”122 After reading a portion of scripture, the AG pastor commanded Mrs.
Gallemit to rise. She got up, packed her belongings, and left the hospital, much to her
son’s consternation. But she was healed, and lived another ten or twelve years, long
enough to see all her children in the Assemblies of God. Tony himself was baptized in
the AG in 1963. Within five years, his mother had converted to the UPCP. Oneness
Pentecostalism was the final point on her spiritual pilgrimage. Following an impromptu
debate with 2 UPCP preachers in his mother’s home, Tony was convinced of Jesus’ name
baptism and walked with them to the Augusan River to be baptized at 1:00 in the
morning. His comparison in 2014 of the AG and the UPCP is telling. He said the AG
concentrated on holding crusades, and that most of the AG were converted because of
miracles. He said the “UPC also had miracles, but mostly doctrine. Most of us in the UPC
were converted in Bible truth.”123 Then he made a statement that must be taken within the
context of his own experience in both the AG and the UPCP. “Most of the UPC converts
in the Philippines were AG, because all they needed was baptism, and that’s it.”124 Taken
in the context of what he was saying, the claim that “most of the UPC converts in the
Philippines were AG,” is most certainly hyperbole. As the survey shows, most of the
converts in the UPCP, or any other Oneness Pentecostal organization, were certainly not

121 Tony Gallemit, personal interview, Manila, 25 February 2014.
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from the Assemblies of God. But Tony Gallemit was. And because of his own background, he was acquainted with other Oneness Pentecostals who had migrated from the AG and other Trinitarian Pentecostal groups. However, as was discussed above, a significant percentage of Oneness Pentecostals, about 5%, did migrate into the movement from other Pentecostal/Charismatic churches. This rate of migration was higher than from any other denomination other than Catholic and the undefined Protestant category that could have also included Pentecostal/Charismatics.

2.9 Conclusion

That Oneness Pentecostals have an important part to play in the world would come as no surprise to them. The question is, can they overcome their ‘little sister’ mentality and step up to do their part in being a witness to Jews and Moslems. And can they engage in a respectful and meaningful manner with Trinitarian Pentecostals, Evangelicals, Reformers and Catholics in order to present Oneness Pentecostal theology as being firmly grounded in scripture without compromising their distinctives in order to be accepted? Can they continue to develop a Oneness Pentecostal theology in a sound and academic manner without sacrificing the praxis and doxa that make them Apostolic Pentecostal? Can they ‘walk with kings, nor lose the common touch’?

It has been said that perhaps one fourth of all Classical Pentecostals worldwide are Oneness Pentecostals.125 If the figures arrived at in this research of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines is any indication, that is no exaggeration. The information presented in the Survey of Religious Migration provides valuable insight into the movement before the historical examination that follows, including where members
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migrated from in a religious sense and their motivations for converting to Oneness Pentecostalism. An interesting comparison is given concerning the frequency of speaking in tongues between Oneness Pentecostals and the rest of Filipino Pentecostalism, with rather dramatic result differences. Talmadge French does a masterful job at presenting a worldwide glimpse of the Oneness movement, but there is very little material available that closely examines Oneness Pentecostalism by country, outside of denominational boundaries.126 This work seeks to begin filling that void by taking a closer look at Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippine Islands. It will also examine if the propensity for schism, found in the beginning, continues to exist within the scope of this study.
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CHAPTER 3
Background

3 Introduction

This chapter will look briefly at Filipino history and examine some of the cultural attributes of Filipinos that might influence present day realities and the development of schism among Oneness Pentecostalism there. This will be followed by the introduction of the Pentecostal message in the Philippines, and the earliest known evangelistic efforts among Filipinos in the Hawaiian Islands that resulted in Filipino Pentecostals returning to their homeland.

3.1 Historical and Cultural Considerations

Unlike western civilization with its sharply defined history, the result of written records and multitudes of identifiable archeological sites, the Philippines remains an enigma as far as much of its pre-Spanish existence. Written records are all but non-existent. Most of what can be understood about the pre-Spanish era is therefore gleaned from the writings of the Spanish themselves, and that from their observations through the lens of conquerors and colonizers, convinced of their own superiority and the inferiority of the natives. These Spanish writings are not useless because of their prejudices however. Missionary and Philippines historian William Henry Scott realized the strong Spanish (and Catholic) biases in such works, but argued in his*Cracks in the Parchment Curtain* that Spanish records, nonetheless, offer glimpses into Philippine society that one sees coming through these writings.127 Similarly, much of what is known about early Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines must be gleaned from the writings

of Western missionaries, in spite of their pro-Western biases. This is what Allan Anderson means by "reading between the lines."\textsuperscript{128}

Traditional Filipino religion has been commonly, and sometimes disparagingly, referred to as animism. A simple definition of animism, applicable to this research, is "the belief in Spiritual Beings" and the supernatural.\textsuperscript{129} Belief in the supernatural or the spirit world was pervasive throughout the pre-colonial Philippines, as it was indeed, in most ancient societies and certainly throughout the majority world. This belief made the inhabitants open to Christianity, and its influence can still be seen among many Christians from sub-conscious actions to more easily identifiable customs.\textsuperscript{130}

At the beginning of Spanish colonization, the scattered inhabitants of the Islands did not view themselves as one people. They were isolated clusters of people who formed alliances or experienced hostilities with other isolated groups. Everyone outside of the tribe was ‘other.’ It wasn’t until a common repression by Spain forced Filipinos into a heretofore unrealized cultural identity that Spain became the ‘other’ that made Filipinos one. Most Filipinos lived in communities of between thirty and one hundred homes that were known as barangays, a name that had come from the outrigger sailing boats, balangays, which had brought their ancestors to these shores hundreds or even thousands of years earlier.\textsuperscript{131} People who lived in these barangays called themselves kabangka, meaning ‘from the same boat.’ In many cases, their ancestors had

\textsuperscript{128} Anderson, \textit{Spreading Fires}, 10-11.
actually arrived in the same boat and thus the barangays were made up mostly of people of the same blood. More than one barangay might be adjoining or in close proximity to other barangays, forming a bayan, or larger settlement. To this day, Filipinos returning home from abroad are known as balik bayan – balik meaning to come back or to return.

A major component of Asian culture is the concept of hiya, which is the loss of face. In contrast to cultural Western norms, social embarrassment, and/or shame, reflects not only on the individual, but their ancestral linage. The term hiya can also be translated as meaning to ‘be troubled by evil spirits or dead ancestors’ which adds further weight to the importance of saving face. This might have been demonstrated during the first Spanish visit by what happened after Magellan was killed by Lapu-Lapu. Magellan had baptized Humabon, viewed by Magellan and his crew as the king of Cebu. Magellan had further called the chief men and pressured them to submit to the rule of Humabon. Lapu-Lapu, who was the chief of a small island, today known as Mactan Island, just across the straight from Cebu, refused to submit to either Humabon or Spain. Magellan decided to teach Lapu-Lapu a lesson. He might have been encouraged by Humabon, whom, it has been suggested might have been using Magellan to settle a feud with his neighbor. Magellan took a force of soldiers to the island and was killed by superior forces while attempting to wade ashore. The Spanish defeat, and Magellan’s death, after his threats and boastings of superiority, were a tremendous loss of face in the eyes of the Cebuanos. This loss

132 Francia, 32-3.
133 Scott, Cracks in the Parchment Curtain, 101-2.
135 Francia, 54.
136 Zaide, 84; Maring and Maring, 123.
of face was tantamount to losing favor with the spirit world and thus losing power. It is possible that this caused the recently baptized King Humabon of Cebu, to disregard his newly formed alliance with the Spanish and betray them in a catastrophic manner that left only a few of them alive. The surviving Spanish, without the leadership of Magellan, returned to Cebu only to be led into an ambush by Humabon, who, after inviting the survivors to a banquet, had his guards to kill twenty-six of them.\textsuperscript{137} Gaining or saving face, and avoiding the loss of face is still of paramount importance to Filipinos. Western missionaries in the Philippines and among the Filipino Diaspora have, at times, caused major disarray, and possibly even schism, by not properly understanding or respecting Filipino feelings in this area. Filipinos will go to great lengths to avoid the risk of losing face, or of causing someone else to lose face. This contributes to the Filipino method of using facilitators, or go-betweens, to approach another person in business matters, asking favors or pardon, courting, or asking for someone's hand in marriage.\textsuperscript{138}

### 3.1.1 Three Classes of People

It has been suggested that the term ‘class’ as applied to Filipino people must be understood differently than the term ‘caste’ in the Indian sub-continent.\textsuperscript{139} The various classes of people in the Philippines were more fluid than the unchangeable castes of India. Unlike the Indian caste system, there was upward and downward mobility for all except perhaps the lowest form of slave who had been captured in a raid against an enemy. A person was, because of birth, neither guaranteed a continued role as ruler, nor confined to a hopeless life of slavery. Their status was

\textsuperscript{137} Francia, 55.
\textsuperscript{139} Kathleen M. Nadeau, \textit{The History of the Philippines} (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008), 16.
ultimately determined by indebtedness, which is tied to the Filipino idea of *utang na loob*, which will be examined below.\(^{140}\) Pre-Hispanic Philippine society was generally divided into three tiers.\(^{141}\)

At the top of the social structure was the ruling class, which was generally headed by datus or chiefs. The Spanish term *principales*, referring to those who hold “first place in value or importance and is given precedence or preference before others” is probably the best description of this class.\(^{142}\) Members of this class had the right, by being of noble birth, to respect and obedience from those in the lower two classes. The chief or king of the barangay was often known by the title *datu*, and might be compared to the captain of a boat, and in fact, most datus would captain the ship on raiding parties and act as military commander in times of war.\(^{143}\)

Though being born in the right family strongly influenced who would become datu, the power, and ability to continue as datu, depended upon the loyalty of his peers and those of the middle tier as well as the support of those in the bottom tier. It was imperative that the datu remain strong and rich, which contributed to others being indebted to him. Otherwise his peers might cease to support him and choose another leader.

Members of the middle stratum of society rendered service to the principales, especially the datu, in the form of manual labor or military service. They were expected to respect and obey the datu of the barangay where they lived, but if they were free of debt, and economically able, they were free to move to another barangay and choose another datu to whom they would owe

\(^{140}\) Francia, 36 cites historian Vicente Rafael thus, “Status reflected indebtedness, not the person…”

\(^{141}\) See Scott, *Cracks in the Parchment Curtain*, 96-126, for a thorough examination of Filipino class structure in the sixteenth century. Scott uses seven basic documents spanning from 1582 to 1668.
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allegiance.144 This fluidity of loyalty has carried down to the present day and may be a major factor in the causes of schism within religious systems including Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. It is not unusual for a minister or a group of ministers to leave one organization and join another if they perceive that financial or other benefits will be greater. Without doubt this has contributed to the back-and-forth migration within the Filipino Oneness Pentecostal movement itself.

Members of the bottom layer of Filipino society have sometimes been referred to as slaves, and indeed, some of them, such as those who were captured during raids, might be compared to the slaves of other societies, and might be bought and sold. Others could not be sold and, unlike the stereotypical slave, could actually own property, live in their own house and marry without their master’s consent.145 A person might become a slave because of indebtedness, or might be born into slavery because of his parent’s indebtedness. By the same token, a slave of this nature had the possibility to pay his debt and escape slavery.146 The pre-colonial debt-bondage system was a part of the patron-client relationship that continues to be demonstrated in practically every extra-familial relationship in today's Philippines.147

3.1.2 Exploring the Patron System

Patrons would be those in a higher class than the client. Or, they could be someone in the same class, but in a position to help the client either economically or by representing them, or their cause, to another. Then, and now, it was not ‘what’ you know, but ‘who’ you know. If a person
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had no patron, he had no one to help him through the innumerable intricacies of Filipino life. Even in engagement and marriage, the man would not, himself, ask for the hand of a woman in marriage. His friends and representatives would intercede in such a way, that in case of a refusal, loss of face would be avoided if at all possible. In the Philippines it is a known fact that patrons are needed in everything, from the time one is baptized until one dies, to obtain justice, secure a passport or exploit whatever industry.

But the patron was also dependent upon the client for the host of things the client could provide that made the patron's position as patron, and as respected and looked up to, possible. Without clients there would be no patrons. Without the slaves there would be no masters. Without the lower classes there would be no upper classes. Opposite of the Western individualistic nature, where individuals are self-reliant, the Philippine culture is built on a collectivist approach. The behaviors of each member of society interlocked with those around them. In the Philippines there were no self-made men or women. Everyone depended on a patron or patrons for their opportunities and advancement. And those in power depended upon the deference their followers gave them.

Attached to the patron-client system was the idea of utang na loob, (debt of the heart, or debt of the inside). In this system there was no way to ever entirely pay off this debt. The client remained indebted, not, perhaps, as a slave, but as one who would continue to show respect for his patron. The client could always be counted on to be there when his patron needed him for

148 Jocano, 64-72; Cannell, 60, discovered in her research of lowland Bicolanos, that in courtship and marriage, “Intermediaries were always used by both sides.”
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whatever it was he could provide. And the patron would be there for his client's needs. In today's Philippines, *utang na loob* remains an important part of interpersonal relationships. An employer can count on the employee working extra hours, or doing work that is not normally within the job description, but the employee expects the employer to take care of his child when sick, or help with funeral expenses when a loved one dies. It is not unusual for an employer to put his or her workers' children through school. This social reality continues to influence practically every area of life in the nation.

Just as mobility within the class system applies, and possibly encourages, movement within Philippine Oneness Pentecostalism today, so does the age old culture of patron-client influence schism and the creation of new groups of ministers. If, for instance, one's patron were to leave an organization, his or her clients would feel immense pressure to follow. The patron, by performing favors for the client, creates *utang na loob*, and the expectation that the client will take his side in a dispute. Politically minded individuals understand the culture and might spend years cultivating others in order to become their patron. If such an individual could accumulate enough clients, he might actually use his patronage to elevate himself into a higher class, which comes with the recognition and possibly financial support of his clients. Another consideration is what happens when a patron dies. Ministers who feel *utang na loob* toward their missionary or leader might be released from that debt in the case of their patron's death, and thus be free to transfer their loyalty to another patron. This might result in one group exiting an organization and moving to another, or creating an entirely new one.
3.1.3 Cooperation vs. Competition

Rather than adhering to a system of interpersonal relations based on competition, the Philippines, like most countries in Southeast Asia, practices a follower system that freely acknowledges a gap between employers and employees, teachers and students, leaders and followers. In contrast to modern Western philosophies, which abhors any distance between followers and leaders, Filipino relations are “based on cooperation.”\textsuperscript{151} Emphasis is on shared labor in and around the \textit{barangay}. Whether it was planting and harvesting the fields and rice terraces, or building a boat or a house, it was the responsibility of the group to get things done. This practice is known as \textit{bayanihan}, which means community solidarity.\textsuperscript{152} This cooperation was in itself a form of maintaining discipline and mutual respect, for everyone understood that sooner or later, they themselves would require the help of others. Competition introduced by the first Oneness Pentecostal missionaries, something that was commonly expected within North America, caused confusion among their Filipino converts and brought disarray from which the movement has never recovered. This will be examined more closely in Chapter Six.

3.1.4 Status of Women

Depending on the source, women in the Philippines were described as being sensual goddesses who danced naked and were sexually independent, or were charmingly modest and moral.\textsuperscript{153} It appears that women were valued in society, respected and well treated.\textsuperscript{154} Francia makes the case

\textsuperscript{152} Francia, 34.
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for gender equality in the early Philippines, whereas Canella says that “women are concerned with the running, care and finances of the household.” Zaide furthers this image by quoting an official from the early 20th century, American Governor-General Leonard Wood as saying, “The best men in the Philippines are the women.” In contrast to the many references to men as loving to drink and gamble, women in the Philippines are held up as the quiet strength of the home. When it came to religious matters however, there was, and still is, strong adherence to male dominated leadership. The long history of Catholic male priesthood has effectively striven against women in lead positions of religious organizations in general. While women have played a lead role in the development of Oneness Pentecostalism, it has only been occasionally, sometimes accidentally, and not without resistance. There remain strong feelings in some Oneness organizations against women preaching, pastoring or baptizing. However, just as the society view women as the underlying strength of the home, who often oversee the finances, most people will accept the strong influence and active ministry of a woman so long as the official leadership abides in a male, preferably her husband. While there are many Oneness Pentecostals in North America who look askance at women preachers, it appears that the feelings among Filipinos are even stronger, and stem rather from their culture than from missionary influence. This subject will be discussed later as the conversation turns to women in the Pentecostal movement in the Philippines.
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3.2 Colonization and Catholicism

Among other results of more than three centuries of colonial rule is the undeniable fact that if Spain had not come along when it did, the nation that we know today as the Philippines might not exist. Their neighbors to the north, south and west may have swallowed them up piecemeal. They could have developed into several different states. They certainly did not have any form of national identity. For better or worse, one way or another, Spain was the glue that bound these islands together.\(^\text{159}\) Even the “common grievances” the people in scattered islands shared as a result of colonization, helped “to develop a national solidarity.”\(^\text{160}\) Catholicism was, for all practical purposes, inseparable from the state. The Church contributed to creating solidarity among the people of these scattered islands in ways both good and bad. Even today, “the Catholic church in the Philippines openly exerts its power and influence on virtually every aspect of politics and culture in the nation.”\(^\text{161}\) Spain depended upon the Church, and the Church depended upon the friars. The friars, missionaries at the first, eventually came to be viewed as bandits by the populace. The accumulation of property by the Church at the expense of the Filipinos became one of the causes of later protests. Abuses by the clergy were common, even in the first decades of colonialism. These abuses increased as the power of the friars increased, and as their “missionary zeal” waned.\(^\text{162}\) The friars were seen as enriching themselves at the expense of the natives. There were taxes on a wide variety of items including water, tree planting, the use

\(^\text{159}\) Francia, 13, 23.
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of wood, rattan and bamboo. There were fees on burials and baptisms, and profits from the sale of religious objects such as rosaries and scapulars. Eventually they accumulated some 400,000 acres of land in their own estates. It is possible that the abuses of the friars remain deeply embedded in the Filipio psyche, contributing to schism when ministers feel that missionaries are holding funds intended for Filipinos.

3.2.1 Protests

The written history of the Philippines began with protests. Magellan had no sooner claimed the islands for Spain than he was killed by natives protesting his presence and his presumptuousness. Thus we can conclude that occupation helped to unite the inhabitants of these islands. The people who came to be known as Filipinos were identified as the 'occupied' as opposed to the occupier, and were unified by their protests against the colonizer. This unity did not happen quickly. A national identity was forged on the anvil of "common grievances," but it was forged slowly, over the span of literally centuries of oppression and control. Grievances against the government and the Church, though at times difficult to separate, resulted in many protests over the years.

Abuses by the friars, as noted above, contributed to a growing sense of anger among the population who experienced economical and spiritual impoverishment because of the endless taxation and virtual slavery. This anger broke out from time to time in revolts. Many of the

---
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earlier revolts were nativistic in nature. That is, they were an uprising against the Catholic Church, using traditional religion as a preferred alternative to what the colonizers had imposed upon them. This does not mean that religion was the primary cause of these outbreaks. More often than not, economic suffering was at the root of the revolt, and the Church, or the friars, were blamed. Some felt that the overthrow of the Church would mean economic relief. Many churches were destroyed and clerics were killed during these protests.\textsuperscript{168}

As time went on, and as Catholicism became more entrenched in society, fewer protests claimed the legitimacy of traditional religion. Many protestors continued practicing Catholic rites even while burning Catholic churches. The unrealized ambitions of Filipino secular priests, and the fact that they were not accepted as equals within the Church hierarchy was one of the underlying causes for the unhappiness felt by the people. In protest, they appointed their own people to do the work that Spanish friars and priests had always done.\textsuperscript{169} Some protest leaders claimed to be defenders of the faith, and were absolutely fanatical about the Catholic religion.\textsuperscript{170} Eventually, revolt took the form of an attempt at the Filipinization of the Catholic Church as will be seen below. History has repeated itself in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism, which has seen schisms resulting from the reluctance of Western missionaries to cede control of organizations to national leaders. The abuses of the past are too deeply entrenched in the Filipino mind to escape the tendency to compare such missionaries to the centuries of colonialism suffered by their ancestors.

\textsuperscript{168} Constantino, 85-96.
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3.3 The American Period

The American occupation in 1898 and subsequent conflict with Filipino revolutionaries introduced 126,000 American servicemen to the Islands.\textsuperscript{171} This was just the beginning, as the United States kept military bases in the country until 1991.\textsuperscript{172} During that time, hundreds of thousands of Americans were exposed to the Philippines through the military. Some of these military personnel eventually returned to the Islands as missionaries. Another factor that contributed to some American soldiers’ decision to return and do missionary work in the Philippines was that some of them had married Filipinas that they met during their military activity there or elsewhere. Another important connection between the American military and Protestantism in the Philippines that should not be overlooked is that the very first Protestant minister, George C. Stull, was a United States Army chaplain. Joseph Suico wrote, “It is said that Protestantism arrived in the Philippines wearing an American soldier’s uniform…”\textsuperscript{173} A number of Pentecostal missionaries, both Oneness and Trinitarian, were first introduced to the Islands as soldiers or sailors. One of the most significant contributions of the American era was the widespread introduction of the English language. The fact that most Filipinos today speak English has been a major factor in the creation of the Filipino diaspora scattered around the world. The Filipino diaspora may be significant for the spread of Pentecostalism globally.

\textsuperscript{171} Stuart Creighton Miller, “Compadre Colonialism”, \textit{The Wilson Quarterly} 10, no. 3 (1986), 98.
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3.3.1 Opening the Doors – Arrival of the Protestants

The Protestant Reformation, which was taking place in Europe before Magellan ‘discovered’ the Philippines in 1521, did not even begin to occur in the Philippines until 1898. Although Spain had been open to Protestantism from 1869, the Spanish government and Catholic Church had not allowed Protestants to operate in the Philippines. It wasn’t until the Americans took control of the Philippines that Protestant organizations were allowed into the Islands, and that Catholicism had any established organized religious competition. That year saw the entry of the United Presbyterians and the Methodist Episcopal. The flood gates were open, and the ensuing years saw many more religious organizations enter into what had for over three hundred years been the sole domain of Roman Catholicism as far as Christianity was concerned.174

In 1901, the same year that Agnes Ozman received the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Topeka, several of the major Protestant groups were invited to meet in Manila to discuss some form of cooperative organization in the Philippines. From this meeting came a comity agreement that portioned out the Philippines and gave each group their own geographical area. Manila was not assigned to any particular group and was open to evangelization by all.175 Because various denominations were basically responsible for different areas of the country, people describe their religious heritage in different terms depending on where they were from. Someone from Negros Occidental, where the Baptists were assigned, might say, “My mother was Evangelical Baptist.” Or they might just say, “Our family was Baptist,” or “we were from the Evangelical Church.” To them, the term Baptist and Evangelical were synonymous. In another location, a person might

use the term Evangelical to refer to his or her Methodist church. This might stem from the
Spanish language usage of “evangelico” to refer to any Protestant.

3.3.2 Nationalism in Religion

One way that Filipinos found to express their identity was through the establishment of
autochthonous or indigenous churches. These national churches did not always come about
because of religion. Some religious organizations came about primarily because of nationalistic
feelings. Therefore it has been argued that these Filipino religious movements that sprang from
nationalism are not true indigenous religions.176 Doubtless, those listed below were heavily
influenced by non-Filipino religions. However one chooses to categorize them, the fact that these
religious movements grew up around Filipino ideas and with Filipino leadership, makes them
uniquely Filipino. While nationalism probably did not play a major part in the development of
Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, it has occasionally been used as an excuse for
schism, by using such comments as, “We don’t need any American missionaries.”177 The
reference to “American missionaries” was convenient only because the missionary in question
was American. The same would have been said about “Canadian missionaries,” or one from
elsewhere.

176 F. Go, “The Philippine Independent Church: Religious Conversion and the Spread of Aglipayanism in Cebu
February 2012). See also the article by Ranche, “Iglesia Filipina Independiente” in Sunquist, 359-360.
177 It was told to the researcher that the leader of one semi-independent group who had separated from Carlos Grant
had made statements similar to this.
3.3.3 Aglipayism – Philippine Independent Church (PIC)

Gregorio Aglipay was born in 1860 in the northern Luzon province of Ilocos Norte. After Aglipay obtained an education he became a priest, serving in several parishes in Luzon.\(^{178}\) He joined the revolutionaries and urged other Filipino priests to both join the revolution and to begin work on making the Catholic Church in the country more Filipino.\(^{179}\) He worked to Filipinize the Catholic Church by attempting to gain recognition from Rome and by urging that the Spanish friars be replaced by Filipinos.\(^{180}\) His efforts were fruitless and Archbishop Nozaleda, fearing Aglipay’s nationalism, excommunicated him in May of 1899.\(^{181}\) After the Americans assumed control of the Philippines, it became apparent that the newly appointed Apostolic Delegate from America, Placido Chapelle, disapproved of replacing the Spanish friars with Filipinos. He was also viewed as being “anti-Asiatic,” and actually enflamed the nationalistic fervor by his policies.\(^{182}\)

The *Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Philippine Independent Church (PIC), was founded in Manila on 3 August 1902 and Aglipay was nominated as the first supreme bishop, *Obismo Maximo*.\(^{183}\) The PIC was born of socio-political rather than theological reasons. Indeed, Go states that “The emergence of Aglipayanism cannot be understood separately from the events of the
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Philippine Revolution.” Filipinos who refused to join the Aglipay movement were considered “unpatriotic.” Aglipay and the PIC succeeded on an initially spectacular scale, where all earlier attempts to split with the Church had failed. The schism was immediately successful, with a widespread following throughout the Islands. Within 20 years of its founding, the PIC claimed 1.5 million members, approximately 15% of the population in 1918. Some geographical areas showed PIC membership higher than seventy-five percent of the population in 1918 according to the census data from that time. The next century saw only a numerical growth to about 2 million members, and a drastic fall in percentage of the population to around two-percent. By 1935 the PIC was rent by schism that saw it in the courts for many years. The Aglipayans joined communion with the American Episcopal Church in 1961, but had already, by then, fractured into thirteen different groups.

The early success of the PIC can be attributed, among other things, to the excesses of the friars during the history of Roman Catholic domination of the Philippines, and to the failure of empowering Filipinos to become priests and leaders of the Church in the Philippines. To these reasons were added the anti-Filipino and pro-friar decisions of the Americans immediately following the U.S. occupation of the Islands and, of great import, the occupation of Catholic Church buildings by the PIC in areas where they were strongest. One of the significant contributions to Filipino society by the PIC is the promotion of schism as an acceptable and Filipino alternative to the established religion or the status quo.
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3.3.4 Iglesia ni Cristo

The Iglesia ni Cristo (INC) was founded in 1914 by Felix Manalo. Manalo was born on May 10, 1886 not far from the capitol city of Manila into a devoutly Roman Catholic family. Living with his uncle, a Catholic priest, Manalo rejected Catholicism while still in his teens. He had been harshly rebuked for studying the Bible on his own. His search for spiritual meaning led him on a journey that took him through several different religions, including Methodism and Presbyterianism. By 1911 he became involved in Seventh Day Adventism, even becoming an evangelist, but he quarreled with the leaders over doctrinal matters as well as the leadership relationship between Filipinos and Westerners. He was expelled in 1913, possibly due to moral issues. Finally, in July of 1914, he registered the INC as a religious organization.189 The name Iglesia ni Cristo means 'Church of Christ.' It is a large and very politically active religious organization throughout the Philippines. It is reported to have congregations in 70 different nations and anywhere from three million to ten million members globally.190 INC has been called the most disciplined and unified of all indigenous religions in the Philippines.191 Like Oneness Pentecostals, it denies the doctrine of the trinity. Unlike Oneness Pentecostals however, it also denies the deity of Jesus Christ. The movement is appealing to many based on its very nationalistic, highly organized and authoritarian practices. It has capitalized on the general Biblical illiteracy of most church members, using public debates as a favored method of persuasion. One such debate contributed to the formation of the first identifiable group of Oneness Pentecostal believers in the Visayas in 1957, and will be discussed further in the
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Chapter Five.\textsuperscript{192} When Manalo was expelled by the Seventh Day Adventists, it probably would not have been called a schism. Merely a separating by one man and perhaps a handful of followers. But large doors swing on small hinges. What may not appear to be a schism at the time might turn out to become a notable movement. This has happened in the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines on more than one occasion.

3.4 World War II and the Post-War Period

Although American military had been in the Philippines since 1898, the numbers of soldiers and sailors exposed to the Islands during and following the Second World War was considerably higher. During Japanese occupation, prisoner of war camps were set up around the Islands and foreign civilians, including missionaries and their children, were interned during the duration of the war. The imprisonment of the missionaries forced the nationals to assume leadership of the churches.\textsuperscript{193} This caused the Assemblies of God to make the sudden and necessary transition from missionary leadership to national leadership. Because Oneness organizations were not yet in the country they never experienced this type of unavoidable transition. Thus, post-war American led Oneness organizations continued to be overseen by Americans, some of them to the present time. By assuming ultimate authority over an organization, missionaries have neglected the proper training and entrusting of the national leaders. This has caused those organizations still under missionary control to be limited in numerical growth and in the
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development of national leadership, and resistant to indigenous ideas and methods. Some of them have fewer churches now than they had decades earlier.

General Douglas MacArthur and 200,000 United States military troops liberated the Philippine Islands in 1944-45. Among these troops were men who would one day return to the Philippines as missionaries, such as Carlos Grant who will be studied in more detail later. The aftermath of the Second World War saw increased pro-American feelings in the Filipino populace and pro-Filipino feelings among the thousands of American servicemen who had served there. This first bode well for American missionaries in the Philippines and the second influenced the return of some Americans to the Islands as missionaries. American appearing men were commonly greeted with smiling faces and an excited, “Hello Joe!” There can be no doubt that American missionaries benefitted from the pro-American feelings that followed the war. Some of those missionaries who had fought in the Philippines during the war, were welcomed as heroes.

3.5 Pentecost in the Philippines

The first recorded visit by a Pentecostal missionary of any kind to the Philippine Islands was that of Lucy Leatherman (1863-1924), who is described as an itinerant missionary evangelist who eventually identified with the Church of God, Cleveland, Tennessee, which was a ‘threelfold blessing’ Pentecostal organization devoted to maintaining a separate sanctification experience
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subsequent to salvation and prior to Spirit baptism.\textsuperscript{197} Leatherman, originally from Greencastle, Indiana, received Spirit baptism in Los Angeles in 1906 when Lucy Farrow laid hands on her.\textsuperscript{198} She became one of the earliest of all Pentecostal missionaries, was in Jerusalem by the end of 1907 as the first Pentecostal missionary in the Middle East, also visiting Beirut, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, India, China and Japan before arriving in Manila in late 1909.\textsuperscript{199} Not much is known of her ministry in Manila, only that it was about three months in length, and that she was preaching to American military personnel.\textsuperscript{200} By the time she appeared in Manila, Leatherman would have been in her mid-forties, about the same age as the mothers of many of the American soldiers and sailors to whom she preached. On 10 December Leatherman wrote from Manila-

\begin{quote}
\ldots one sister who is chanting today in the Spirit and God has wonderfully manifested His own power through her; yet, she is not fully baptized into the Holy Spirit. Do pray that He who has begun a good work in Manila will perfect that which concerns Him. Pray that there may be a great work done among the sailors and soldiers who come from our own land.\textsuperscript{201}
\end{quote}

Leatherman spent three months in the Philippines, but it appears that her work in the Philippines was neither successful nor long lasting. What is significant is that she appears to be the first person to preach the Pentecostal message in that country.

Another early Pentecostal missionary to the Philippines was P. R. Rushin who was reportedly in the Philippines and being supported by G. T. Haywood’s Christ Temple by 1915.\textsuperscript{202} There has been speculation that the Rushins were Oneness, possibly due to Haywood’s support.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Bridegroom’s Messenger (BM)} 1:16 (15 June 1908), 1.
\textsuperscript{199} Anderson, \textit{Spreading Fires}, 6, 54, 85, 98, 152-3, 288.
\textsuperscript{200} Anderson, \textit{Spreading Fires}, 153; \textit{To the Ends of the Earth}, 100.
\textsuperscript{201} \textit{BM} 3:53 (1 Feb 1910), 2.
\end{flushright}
A publication of the United Pentecostal Church International goes so far to say that
“P. R. Rushin was sent by the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World to the Philippine Islands [in
1915].”\textsuperscript{203} But the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (PAW) did not have a missions
department until 1919.\textsuperscript{204} Talmadge French would not include Rushin in his list of early Oneness
missionaries because of “unknown affiliation” and the fact that Haywood continued to support
non-Oneness missionaries possibly as late as 1918.\textsuperscript{205} In this case, it might be important to
remember that Haywood was not rebaptized until March 1915.\textsuperscript{206} The Rushins were reporting as
missionaries in China in July 1916, and Mrs. Rushin was back in the Philippines, apparently
alone, by October 1918.\textsuperscript{207} Mirroring Leatherman’s ministry, there was no known lasting results
in the Philippines from the Rushins.

\textbf{3.6 The Hawaiian Connection}

Early Pentecostal missionaries to Hawaii ministered among Filipinos, making Hawaii an
important point for the spread of Pentecostalism to the Philippines. The first known Pentecostal
missionaries in the Hawaiian Islands were Henry and Anna Turney, who started a Pentecostal
church in Honolulu in 1907 that was especially successful among Filipinos and Puerto Ricans.
They were only in Hawaii for a few months and were among the first Pentecostal missionaries in
South Africa.\textsuperscript{208} Tommy F. Anderson also worked among Filipinos in Hawaii from 1913 to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{203} United Pentecostal Church International, Global Missions Division, Next Steps.
June 2016).
\item \textsuperscript{204} Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, Inc. Facebook entry 29 August 2013.
\item \textsuperscript{205} French, \textit{Early Interracial}, 214.
\item \textsuperscript{206} French, \textit{Early Interracial}, 105.
\item \textsuperscript{207} \textit{BM} 9:183 (1 July 1916) 2; \textit{BM} 11:206 (1 October 1918) 2.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Anderson, \textit{Spreading Fires}, 141.
\end{itemize}
Anderson had a Filipino helper who was feeling the call to preach, and to return to his own country in order to share the gospel with his own people. Anderson, writing of this man (but not naming him), good-naturedly bemoaned the fact that he was losing him to the ministry.\textsuperscript{210} This was not uncommon among early Pentecostals in the Hawaiian Islands. Another missionary in Hawaii, Frank F. Fisher, wrote from Hilo, Hawaii, in a report to the \textit{Pentecostal Evangel} in 1929, “Much of our work is with Filipino laborers in the plantation and our greatest hindrance is having the interpreters return to the Philippines with the gospel just at a time when they could be of great value to the work here.”\textsuperscript{211} Nor was it uncommon for non-Western persons to be unnamed. In 1914, Anderson had reported, “one of the brethren was stoned by some Catholic Filipinos for preaching that Christ was the only one with power to forgive sins and save the soul.”\textsuperscript{212} In an oversight, the likes of which hinder research into early Filipino (and other national) preachers, Anderson failed to name the brother who was stoned. Had the persecuted man been American, Canadian or European, there is little doubt that the story of his stoning, along with his identification and photos, would have appeared in one or more Pentecostal periodicals. Anderson was almost certainly not intentionally neglecting to name the preacher. He was only acting out the normal and accepted ethnocentric attitudes of his time. Other Pentecostal preachers, like Anderson, have written the history of the Pentecostal movement in the Philippines, and other majority world countries, with most emphasis upon their own contributions and only minor, sometimes incidental, references to native ministers. It cannot now

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Richards, \textit{Scotty Kid}, 203-4.
\item \textit{Pentecostal Evangel} No. 823 (16 November 1929), 11.
\item \textit{The Christian Evangel} No. 64 (24 October 1914), 4.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
be known for sure, but it is likely that the brother who was stoned was a Filipino, for it would have been highly unusual that Filipino farm workers in Hawaii would risk deportation by attacking a religious worker of another race. Likewise, although Anderson did not name his helper (in the beginning of this paragraph), he did say he was at the “Hawaiian Board School.”

From that clue, there is a good chance this man was Maximiano Somosierra.

Maximiano H. Somosierra was born in Iloilo, Philippines 28 December 1885. He had arrived in Hawaii from the Philippines in 1912. He was converted to Pentecostalism in Hawaii and returned to the Philippines in 1921. He was licensed by the General Council of the Assemblies of God by 1923, making him that organization’s first minister in the Philippines. His residence in Iloilo, after his return from Hawaii, spanned some twenty-five years, from 1921 through 1946 and possibly beyond. He was the first of several Filipino ministers who were ordained by the General Council of the Assemblies of God outside of their own country, and before the AG was organized there. Although Filipino histories of the Assemblies of God in the Philippines credit early Filipino pioneers like Cris Garsulao, Pedro Collado, Benito Acena, Rosendo Alcantara, Eugenio Suede, and Rodrigo Ezperanza, none of these men were there earlier than Maximiano Somosierra who seems to have been overlooked. He was in the Philippines five years before AG missionary Benjamin Caudle who has been credited as being

213 Richards, SCOTTY KID, 203-4.
215 National Archives and Records Administration (NARA); Washington, D.C.; Index to Filipino Passengers Arriving at Honolulu, Hawaii, ca. 1900-ca. 1952; Microfilm Series: A3407; Microfilm Roll: 17.
216 GC, Constitution and By-Laws of the General Council of the Assemblies of God…with List of ministers and missionaries, 1923, 91.
the first AG preacher there. Balikbayan is the term given to Filipinos who are living elsewhere in the world and returning to the Philippines to visit. Pentecostalism could be said to have begun as a balikbayan religion, brought home by returning nationals to share with their friends and family.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has offered historical background to Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism in order to contribute to a broad understanding of Filipino society, culture, government and religion. It attempts to give a glimpse of the Philippines from the sixteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries by providing just enough details to gain insight into the context for the advent of Oneness Pentecostalism and its development to the present time. In the examination of its earliest history can be seen the seeds of cultural understandings that have had influence on the feelings toward schism and women in the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines. The Filipino experience puts in place all the necessary ingredients for the development of schism. The historical and cultural milieu created by Catholicism, the abuse of the friars, the class and patron systems, the idea of utang na loob, nationalism, and the patronizing attitudes of American missionaries (to be examined in more detail below) work together to make schism almost unavoidable. The next chapter will also show that the beginnings of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines has much in common with what has been seen here in the Hawaii connection.

219 Passenger Lists of Vessels Departing from Honolulu, Hawaii, compiled 06/1900 - 11/1954; National Archives Microfilm Publication: A3510; Roll: 038; Record Group Title: Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1787 - 2004; Record Group Number: RG 85.

CHAPTER 4
The Beginnings Of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism

4 Introduction
This chapter will examine the beginnings of Oneness Pentecostalism in Hawaii and the Philippines. It has been seen that Hawaii was an important connection point for Pentecostalism from an early date. The advent of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines follows the pattern set by the AG in that the first known Oneness Pentecostal in the Philippines was converted in Hawaii and returned home with the message. The earliest Oneness Pentecostal missionaries to Hawaii will be discussed here. The lives and ministries of the first two, known Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preachers, Urbano Aventura and Diamond Noble, will be examined, along with the beginnings of schism in the movement.

4.1 Hawaii
The first known Oneness Pentecostal ministry to Filipinos occurred in Hawaii. Harvey J. (1875-1957) and Florence (1875-1922) Johns and their son, Clarence R. Johns, all received their Spirit baptism in 1906.\(^{221}\) They felt the call to the Hawaiian Islands the same year, but didn’t arrive in Honolulu until sometime around 1914. They started several congregations on Oahu Island, one of which was primarily Filipino.\(^{222}\) It appears that the family embraced the Oneness message by 1917, eventually identifying with that young movement, and distancing themselves from the Assemblies of God.\(^{223}\) In this way,

---

\(^{221}\) WE 214 (10 November 1917), 11.
\(^{222}\) WE (9 March 1918), 10.
\(^{223}\) PE 334-5 (3 April 1920), 12.
they were part of the New Issue that caused one of the major schisms in the Pentecostal movement. Their ministry appears to have been cut short by the untimely death of Florence Johns in December 1922, and the rest of the family left Hawaii shortly thereafter.224

It is significant that the Johns were the first Oneness Pentecostal missionaries in Hawaii, and that their ministry was possibly the first Oneness Pentecostal outreach to Filipinos, and could have seen Filipinos baptized in Jesus’ name in Hawaii by 1916 or earlier. Due to the steady movement between Hawaii and the Philippines, it was easy for the gospel message to be spread as new converts traveled back to their home countries. It is entirely possible that one of these converts carried the Oneness Pentecostal message to the Philippines earlier than was previously documented.225 Alternatively, there may have been Filipinos exposed to Oneness Pentecostalism on the U.S. mainland, or elsewhere, before returning to the Philippines. Perhaps future research will reveal that such is the case.

This investigation has discovered no evidence of any connection between the Johns and the Lochbaums, who arrived in 1923 (See below.) That is not to say that they had no connection, or were totally unknown to one another. Pentecostals were a society within a society. Oneness Pentecostalism, being smaller than the overall Pentecostal movement, was an even more tight-knit movement. It might also be significant that when the Lochbaums arrived, there was “a group of Puerto Rican people” who had “told them

---

224 PE 493 (21 April 1923), 12.
225 This was the case with Maximiano Somosierra discussed earlier in this work. For more on Maximiano Somosierra, see Chapter 3.6.
that they had been praying” for a pastor.\textsuperscript{226} Was this group the result of an earlier work? Were they people who had been left without spiritual leadership due to the death of Florence Johns, and the departure of her husband?

The arrival in Hawaii of the new missionaries, Charles (1876-1962) and Ada (1875-1949) Lochbaum, resulted in the earliest confirmed Filipino conversions to Oneness Pentecostalism in the Hawaiian Islands. Charles was born in the United States of German parentage, and Ada was born in Birmingham, England. The Lochbaums were living in Los Angeles when they were converted in 1917.\textsuperscript{227} There appears to have been some connection with Aimee Semple McPherson. McPherson may have been present in the prayer meeting where the Lochbaums received their calling to Hawaii.\textsuperscript{228} In that meeting, 5 March 1923, Charles Lochbaum had a vision in which “the Lord called me…to come to the Hawaiian Islands and showed me in a vision a group of dark-skinned people praying in a little whitewashed shack.”\textsuperscript{229} Less than five months from the time Charles experienced his vision, the entire family sailed to Hawaii, arriving 4 August 1923.\textsuperscript{230} They searched for the people Lochbaum had seen in a vision. “Led by the Spirit,
they found the church…where a group of Puerto Rican people told them that they had been praying that the Lord would send them ‘a Shepherd.”

The Lochbaums founded The Apostolic Faith Church in Honolulu by erecting a tent in an empty lot on Middle Street and holding revival services. Perhaps the Puerto Rican people that they found when they arrived formed a nucleus to begin their new work. Ada played an active part in ministry, preaching and baptizing. “Although she was soft spoken, her delivery of preaching the Word of God was very passionate and dynamic.” “Apostolic Faith” was a popular local church and organizational name in the early 20th century. It had been used extensively by Charles Parham. Joseph Seymour used it at Azusa Street and many others followed suit. The term “Apostolic” had not yet been appropriated by many North American Oneness Pentecostals as it has been today. This research did not discover how the Lochbaums became Oneness Pentecostal, or whether they had ever been Trinitarian. What is known is that from the time they landed in Hawaii, they performed water baptisms by immersion in the name of Jesus Christ, 4,000 of them by July of 1930. Talmadge French called the organization “a second blessing Oneness group.” This could be the influence of Aimee Semple McPherson, and might be further seen in the group’s emphasis on “the foursquare Gospel.” It does not appear that the Lochbaums or The Apostolic Faith Church of Hawaii were ever associated with any other organization. In addition to the main church in Honolulu, they have 5 branch churches in Hawaii and two in the Philippines. Like other Pentecostals in Hawaii, the Lochbaums reached into the large Filipino population. Among those

---

converted by the Lochbaums were the Aventura brothers, Julian and Urbano. At that
time, there were many Filipinos working in the sugar plantations in Hawaii. These
brothers were among them, and they are the earliest known Oneness Pentecostal
Filipinos.

4.2 Urbano Aventura

The Aventuras originated in a small village in Iloilo called Janiuay, Julian being born
there 20 February 1894, and Urbano on 15 May 1901. Like most Filipinos, the
Aventura family were Catholics. Julian and Urbano’s elder brother had become a Jesuit
and served in California. In November of 1912, Julian Aventura went to Hawaii to
work on the sugar plantations. By 1920 he was a foreman at Camp One of the Honokaa
Sugar Plantation on the big island of Hawaii. His younger brother, Urbano, joined him
to work on the plantation in 1924. Both brothers worked on the plantation until they
decided to find work in California. They sailed to California in the latter part of 1926,
where they worked on a ranch during summer, and as house servants or janitors in hotels
or apartments during the winter throughout the next few years. The brothers attended
Mass every Sunday, but Urbano wrote that this left him “without hope.” Julian
returned to Honolulu in February of 1930, where he was introduced to the Apostolic

---

237 Urbano Aventura, “MY TESTIMONY”, Celebrating 50 years of Apostolic Liberty (Makati City: United
Pentecostal Church (Phils.) Inc., 2007), 75. Aventura’s testimony was reprinted with minor changes from
Roberta Dillon, My Philippines, by the author, 1965, 52-55, a small booklet. The testimony appears to have
originally been a letter written at the request of Albert and Roberta Dillon, formerly UPC missionaries in
the Philippines, after their return to the United States in early 1962.
238 Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving or Departing at Honolulu, Hawaii, 1900-1954; National Archives
Microfilm Publication: A3510; Roll: 153; RG 85, 405/638.
240 Urbano Aventura, “TESTIMONY”, 75.
Faith Church and became a member.\footnote{102} Although it is not known by what means Julian came to the Apostolic Faith Church, we can know for sure that Urbano came as a result of his own brother’s testimony. Julian wrote to Urbano in the first part of 1932 encouraging him to return to Hawaii. Urbano did not waste any time. He was aboard the S.S. Calawai sailing from Los Angeles 28 May 1932 and arrived in Honolulu on 4 June.\footnote{102}

**4.2.1 Urbano Aventura Conversion 1932-1937**

When he arrived in Hawaii, Urbano found that his brother had become a member of the Apostolic Faith Church. “He gladly told me of the wonderful work of God and it amazed me that he was now praising Jesus. I thought he was crazy because that was the first time I heard him say praises to Jesus.”\footnote{243} Urbano later described his own conversion experience as supernatural.

…I told myself that I would never believe any doctrine other than the Catholic beliefs. However, in a vision, I heard a voice calling me and commanding me to wash myself in a spring of water under the foot of the cross of Jesus Christ… It soon dawned on me that I needed baptism. I did not tarry. During that same day, I was baptized, and right on the water I saw the glory of God while afloat on the water for about five minutes without strength…

I praise and thank God for His great love and mercy toward us. Though our sins do not deserve cleansing and forgiveness, He blotted them out through His precious blood…People need to repent and be baptized in His name according to Acts 2:38.\footnote{244}

In this brief testimony, it is apparent that Urbano had no intention of ever being any other faith except Catholic. Like almost all other Oneness Pentecostals of that era, he migrated

\footnote{241} *Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at Honolulu, Hawaii, compiled 02/13/1900 - 12/30/1953; National Archives Microfilm Publication: A3422; Roll: 107; Record Group Title: Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1787 - 2004; Record Group Number: RG 85. Urbano Aventura, TESTIMONY, 75.
\footnote{242} *Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at Honolulu, Hawaii, compiled 02/13/1900 - 12/30/1953; National Archives Microfilm Publication: A3422; Roll: 123; Record Group Title: Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1787 - 2004; Record Group Number: RG 85, 322.
\footnote{243} Urbano Aventura, “TESTIMONY”, 75.
\footnote{244} Urbano Aventura, “TESTIMONY”, 75.
from another faith, in his case, Catholicism. Coming into contact with this new belief through his brother, Julian, Urbano’s initial impression was that “his brother was crazy.” But that was of no import once Urbano experienced his vision described above. Urbano responded to his vision by being baptized the same day. He was baptized by Ada Lochbaum.245 When he had been immersed, he “saw the glory of God while afloat on the water for about five minutes without strength.” This floating on the water seems to have been considered supernatural and was a convincing sign for others who witnessed the later baptisms. It had been emphasized by the Lochbaums, with the comment appearing in one of the early issues of their periodical, *The Kingdom of God Crusader*, “We have seen hundreds slain under the power of God in the waters and floating as long as half an hour at the time, many speaking in tongues.”246 Urbano’s experience of floating became a pattern that was repeated years later when he baptized his first converts. Some of them, also, were described as floating on the water after their baptism. This was considered so impressive that Eddie Acuesta, who later pastored the church begun by Urbano Aventura in Baguer, was baptized immediately after he witnessed a baptism performed by Aventura with the woman just baptized floating on the water. The floating on the water was what convinced Acuesta to be baptized.247 Another pattern, which was more common, was the way in which Urbano was converted. In a scene that is repeated time and time again, Urbano was convinced by the witness of his brother, which included the verbal testimony and lifestyle change. Most conversions traced in this research resulted from the personal witness of a friend or family member. The witness usually included an

247 Art Acuesta, personal interview in Davao City, Mindanao, 20 February 2013. Art Acuesta is the son of the late Eddie Acuesta.
invitation to a church service, or a Bible study, or a baptismal service. This was seen in
the Survey of Religious Migration mentioned in the Chapters One and Two.

Unfortunately, Urbano does not give the exact date for his own baptism, and the
organization did not keep records that show when Julian and Urbano were baptized, but
we can place the date somewhere between June 1932 when he arrived back in Hawaii,
and January 1937 when he returned home to Iloilo, already converted. He used the term
“I did not tarry” to describe his immediate, same day, response to the vision he described
above. In comparing Urbano’s conversion to the many others that were reviewed in the
course of this research, it would seem probable that he was baptized shortly after
returning to Hawaii in 1932.

4.2.2 Back to the Philippines – War and Aftermath 1937-1946

Feeling homesick, Urbano returned home to Janiuay, Iloilo, departing Honolulu 15
January 1937. It is curious that the first known Oneness Pentecostal preacher in the
Philippines was from a town only fifteen kilometers from Santa Barbara, Iloilo on Panay
Island, where Maximiano Somosierra, the first known Assembly of God preacher in the
Philippines lived from at least 1921 through 1946 as a member of the United States AG
General Council. Instead of finding a warm welcome when he arrived in Iloilo, Urbano
Aventura found that he was “hated” and “cursed” by his family and friends for turning
away from Catholicism. His mother told him “it did not matter if we would all go to the
lake of fire as long as we are all together.” Feeling rejected and frustrated because his
family would not accept his Pentecostal message, Aventura moved to Mindanao. He

248 Honolulu, Hawaii, Passenger and Crew Lists, 1900-1959 for Urbano Aventura, A3510 – Departing from
249 For more on Maximiano Somosierra, see Chapter 3.6.
homesteaded on eight hectares of land in Barangay Kimarayag, and began farming.

Finding no Oneness Pentecostal churches in the area, (there were none in the entire country), he tried the local Protestant churches. Complaining that he found them “dead,” Urbano stopped attending any church at all. He began associating with “ungodly people” who were “nice and warm”, but “very worldly.” Urbano was shaken out of his spiritual lethargy by an incident that almost cost him his life.

In 1944, during the enemy occupation, Japanese soldiers invaded our hideout. A Filipino PC [Philippines Constabulary] who was with them shot me with an automatic rifle from about a 20-meter distance. The PC told me not to run away. I suddenly remembered God and asked Him to spare me. I said, “Lord, deliver me at this time. If you will spare me, use me in Your own way.” So I rolled on the ground; I was able to escape but was slightly hurt by a bullet in the arm. I praise and thank God because even though we are going against His will, if we will go back to Him, He will accept us as His son.

During the war, under Japanese occupation, he kept his Bible hidden and his beliefs to himself. He had another close call toward the end of the war, when a desperate Japanese officer came into his house and threatened his wife and little girl. The little girl was sent to bring her father in from the field. Urbano returned home and wrestled the soldier’s gun away from him. He allowed the soldier to leave, but the man was killed by other Filipinos shortly after. Although Urbano Aventura returned to the Philippines in early 1937 with the Oneness Pentecostal message, and with the desire to share it, he became discouraged and inactive for a number of years. It was his near brush with death that caused him to say, “Lord, deliver me…If you will spare me, use me in Your own way.”

---

250 Urbano Aventura, “TESTIMONY”, 76.
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Janiuay, Iloilo
Birthplace and home of Urbano Aventura. He returned here with the Oneness Pentecostal Message in 1937, suffered rejection by his family, and moved to Cotabato.

Santa Barbara, Iloilo
Maximiano Somosierra was here as an Assemblies of God preacher from 1921-1946.

Baguer, Cotabato
Urbano Aventura began witnessing here in 1947 and formed the first known Oneness Pentecostal Church (Apostolic Faith Church) although he did not perform baptisms before 25 December 1948.
4.2.3 Ministry 1946-1968

After the war, Urbano made good on his promise and began to preach around the area where he lived. In 1946 he began in earnest to testify, saying later that God had given him courage and boldness in spite of inexperience and lack of education. Thus, 1946 marks the point when Oneness Pentecostalism teaching began to be propagated, howbeit only on a very small and localized scale. Urbano did not complete elementary school and had no Bible school training. He began having services in his home in 1947 with only his family. They invited neighbors in the village of Baguer to attend, and shortly had between fifteen and twenty in attendance. He preached the same Oneness Pentecostal message that he had received from the Lochbaums. He also felt God encouraging him to testify about divine healing. There were several notable healings, but the reaction was mixed. Some neighbors were impressed and converted as a result of the healings; other of the barangay residents accused him of using hypnotism. In early 1948, Urbano’s followers began to request water baptism. He did not feel qualified to perform baptisms, and told the people to ask God to send someone to baptize them. Urbano married a widow, Anastacia Gregula Jalandoni on 18 March 1948. His older brother, Julian, arrived in December, as though in answer to prayer. Bolstered by the presence of the man who brought him into the church, Aventura performed the first known baptisms in Jesus’ name in Mindanao on 25 December 1948. The first baptized was his stepdaughter, Nellie Jalandoni Bacus. Nellie was born April 23, 1923 which would make her 25

---

254 Urbano is credited for performing these baptisms, although it is possible that his brother, Julian, actually did the baptizing. The contemporary sources are most likely taken from his testimony, which was included in Roberta Dillon, 52-55. This is the earliest extant source of Urbano Aventura’s testimony.
255 Art Acuesta, personal interview, Davao, 20 February 2013. Acuesta’s father was Urbano’s assistant pastor, and became pastor of the church in Baguer after Urbano stepped down due to ill health.
years old when she was baptized.\textsuperscript{256} She remained a member of that church until her death in August 2012. Also baptized on that day were Ricardo and Josefa Villa, Maria Jalandoni and the Banto family. Urbano felt that God confirmed the preaching because people then began receiving Holy Spirit baptism. It is likely that Julian Aventura would have become the leader of the group because he was the older brother, and because of the years he had spent with the Lochbaums at the headquarters Apostolic Faith Church in Honolulu. He was also the one who introduced his younger brother to Oneness Pentecostalism. However, he was paralyzed in an accident on a trip back to Iloilo. This led Urbano to believe that it must not have been the will of God for Julian to lead the work.

The small group of believers erected a small grass chapel in 1950 and called themselves Apostolic Faith Church, after the church where Aventura was baptized in Hawaii. Because the neighbors had never heard of anyone else teaching this doctrine, they assumed that Aventura had invented something new. People in the barangay began to make fun of the group and called it “Iglesia ni Bano,” (Church of Urbano). This prompted the group to pray that a missionary would be sent as proof to the critics that there were others who believed this same message. Aventura had contacted the Lochbaums and requested them to come, but they were unable to do so. This points to an interesting situation that still exists in the Philippines, though perhaps not to the same extent that it did in the past. The issue is the influence of non-Filipinos upon Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. There was from the beginning a feeling among most Filipino Pentecostals that they needed a missionary. Preferably one from the United

\textsuperscript{256} Bless Golez, private message, 24 September 2014. Golez is the great-granddaughter of Anastacia Gregula Jalandoni Aventura, and the granddaughter of Mercedes Jalondoni Golez who was baptized the same day as her sister, Nellie.
States, which was held in high regard after the war. In 1965, Roberta Dillon wrote, “An American missionary in the Philippines enjoys a wonderful opportunity. They [the Filipinos] have not forgotten World War II and that the Americans drove away the dread Japanese invaders from their shores. They are a grateful people.” So here is the first Oneness Pentecostal preacher in the Philippines, a Filipino, who was reluctant to baptize those whom he had discipled, and was hoping that the missionaries in Hawaii would come and visit his village to prove to the skeptics that he hadn’t invented his own religion. When this did not work out, he travelled to Negros Occidental to inquire about an American missionary he had heard of. Negros Island was directly across the Guimaras Straight from his home island of Panay. The missionary who had come to Negros had also started a church on Panay Island, in Iloilo City, the city of which Aventura’s home village of Janiuay was administratively attached. Word of these new Pentecostals would have spread, and it is possible that Julian Aventura, if he were still living in Iloilo after his paralyzing accident, would have heard about these people and contacted his brother in Mindanao with this information. In 1957, the first Oneness Pentecostal missionary, Carlos Grant (1910-1998), had arrived in the Philippines and was working in Negros Occidental. Grant was joined in late 1959 by Arthur Dillon (1922-1997). One way or another, Aventura found out about the Oneness missionary and travelled to Cabungahan, Fabrica on Negros Island to make contact. It was a 725-kilometer trip by boat. He succeeded in meeting some of the believers in Fabrica. In early 1960 he wrote to Dillon, asking him to come to Mindanao. Aventura had been

258 Meliton Zarsuelo, *UPC 50th*, 47.
259 Meliton Zarsuelo, *UPC 50th*, 47.
260 Roberta Dillon, 17.
converted before either Grant or Dillon, and was older than either of them. He had been in the ministry before Grant or Dillon, and had been pastoring for several years before Dillon attended Bible school.

Why would a man who was an elder, and had more years in the ministry submit himself unto American missionaries who were younger and perhaps less experienced than himself? One reason may be that he was converted in Hawaii where he was baptized by missionaries, who were in this case, an Englishwoman married to an American. But this might have been strengthened by the Filipino psyche, being predispositioned by hundreds of years of colonialism, to depend on others for leadership, unless they had themselves been born into the leading class. Wealthy people in the Philippines are not simply wealthier, they are in a different social class, one that demands and receives respect from those who are not as wealthy. Most often, wealth translates into leadership. Having money seems to confer the right to lead. Those without wealth are most often willing to do the bidding of those who do have it. The missionaries must have seemed immensely wealthy to the Filipinos. Urbano was not wealthy.

Dillon received the letter asking him to come to Mindanao in early February 1960. During a prayer meeting about that time at the home of Mercedes Golez in Baguer, one member of the small group prophesied that somebody would come on 25 February. Dillon flew into Cotabato City on 24 February, and after spending the night in a hotel, found his way to the Golez home on 25 February in a manner that the group attributed to the direction of the Lord. They also saw his arrival on that date as the fulfillment of prophecy. What Dillon found upon his arrival was a small group of people, worshipping in a small chapel with grass walls and roof, and sharing one old, worn Bible among all of
them, including the pastor. Dillon was invited to hold nightly revival services. Ten people were baptized during the first week, and by the time Dillon had been there two and a half weeks, sixty-six had been baptized in water. This number might have included those who had already been baptized before Dillon’s arrival. After observing Dillon’s ministry and message for two weeks, Aventura decided that there was no difference between what they believed. A decision was made by the pastor and members to affiliate with Dillon’s organization, the United Pentecostal Church (Philippines) Incorporated (UPCP). Before the end of 1960, the name Apostolic Faith Church came off the building and the new name, United Pentecostal Church was adopted. A new, two story, mahogany building replaced the grass chapel and was dedicated on December 25, 1961 in a service attended by some three hundred people. By this time, 230 people in Baguer had been baptized. Aventura continued to pastor until declining health due to tuberculosis forced him to resign in 1964. By that time, he had overseen the founding and growth of the first Oneness Pentecostal Church anywhere south of Luzon, the baptism of 230 people in Baguer, and the establishing of at least three other assemblies in Mindanao. Urbano Aventura died in April 1968. The man who assumed the pastorate from Aventura was one of his converts, Eddie Acuesta, who had witnessed a baptism by Aventura and saw the woman who had just been baptized floating on the water speaking in tongues. He requested baptism the same day.

Like Maximiano Somosierra, the first known AG minister in the Philippines, Urbano Aventura, the first known Oneness Pentecostal in Mindanao, received his experience in Hawaii and returned home with his experience. Urbano had the distinction

---
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262 Art Acuesta, personal interview, Davao City, 20 February 2013.
of being baptized by a woman, something that some of the later Oneness Pentecostals in
the Philippines would have frowned upon, and others would have required him to be re-
baptized again by a man. Aventura demonstrates the common Filipino Pentecostal
characteristic of craving for a missionary, even as he proves by his steadfastness and his
success, following his wartime experience, that he was perfectly capable of being a pastor
and church planter. The desire for affirmation is understandable, considering the lack of
fellowship and the lack of ministerial training. In MY TESTIMONY, which appears in
Roberta Dillon’s book, and was written probably in 1965, Aventura displays his almost
childlike feeling of need and gratitude.

Early in 1948, the converts began to ask me if who will baptize them, I told them
just pray that God will send some body to baptiz (sic) for I am not worthy to
baptize. In 1948 in the month of December Brother Julian from Honolulu, Hawaii
arrive and we start baptizing December 25, 1948. And God confirm the word by
giving the converts the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But Brother Julian go back to
Iloilo he got accident and he got paralized (sic), I think it is not the will of God
that he will carry the work because God manifested His power in the church that I
will carry the work and will stand fast in His Holy Name. Since then because of
lack of aid lack of anything even some time we like to go to other places we can’t
go because of lack of transportation but praise God our prayers is answered we
have been praying for the missionary here in the Philippines for 12 years, and in
1960, February 25, Brother Dillon arrives from Negros and we are so happy for
God has answered our prayers. And the people here in Mindanao like very much
Brother Dillon and they believe now that the Gospel I preach is not here only in
Mindanao but also in the United States, too. Before they said I only invent the
Gospel, God is blessing Mindanao since the arrival of Brother Dillon. 263

That there was a productive relationship between Aventura and missionary Dillon seems
obvious. Such relationships could, at least in the early days of the movement, offer moral
support, which in this case, was sorely needed. The financial assistance offered by the
missionary, or by his organization, can help the native pastor accomplish things he might
not be able to accomplish alone. Along with this support, however, comes a gradually
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increasing dependency upon other, non-Filipino organizations as will be examined further in this research. Aventura’s testimony must be also understood in the context in which it was written. It might have been requested by the Dillons in order to be included in Roberta’s book, and to show that their time in the Philippines had been successful. Additionally, Aventura probably felt an *utang na loob* (debt of the heart, or of the inside) toward Dillon because he was the one whose coming confirmed that the church he founded was not *Iglesia ni Bano*, and that there were others who believed the same doctrine. Although Aventura remained part of the UPCP until his death, he was exposed to turbulence that raised the specter of schism in that organization as will be seen in Chapter Six.

**4.3 Diamond A. Noble**

In a dramatic departure from the example seen above, the man examined in this section was a graduate from a Oneness Bible school in the United States, was credentialed by two Oneness organizations in the U.S. before beginning his ministry, suffered no obvious lack of self confidence and did not wait for a missionary to arrive before beginning an effective ministry in the Philippines. Without a missionary, he built a local congregation, beginning with the conversion of his own family members, and registered the first Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines. He launched a successful campaign of healing crusades that covered most of Luzon Island before 1957. He is significant for performing the first known Oneness Pentecostal baptisms in the Philippines in 1947.
4.3.1 Noble in the United States 1935-1947

Diamond Ablang Noble (No-blay) was born in a Catholic family in Lawak, Tayug, Pangasinan, Philippines 22 February 1908.\textsuperscript{264} He was the first of seven children.\textsuperscript{265} At the age of 17 or 18, after completing his second year of high school, Noble went to the United States to work.\textsuperscript{266} In 1940, he was working as a cook in a private home in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He had been there at least as early as 1935.\textsuperscript{267} He married an American, Mary Louise Bradley at his residence on 21 August 1943.\textsuperscript{268} Just nine days later, on 30 August, he enlisted in the United States Army.\textsuperscript{269} By the following May, Noble was stationed at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma, and desperate to get out of the Army. Sometime during the last week of that month, Noble had a dramatic spiritual encounter.

In describing when God “found” him, he wrote:

> Something got hold of me that memorable night in May and that very thing which I’ve realized later was the Spirit of God. I was like a leaf shaking and I thought I had malaria. I was praying on my knees for the first time in my life crying and praying to Jesus: and this was my prayer. “My God the Lord Jesus Christ delivers me out of this army and I’ll serve thee.” I had only a little sleep that whole night.

\textsuperscript{264} Dialyn Estillore, personal correspondence 16 February 2015. Dialyn is the daughter of Diamond Noble. See also 1940; Census Place: Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Roll: T627_3694; Page: 7A; Enumeration District: 51-224A.
\textsuperscript{265} Dialyn Noble Estillore, personal interview, 11 November 2015. The children, in order of their birth were: Diamond Noble, Hermogenes Noble, Benito Noble, Petronio Noble, Amador Noble, Jacinta Noble Publico(married name) and Pacita Noble Maza(married name).
\textsuperscript{266} Avelina Noble and Dialyn Noble Estillore, personal interview in Bantug, Umingan, Pangasinan, 11 November 2015.
for I was always trembling, kicking and crying to Jesus on my knees to deliver me out of the army and ill’ (sic) serve Him.²⁷⁰

From that time Noble began to be outspoken about God, saying, “I was bold as a lion, championing His truths.”²⁷¹ It cannot be known now if Noble was witnessed to during his time at Camp Gruber, but it is not beyond reason. At the time of Noble’s spiritual experience, there was at least one Oneness Pentecostal soldier, Private First Class Howard Glen Devore, stationed at Camp Gruber. Devore had been described as a “good church worker,” and the possibility must be considered that he, or someone like him, witnessed to Noble about the Oneness of God.²⁷² In a pattern that is not uncommon in the Oneness Pentecostal movement, Noble migrated from his initial experience described above, into a step-by-step progression that shortly brought him to Oneness Pentecostalism where he was to spend the remainder of his life.

Following this initial experience, Noble began the search for a religious community he could fit in. Five months later, in August of 1944, Noble obtained leave and travelled to New York City to see Father Divine, the African American religious leader who claimed to be God. He was introduced to the leader, saying, “I was like the Apostle Thomas feeling for the nail print in his hand, but I felt and found none…I cried to God Jesus that night on my bedside down on my knees asking Him to reveal to me who this so called Father Divine is and in a dream God showed me that Father Divine is a man like you and I.”²⁷³ Back at Camp Gruber, Noble had a conversation with a Jewish

²⁷⁰ Diamond A. Noble, My Concise Personal Testimony, undated, received by Johnny King in an email dated 27 April 2013 from Noble’s son-in-law, Isagani B. Estillore.
²⁷¹ Noble, Testimony.
²⁷² Pentecostal Outlook, 14: no. 7, January 1945, 7. The article cited is an obituary. Private Devore was wounded in action in France, 15 September 1944 and died the next day.
²⁷³ Noble, Testimony.
soldier, telling him “that there is but one God and His name is Jesus Christ.” Noble’s Oneness leanings while he was still in the Army, and before he identified with any religious group. In a way that he described as “humanly impossible,” Noble received an honorable discharge from the Army on 25 October 1944. With America at war and his enlistment being “for the duration of the War or other emergency, plus six months, subject to the discretion of the President...” it seemed unlikely for Noble to get a discharge so early. Immediately after his discharge, he sought for a congregation that shared his newfound faith. He was offered education and financial backing by three different “Christian organizations but they differ from me... I declined to accept their offer, telling them that I am in search for this truth.” By January 1945 he found himself back in New York City, where he attended a large, predominately African American church led by Robert C. Lawson. Lawson, a convert of G. T. Haywood, founded the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith in 1919. It has since grown into an organization with over 700 congregations and more than 100,000 members. Noble later stated that he received Spirit baptism on 5 January 1945. In his written testimony, Noble wrote, “God led me to this group who stands for this truth...I got the Holy Ghost

274 Noble, Testimony.
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279 Robin Johnston, email dated 23 March 2015. Johnston is the Editor-in-Chief of the UPCI. Johnston states that Noble’s application for license with the UPCI indicated that he had received the Holy Ghost on 1/5/1945.
without anyone telling me about it. I was speaking in tongues…for about twenty
minutes.” What Noble was saying, is that his experience was miraculous and
spontaneous. He spoke with tongues with no knowledge of the doctrine of evidential
tongues. It is not uncommon for people to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit and
speak in tongues at their first exposure to a Pentecostal meeting or prayer service, or
shortly thereafter. The fact that people experience the Pentecostal outpouring, speaking in
tongues, before they have even heard about it, has been considered by many to be a
confirmation of the promise of the Spirit in Acts 2:39, as well as an indication that
tongues may not be a result of some thought planted into the persons consciousness by
another. This seems to have been what happened to Cornelius and his household in Acts
10:44-46, when “the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.” Thus, Noble’s
testimony is not at all unusual. He was baptized in water, along with nine other people,
three days later at a Sunday morning service on 7 January 1945.

    Noble Remained in the United States until 1947, during which time he attended
the 1946-47 school year at Pentecostal Bible Institute in as a “special student…having
obtained credit from other schools…eligible for graduation” in 1947. PBI had begun
classes in 1945 and was associated with the newly formed United Pentecostal Church. He
would have been acquainted with some of the current and future leaders of the UPC.

280 Noble, Testimony.
281 Diamond A. Noble, My Concise Personal Testimony, n.d. Most of the facts in this section came from
Nobles undated Testimony of almost 2,800 words. Internal evidence points to it being written probably in
January 1970. It was provided by Isagani B. Estillore via email on 27 March 2013. In Noble’s application
for ministerial credentials with the UPC, he stated that he had been baptized 5 January, which was a Friday.
In his testimony he states that he received the Holy Ghost and “three days after, I was in the morning
Sunday service and the preacher preached on water baptism…After the service, I…got baptized in Jesus
Precious Name.” The Sunday following 5 January in 1945 was 7 January, so either Noble was mistaken on
the date he received the Holy Ghost, or in the number of days between then and his baptism, or he simply
counted the day of his Holy Ghost baptism as one of the three days.
During Noble’s time at the Tupelo, Mississippi school, UPC General Superintendent Howard Goss visited and spoke. A first year student that year was Edwin Judd, who was later the Secretary of the UPC Foreign Missions Division for many years. Judd remembers Noble from his PBI days, but only vaguely. He remembered no “problems or major achievements.”283 PBI was not a large school, so this probably points to Noble being an average student except that he was a Filipino. Noble had a handsome face with fine features and light skin. He was listed as “white” on both the 1940 U.S. Census and his Army enlistment papers.284

Photo 1 Diamond A. Noble. (Courtesy of the Noble family.)

283 Edwin Judd, personal correspondence, 11 December 2014. Judd’s recollections of Noble were “vague.”
4.3.2 Ministry in the Philippines

Noble graduated and was awarded a diploma from PBI 16 May 1947. Before his graduation, Noble had applied for ministerial credentials with the Southern District of the UPC, which were granted 3 April 1947. He application reveals that he had previously held “license” with the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith (COOLJC), where he had earlier experienced his baptisms of Spirit and water in New York City. He wanted to return to the Philippines immediately following his graduation and obtaining credentials with the UPC, and witness to his family. The UPC wanted him to “prove his ministry” for two years in the United States before returning to the Philippines. He asked for permission to at least go home and baptize his family before returning and complying with their conditions. He was refused permission. He then requested to be released from the UPC, which they did in October 1947. By that time, he had already been ordained in the COOLJC, by Bishop Lawson in August in New York City. UPC General Secretary Stanley Chambers recommended on 7 October that the Southern District of the UPC withdraw Noble’s affiliation. This was done shortly afterwards. Noble tried for years to mend his broken relationship with the UPC, but to no avail. In his letter to J. M. Stubblefield dated 21 March 1977, Noble said,

I’ve written the U.P.C. a nice letter, telling them of the friction between the late Brother Goss and I. I wrote Bro. Goss about three letters asking forgiveness, but I found out that he never did forgive me because of the first U.P.C. Missionary Brother Carlos Grant whom I met in 1958 in Bacolod City…He told me that he got orders from the U.P.C. Headquarters not to fellowship with me. This means that Bro. Goss didn’t forgive me. I asked the U.P.C. Brethren to tell me why they

---

285 PBI Diploma, copy, courtesy of Muncia L. Walls, World Missions Director, ALJC, received February 2015.
286 Robin Johnston, Editor in Chief, UPCI, personal correspondence, 9 March 2015. He obtained the information from Diamond Noble’s file at the UPCI.
287 Dialyn Estillore, personal correspondence, 24 February 2015.
have ostracized me and for them to please forgive me…I wrote them in 1975 registered air mail and to this date no answer. 289

According to Noble’s widow and daughter, the “friction” between him and UPC General Superintendent Howard Goss was because of Noble’s refusal to remain in the United States and “prove his ministry” for two years before returning to the Philippines. Noble was not comfortable with those restrictions. He had informed the UPC that he had been given an offering by R. C. Lawson, and planned to depart for the Philippines 18 October 1947. 290 He then returned to his home, in Umingan, Pangasinan, Luzon Island in the Philippines and “preached the glorious Gospel of God.” 291 He returned home both credentialed and educated by U.S. organizations. Even without a missionary present, he could show his papers to Filipinos, who are particularly impressed by such things and in many ways dependent upon them. Filipinos remain, for the most part, reliant upon organizational affiliation and license without which they cannot be recognized by the government, and are not allowed to perform marriages. 292 In addition to his ministerial credentials, which also appointed him “State Overseer of the Philippine Islands,” and his Bible college graduation, Noble had experienced life in the United States for at least 20 years. This would have given him an advanced grasp of the English language, which is its own currency in the Philippines. He might also have absorbed some of the “American way” which would have included the feeling that he was just as good as anyone else, a problem solving mentality (still largely foreign in the Philippines where most learning is

290 Robin Johnston, personal correspondence, 23 March 2105. Information from the file of Diamond Noble at UPCI offices in Hazelwood, Missouri.
291 Noble, Testimony.
292 It is very common for Filipino organizations to publicly display their Security and Exchange Commission (SEC) Registration number on their church signs, banners and business cards. This is true for larger organizations with more than 1,000 congregations, or a small, single congregation sized organization. Having a SEC number offers validity in the eyes of Filipinos.
by rote), and an overall sense of self confidence. Noble did not wait for the coming of a missionary. He does not even appear to have ever desired one.

He was very quickly successful in winning his entire family and a few others. He baptized his mother, 4 brothers and 2 sisters, and their spouses. They all received the Holy Spirit baptism. All four of his brothers became pastors. Their names were Benito, Hermogenes, Amador and Petronio. Their father, Mariano, had died two years before Diamond Noble returned home from the United States. The baptism of Noble’s family in late 1947 probably came at least a full year before the 25 December 1948 baptisms at Baguer, Cotobato, Mindanao by Urbano Aventura. In this first baptism, Noble patterned what would become a normal occurrence by first converting his family. An astounding number of people have been brought into the movement through family members. As Urbano Aventura’s first converts were family members, so it was with Diamond Noble. Thus the first known Jesus’ name baptisms in the Philippines

Photo 2 The first known Oneness Pentecostal baptism in the Philippines was that of Marcela Ablang Noble, the mother of Diamond A. Noble who baptized her in 1947. (Courtesy of the Noble family.)

---

293 Dialyn Estilllore, personal correspondence, 16 February 2015.
294 Jocelyn Noble David, personal correspondence, 14 February 2015. Jocelyn is the granddaughter of the late Hermogenes Noble, a younger brother of Diamond Noble.
occurred in Bantug, Umingan, Pangasinan on Luzon Island in 1947, and were performed by Diamond Ablang Noble who had credentials with Robert C. Lawson’s Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith. The first person known to have been baptized in the Philippines in the name of Jesus Christ was Noble’s mother, Marcela Ablang Noble.

After his initial success in converting his family, and “a few adherents,” his momentum seems to have leveled off. He heard people in his audiences saying, “It’s the same,” meaning that he was just like every other preacher. At this point, he began to desire what he described as a “ministry of power.”

I resorted to fasting and praying and in 1949 God Jesus gave me the victory, forty day and forty nights with plain water God sustained me. And by this victory two Scriptures in the Holy Writ are proven truth. Matt. 4:4; 17:21. In 1950, I fasted ten days and ten nights without food and water and in 1951 I fasted sixty days and sixly nights with water and orange juices. By these great sacrifices, Jesus have endowed me with this divine power which you see in action for the praise and glory of Jesus – gift of faith, gift of miracles, and gifts of healing. After these major fasts, I was urged by an inner feeling to launch out publicly by having my salvation and healing campaign but finance frustrated my plan.295

The Manila Mirror Saturday Pictorial for 13 August 1949 showed photos of Noble before and at the end of his fast, commenting “The happy thin man at left is the Rev. Diamond A. Noble, head of his own Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, breaking his 40-day fast by eating a bowl of chicken porridge,” and that he had lost 50 of his 150 pounds during his fast.296 Noble’s lengthy fasts and emphasis on miracles and healings were later mirrored by Zebedea Sinen and Wilde Almeda, who shall be examined below.

295 Noble, Testimony.
296 Mirror Saturday Pictorial (Manila), 13 August 1949.
Photo 3 Copy of a badly stained newspaper clipping from the Manila Saturday Pictorial dated 13 August 1949. It reads, “The happy thin man at left is the Rev. Diamond A. Noble, head of his own Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, breaking his 40-day fast by eating a bowl of chicken porridge. Reverend Noble, who lives in Coral street, Tondo, decided last July 1 to show his converts, both actual and prospective, an example by going without vittles for forty days and forty nights. At the end of this fast he emerged a “weaker yet stronger” man...A broad, husky man at the start of his vow, he had lost twenty pounds halfway in his fast... On the fortieth day he has lost fifty of his 150 pounds, claimed that he never felt better in his life. “Christ was in me,” he said.” (Courtesy of the Noble family.)

Noble was a prolific letter writer. Existing copies of his many letters made available for this research include letters to 2 Filipino presidents, governors, mayors, the Pope, Joseph Stalin, Elizabeth Clare Prophet, the Reader’s Digest, Manila newspapers, Anton LaVey of the Church of Satan, Felix Manalo of Iglesia ni Cristo, Swami Sachidananda, Sun Myung Moon, Maharaj Ji (Prem Rawat), world heavyweight champion boxer Mohammad Ali, Filipino faith healers, and others. A consistent theme found in most of his correspondence is a challenge to many of the above mentioned, beginning with his letter “To the Pope of Rome, Vatican City, Italy” sent by registered mail on 27 December 1949. In addition to telling the Pope of his need to obey Acts 2:38,
and that the doctrine of the Trinity was wrong, the letter contained what was to become Noble’s standard six-part challenge.

1. An absolute fast without food, water or liquid. (Although the number of days was not mentioned in his challenge to the Pope, most of Noble’s other fasting challenges were for 10 days without food or water. Eventually, Noble stated that if his opponent survived the 10 day fast, that Noble would go on to fast another 90 days.)

2. Raising the dead. (Again, Noble’s challenge to the Pope appears to be one of his early challenges and was not fully formed. He fails to mention the number of days the deceased person is to have been dead. In later challenges, he specifies the person must have been dead for two days.)

3. Taking up serpents. (In later challenges, he says he will take up “100 of the most poisonous serpents to his opponents taking up 1 serpent.”)

4. Drinking poison. (Later challenges specified Noble would swallow 100 tablespoons of the most deadly poison to his opponents one tablespoon.)

5. Divine healing. (Some later challenges specify the healing of a person blind from birth.)

6. Revelation of the Truth by debate.

Noble’s challenge to Felix Manalo of 22 September 1951 was actually mentioned in one newspaper dated 19 December 1951, and titled “Tondo Sect Head Dares Manalo To Verbal Joust.”

The Rev. Diamond A. Noble, self-styled head of a Tondo sect known as The Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, challenged Felix Manalo, head of the Church of Christ (Iglesya ni Kristo) to a debate today. Calling Manalo a “lost soul,” the Reverend Noble gave him the choice of language, whether
Tagalog or English, or the method of debate, and proposed the Luneta as a
suitable site. Earlier, Noble had challenged Manalo to a “show of miracles” at the
Luneta in which he proposed to be bitten by 300 venomous snakes and drink fatal
poison. He reiterated his request to President Quirino for a permit to exhibit his
prowess at the national park. 297

Among other things, the early date of this article shows Noble had an attention getting
ministry by 1951, a full 6 years prior to the 1957 arrival of the first known non-Filipino,
Oneness Pentecostal missionary. 298 This type of challenge continued throughout Noble’s
ministry, as late as his letter to Elizabeth Clare Prophet of 15 March 1985. For over 35
years, it seems that Noble challenged anyone he felt was a leader and promoter of false
doctrine to meet him in a public demonstration to prove their teaching was false and what
he taught was true. In October of 1984 Noble caused to be printed and distributed in
Manila and Baguio City 20,000 copies of a public challenge to Maharishi Mahesh Yogi
and Ramon Jun Labo with three specific challenges. 299 (See Photo 4 below.) There is no
record that anyone ever accepted Noble’s challenge, nor that Noble ever resorted to the
extreme measures of handling snakes or drinking poison. Although he fasted extensively,
“…in 1948 25 days and 25 nights with plain water, and in 1949…forty days and forty
nights with plain water…in 1950 ten days and ten nights without food and water and in
1951 I fasted sixty days and sixty nights with water and orange juice,” 300 he never
appears to have attempted his 100 day fasting challenge.

297 The newspaper clipping does not contain the name of the newspaper, the date or page number. The date
is written by hand at the bottom of the article. (Courtesy of the Noble family.)
298 Carlos Grant, who arrived in the Philippines in 1957, must be considered the first full-time missionary,
although Sabbatarian Oneness Pentecostal James Carr had come to Bacolod on a visit, and baptized
Maximino Rubino in 1955. Grant will be examined in the following chapter.
299 Diamond Noble, letter to Elizabeth Clare Prophet of 15 March 1985. In this letter, Noble gives the date
of October 1984 as the time of the distribution of the 20,000 copies of this challenge.
300 Diamond Noble, undated 14-page paper entitled THE ONLY WAY TO HEAVEN, 12. Courtesy of the
Noble family.
MY CHALLENGE TO THE AMBASSADORS OF SATAN

1. MR. MAHARISHI MAHESH YOGI - The unique styled Agent of Satan: Age of Enlightenment - Manila

2. MR. RAMON JUN LABO - The King of Faith Healers, Agent of Satan - Baguio City

a) Fasting without Food, Water, Liquid in any form for Ten (10) days and if you survive, you can stop and watch me go 90 days more.

b) Drinking the strongest poison known to man One Hundred (100) tablespoons against your one.

c) Handling One Hundred (100) deadly snakes against your One. Mk. 16:17-18. To top it all you can do nothing in my presence in your own Specialty (Your best spiritual power) once I rebuke Satan your Father and your God in the powerful Name of JESUS CHRIST the Almighty God. Satan has to leave you helpless and powerless making to, the Master of the Situation. 1 Jo. 4:4, James 4:7. The ratio is so high in your favor, which should embolden you to contend with me at the Quirino Grandstand, to accommodate the whole world, date, time is at your earliest convenience.

I can Do Nothing. But My God Jesus Christ doeth the Works Thru Me. Hallelujah ! I'm anxiously awaiting your reply of acceptance.

Rev. DIAMOND A. NOBLE
God Jesus' Anointed, Advocate and Defender of God's Truths
Umingan, Pangasinan 0736
Philippines

PUBLIC PLEASE PERSUADE THEM TO ACCEPT MY CHALLENGE, FOR YOU TO SEE THE MIRACLES OF JESUS CHRIST THE ALMIGHTY GOD !!

Photo 4 Twenty thousand copies of this challenge was printed and distributed in Manila and Baguio City in October 1984. (Courtesy of the Noble family.)
After his long fasts in 1949, 1950 and 1951, Noble was impressed to have a public Salvation and Healing Campaign, but was hindered by lack of finances. Lack of finances seems to be a recurring theme among Filipino Oneness Pentecostals, but it is not unique to them alone. Many in the ministry, even among the more developed countries, cite lack of finance as hindrances to local church growth or successful ministry. Although it appears that Noble never obtained any substantial financial support for his crusades, it was not because of his failure to ask. In 1952 he was “called to the States to pray for Elder Thompson and upon my arrival, I prayed for him and [he] was partially healed.” Noble “…asked Bro. Nugent, the Missionary Secretary [of the ALJC] to ask the Brethren to rent the largest auditorium in Memphis, Tenn.…for our Salvation and Healing Campaign to raise all the funds needed to fully evangelize my Nation, the Philippines.”

This shows a tremendous amount of self-confidence, both in approaching Nugent with such a request, and also in his ability to successfully conduct a large campaign in the city of Memphis. His stated purpose, “to raise all the funds needed to fully evangelize” the Philippines, seems incomplete. There is no mention there of meeting the people’s needs in Memphis; no mention of seeing hundreds or thousands of Americans brought to salvation and/or healed of their ailments. Perhaps it should be simply understood that this is included in what he meant, or perhaps not. Nugent asked for three days “to contact the brethren.” Afterwards he said, “We have no money reserved for that purpose.” To say that Noble was disappointed would be an understatement. He used the words “sorrowful and broken hearted” to describe his feelings. Apparently, the Americans did not have
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the same amount of confidence in Noble that he had in himself. Was it because he was a Filipino? Was racial prejudice involved? Or was it simply that Noble’s ministry was unproven in the United States? Noble returned “home with an American Brother who claimed that Jesus spoke to him three times, telling him to come…help me.”305 But after two months in his hometown, “not a soul won to the Lord.”306 Noble’s choice of words, “…who claimed that Jesus spoke to him…” reveals that he is not convinced.307 He certainly is not overwhelmed by the presence of an American, or willing to accept everything he says as authoritative. Noble is dependent/independent. While he depends, or thinks he depends, on financing from American sources, he does not depend on affirmation from an American preacher.

By 1970, Noble had a revelation about his American brethren. “I found out…why all the U.S. Brethren were blind to see the importance and need of my ministry, Jesus the Almighty has a program for me and the time is now to accomplish my heavenly calling.”308 Is he saying that Jesus blinded the Americans so that Noble would depend on Him? Or that the “program” Jesus had for him did not include dependence upon them? Perhaps he had discovered that he was meant to be independent. This is also a revelation about himself. “Jesus…has a program for me…” He doesn’t need a missionary. He doesn’t need a non-Filipino organization.

Could he have accomplished more with the participation of a missionary? Almost certainly, but at what price? Money from religious organizations often comes with strings attached. In most cases, with Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines, part of the price for

305 Noble, Testimony.
306 Noble, Testimony.
307 Noble, Testimony.
308 Noble, Testimony.
funding from outside the country is the loss of independence. Those who provide the financing have the right to designate where it goes. That is normal and understandable. In fact, in the United States and Canada charitable organizations are bound by strict laws concerning designated funds. Pastors and congregations that give, have a scriptural mandate to be good stewards. Therefore, there are usually conditions to financial contributions. The same conditions would sometimes be resisted by more independent minded North American missionaries. They would suggest that they are accountable to no one but God. However, it remains that there is a suspicion among many North American donor congregations or organizations that national ministers may not be trustworthy with large amounts of funds. Hence the tight controls and demands for accountability. When funds are transferred to Filipino organizations, does it inevitably result in the loss of independence? Is the “benevolent paternalism” unavoidable in such instances? Noble seems to have failed in his attempts to find financial sponsorship, but at the same time, he also seems to have only found himself when he discovered God’s plan for him was to work alone as the first, effective, indigenous Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preacher.

Some of Noble’s many letters included appeals for sponsorship or funding of his campaigns. In a letter to Stubblefield dated 14 February 1977, he revealed that he had appealed “to brother Rex Humbard, the great T.V. and radio minister from Akron, Ohio, to assist me with the equipments for my Salvation and Healing Campaign, but to no avail.” He also asked boxing great Muhammad Ali to sponsor a crusade. He wrote to Ali on at least six occasions, dealing with him about such issues as Noble’s personal testimony, the salvation of his (Ali’s) soul, abstaining from adultery, the deity of Jesus

---

309 Anderson, Spreading Fires, 10-11.
Christ and, of course, Noble’s challenge to all false prophets.\textsuperscript{310} Even when Noble was seeking financial sponsorship for his public challenge, he did not mince words about the recipient’s lost condition.

Eventually, Noble did launch out publicly with his salvation and healing campaign. His first public appearance was at the public square in his hometown in April 1953. He said that the Lord confirmed his ministry with “signs, wonders and miracles.”\textsuperscript{311} From 1954 through 1956 he covered most of Luzon Island with his crusades, during which, he said, “thousands and thousands were brought to Christ because of the numerous miracles and wonders of God which they have seen and felt in my Ministry of Deliverance.” An old photograph exists showing a nighttime crowd of at least hundreds, with a speaker in the distance (presumably Noble), standing under a light. It records a moment in one of Noble’s Salvation and Healing Campaigns. This one (see Photo 5 below) is in Binalonan, Pangasinan in March of 1954.

\textsuperscript{310} Diamond Noble, letters to Muhammad Ali of 7 November 1975, 1 January 1976 and 23 August 1978 in which he states, “I’m here again having this dialogue with you for the sixth time; five letters mailed to your Cherry Hill, New Jersey residence.”

\textsuperscript{311} Noble, \textit{Testimony}. 
This photo vividly demonstrates that Noble was hosting large crusades three-and-a-half years before the arrival in the Philippines of Carlos Grant. Because he was focused on evangelism rather than organization building, these numbers did not translate into a large organization. The absence, however, of an enduring organization numbering “thousands and thousands” does not at all negate Noble’s claims. Many evangelists in the United States in the first half of the 20th century travelled from town to town, setting up brush arbors or tents, and seeing the conversions of thousands of people. However, when the evangelists felt it was time to move on, they often did so without leaving a pastor over the large group, often numbering in the hundreds, that had formed during their evangelistic crusade. Without consistent leadership, those who had been converted might seem to evaporate as they filter into other local congregations or move to other towns.

---

312 Grant will be introduced in the next chapter.
Thus, an evangelist might literally see “thousands and thousands” of converts during a ministry of a few years, but because of the peripatetic nature of his or her ministry, the lasting results could not be easily calculated. That is not to say that Noble did not leave any lasting results, he did. Churches started by his ministry still exist. Any tendency to discount the numbers that he offers in his *Testimony* must be considered in this light.

Healing became a significant part of his ministry. During one crusade in Manila in 1955, a twenty-five year old woman with an “acute complicated disease” came to the crusade specifically to be prayed for. Avelina Acantilado. Interviewed at the age of eighty-three, she said, “I went there to [be] prayed over and, praise the Lord, God has healed me. I’m still living now.” Avelina was baptized in water 15 May 1955 and received Spirit baptism a year later. On 12 August 1956, Diamond Noble and Avelina Acantilado were married. Avelina was aware of Noble’s previous marriage, knew the name of Noble’s first wife, and shared with the researcher that the first wife had died prior to this time, probably immediately before or after Noble’s return to the Philippines. Alfredo Bodegas, General Superintendent of the UPCP, remembers seeing Noble at his crusades in the Manila area, holding a sign that said, “Burn me alive if there are no miracles in this crusade!” Noble would publicly declare during his crusade, “Here is the gasoline and here is the match. If there are no miracles, you may burn me alive.”

(See Photo 6 below.)

---

313 Avelina Acantilado Noble, personal interview 24 February 2013.
314 Avelina Acantilado Noble, personal interview 24 February 2013.
315 Avelina Acantilado Noble, personal interview 24 February 2013.
316 Avelina Acantilado Noble, personal interview 11 November 2015.
317 Alfredo Bodegas, personal interview 26 February 2013. Although this was a second-hand recollection, given many years after the event, this research discovered more than one witness with the same recollection.
Photo 6 Copy of Noble's faded campaign poster with the words, “If there is no miraculous healing, burn me alive on this stage”. (Courtesy of the Noble family.)
Noble’s healing ministry was not always understood or appreciated by other Oneness Pentecostals. He said that UPC missionary Carlos Grant, whom he had met at Bacolod City in 1958, “didn’t believe in public healing ministry.” Noble’s daughter, Dialyn Noble Estillore, attended the UPCP church pastored by Celedonio Ompad when she attended university in Manila. She remembers the hurt and humiliation she felt when other young people in the church would see her coming and say, “Oh, how is ‘Burn Me Alive’?”

On 24 August 1950, Noble received appointment as “State Overseer of Philippine Islands” from the COOLJC where he had been ordained three years earlier. Both certificates were signed by Bishop R. C. Lawson (Apostle) and S. E. Williams (Secretary). Less than two years later, he joined the Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ (ALJC), as attested by his ministerial credentials which were signed by J. Frank Wilson, National Secretary on 14 June 1952. Thus, Noble belonged to at least three Oneness Pentecostal organizations with headquarters in the United States. It is not known if he belonged to the COOLJC concurrently after he joined the ALJC, or what made him join the ALJC, or when and why he left the COOLJC. Shortly after the marriage of Diamond and Avelina, they moved to Buluan, Cotobato, Mindanao (now known as Sultan Kudarat) and worked to establish a church and hold crusades in Mindanao until 1962. From 1962 through 1971 they did the same thing in Mindoro, Occidental, basing out of San Jose.

---

319 Dialyn Noble Estillore, personal interview at Umingan, Pangasinan 11 November 2015.
320 The ALJC had only been formed for three months before Noble was issued credentials from them. It was formed in March 1952 from the merger of three organizations: the Assemblies of the Church of Jesus Christ, Jesus Only Apostolic Church of God, and the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Noble was in the United States sometime in 1952 and probably joined the ALJC during his time there. www.aljc.org/organization-history accessed 26 September 2014. I am grateful for Avelina Acantilado Noble, the widow of Diamond Noble, who provided both original certificates during a personal interview in Pangasinan on 24 February 2013.
City. In 1971 they moved back to Umingan, Pangasinan and started a church with the help of Noble’s nephew.321

### 4.3.3 Schism in Noble’s Group

One of the earliest schisms in the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines occurred over a doctrinal issue. One of Noble’s early converts was Pedro Siao, who had been one of the original board trustees at the formation of the ALJC in 1956. When Noble left for Mindanao later in 1956, he left Siao in charge of the congregation at Caloocan. Sometime after this, “misunderstanding crept in.”322 Siao had started claiming that humans were fallen angels. Noble could not countenance that doctrine, and would not have fellowship with Siao if he insisted on teaching it.323 On 15 May 1963, while Noble was in Mindoro Occidental, Siao applied for and received a certified copy of the incorporation papers from the Security and Exchange Commission.324 On 27 August 1968 he chaired a meeting of the board of ALJC, as president and acting secretary, which moved the principal office of the corporation from Manila to Caloocan. The board meeting may not have been legal as Siao was the only person present who was listed on the original incorporating documents. He filed the amended papers 25 October 1968.325 Amended incorporation papers were issued to Siao on 29 November 1968 showing the address change, and also showing him as the president of ALJC.326 In this way, Diamond

---

321 Avelina Acantilado Noble, personal interview 11 November 2015.
322 Dialyn Noble, personal correspondence, 18 March 2015.
323 Avelina Noble, personal interview, Umingan, 11 November 2015.
326 Photocopy of amended incorporation papers courtesy of Avelina Acantilado Noble. A second copy was provided by Muncia Walls, Director of Missions of ALJC in the United States.
Noble, who performed the first known Jesus’ name baptisms in the Philippines, and who registered the first Oneness Pentecostal organization, lost control of the name and incorporation. Noble refused to fight for the organization, and just left the Caloocan church to Siao. The group led by Noble eventually registered another organization called Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, a reminder of where he was converted under Bishop Lawson in New York City. Siao’s group split when he forced out Zebedea Sinen and she formed her Gospel of Christ in 1974.\(^{327}\) Today there are at least 12 different organizations in Northern Luzon that originated with Diamond Noble, 10 of them were splits from Pedro Siao. Often times, leaders who assume authority by causing schism, produce followers who are willing to follow in their mentor’s footsteps. Like produces like. (See Chart 1 below.)

\(^{327}\) See biographical sketch of Zebedea Sinen in 4.4.
It is significant that Noble was the first known credentialed and ordained Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preacher. He was the first known Filipino to attend or graduate from a Oneness Pentecostal Bible school. He performed the first known Jesus’ name baptisms in the Philippines. He registered the first known Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines. He was “found” by God, as he put it, rather than by a missionary. It also appears that Noble was the first person in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism to be blacklisted by an organization, as revealed by Carlos Grant being instructed by the UPC “not to fellowship” with him, and in that organization’s refusing to respond to his repeated requests for forgiveness.\(^{328}\) Although he could have benefited from the financial assistance of a missionary organization, and did receive some limited funding from

---

\(^{328}\) Diamond Noble, letter to Stubblefield of 21 March 1977.
Bishop Lawson, he started his ministry in the Philippines, founded and registered an organization, and by all accounts had a successful and powerful ministry without the help of a missionary from outside the Philippines.\textsuperscript{329} Regardless of the influence upon him by his experiences in the United States, the organization he founded must be considered the first indigenous Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines. Diamond Ablang Noble, first Filipino evangelist, pioneer pastor, organization founder, died in the Philippines 21 May 1988.\textsuperscript{330} His was a Filipino legacy few, if any, would ever equal.

\textsuperscript{329} Dialyn Estillore, personal correspondence, 24 February 2015.
\textsuperscript{330} Death date from Doms Bejec, Noble’s nephew via text message 4 January 2015.
1. Born in Lawak Tayug, Pangasinan 22 Feb 1908

2. First baptisms 1947

3. Preached crusades throughout Luzon from 1947-1956

4. Sultan Kudarat (formerly known as Buluan Cotabato) 1956—1962

5. San Jose, Mindoro Occ. 1962-1971

6. Umingan, Pangasinan 1977 until his death 21 May 1988

Map 3 Diamond Noble Significant Locations Map base used by permission of d-maps.com.
4.4 Zebedea Aguilar Sinen

Zebedea Sinen is the only woman discovered in this research who actually founded and led a Filipino Oneness Pentecostal organization. She was born 1 March 1936 in Pangasinan.\(^{331}\) Her family was very active in the Baptist church in Dagupan City, Pangasinan.\(^{332}\) Sinen heard Pedro Siao preaching in the Dagupan City plaza and invited him to have a debate with her Baptist pastor. The debate occurred and Sinen and the rest of the Aguilar family were converted and baptized by Siao. Sinen attended the ALJC Caloocan pastored by Siao until Siao shut her out of the church. She had become a rather successful evangelist, and Siao may have felt that she was a threat to his leadership.\(^{333}\) This may have been aggravated by allegations that he was married but living with another woman.\(^{334}\) In any case, Sinen was shut out of the church and eventually founded the Gospel of Christ 6 February 1974. On five occasions, Sinen, in the pattern of Diamond Noble, whom she had met through Siao, voluntarily fasted without food for 40 days. Her fasting was thought to have been the reason her ministry was defined by many notable miracles. To become a minister in the organization she founded required one to have

---

\(^{331}\) Pedro Aguilar, personal interview in San Carlos City, Pangasinan 11 November 2015. He is the brother of Zebedea Sinen.

\(^{332}\) Edgardo Espiritu, personal interview, San Carlos City, Pangasinan, 11 November 2015. Espiritu was a convert of Sinen.

\(^{333}\) Don Romero, pastor of Gospel of Christ church in Dagupan, Pangasinan, by private correspondence 9 July 2014.

\(^{334}\) Ricardo Zabala, personal interview in September 2015. Also Edgardo Espiritu, 11 November 2015. In the Philippines, as in many Catholic countries, divorce is very unusual. There are many people who are living with someone they are not legally married to, simply because they have very little chance of being granted a divorce from a failed marriage. In Siao’s case, it appears that he had already broken up with his wife, and was living with another woman by the time he was converted by Pastor Diamond Noble in the late 1940s or early 1950s.
fasted ten consecutive days without food.\textsuperscript{335} She was not a large woman. She stood 4 feet, 11 inches tall.\textsuperscript{336}

Sinen died 18 November 1983, twelve days after coming off a 40-day fast, possibly by complications caused by the fast.\textsuperscript{337} After her death, the organization she founded and led for a decade split and evolved into at least six different organizations, including the Gospel of Christ led by her brother Pedro Aguilar, another Gospel of Christ led by her nephew Efren Aguilar, both of which claim to be the original organization of Zebedea Sinen.

\textbf{Photo 7} Zebedea Sinen shortly before her death in 1983. (Courtesy of Gospel of Christ Philippines.)

\textsuperscript{335} Betty Marcelino, email 8 March 2014. Marcelino and her husband, Benjie, were converted in the Gospel of Christ and are now pastoring in the WPFP.
\textsuperscript{336} Edgardo Espiritu, personal interview. 11 November 2015.
\textsuperscript{337} Betty Marcelino, who along with her husband was converted in the Gospel of Christ, by private correspondence 8 March 2014. Also Pedro Aguilar, 11 November 2015.
4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed the conversion and ministry of the first Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preachers in the Philippines. It has been seen that Hawaii was an important location in the converting of Urbano Aventura, just as it was for the first known AG preacher in the Philippines. It has been shown that Aventura’s ministry in 1946 was the beginning of the propagation of the Oneness message in the Philippines, howbeit only on a small and localized scale. It was not until Diamond Noble baptized his family in 1947 that we can speak of the practical beginning of the movement in the Philippines. Not only did Noble perform the first known baptisms, but his ministry was much more widespread than that of Aventura. Never published details of the life and ministry of Diamond A. Noble have been presented that have proven conclusively that he was the first Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preacher and leader to have accomplished all that he did. His list of “firsts” is impressive. He was the first Filipino known to:

- attend a Oneness Pentecostal Bible school.
- perform Jesus' name baptisms. 1947
- receive ministerial credentials.
- be licensed with the UPC (U.S.) 1947
- resign from UPC. 1947
- be ordained by COOLJC. August 1947
- be appointed as "Overseer" of Philippine Islands by COOLJC. 1950
- be licensed with ALJC (U.S.) 1952

Additionally, he was the first Oneness Pentecostal known to:

- perform baptisms in the Philippines.
- hold a public crusade in the Philippines. 1953
- register a religious organization in the Philippines. 1956

This far removed from the events, it is difficult to know the particulars that led to the UPC’s rejection of Noble and refusal to allow a reconciliation. One can only speculate how successful he might have been with the financial and moral backing of an organization that would have accepted his burden for his own people, and facilitated his ministry, a unique Filipino ministry. The schism of his movement, which has resulted in numerous Oneness Pentecostal organizations to the present time, has been examined. Siao’s underhanded takeover of the ALJC in 1963 was the first known schism in the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines. In this case, the schism was entirely within an autochthonous organization and had nothing to do, so far as can be seen, with missionaries from outside the country. It appears to have been over a doctrinal issue. The chapter concluded with the presentation of Zebedea Sinen, whose successful ministry perhaps resulted in her being forced into an undesired schism and the creation of an organization that has gone on to split in several different directions. The schisms that occurred in this chapter are but a foretaste of many schisms to come.
CHAPTER 5
Carlos C. Grant: Success And Schism

5 Introduction

At the same time that Diamond Noble was released from the United States Army and beginning his search for people who had the same faith as he, the United States was beginning the liberation of his country from the Japanese. Five days before Noble’s discharge, United States military forces under General Douglas McArthur had landed on Red Beach near Tacloban, Leyte. Involved in the invasion of Leyte were two soldiers who later returned to the Philippines as Oneness Pentecostal missionaries. These men were not known to one another and they were not Pentecostals at the time. Both men were deeply affected by experiences that they later shared in writing, experiences that contributed to their later return as missionaries. One of these men was Carlos C. Grant, possibly the single most significant American missionary figure in the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines because two of the more significant branches of the movement sprang from him.338 This chapter examines how the Filipinos responded to some of the more successful methods used by a Western missionary. It shows a symbiotic relationship between Grant and his earliest Filipino converts which, except for Grant’s continued control over the works he started, could be used as an example of missionary success in the majority world. Although schism remains invisible in Grant’s early days, it gains a powerful foothold in the Oneness movement during Grant’s time. As mentioned in the introduction to this work, in order to present the history of this movement these chapters depend upon the scarce, existing sources and personal interviews.

338 The other man was Kenneth D. Fuller, who returned as a missionary in 1985, and whose story is told in his book The Survivor: The Life and Times of Kenneth D. Fuller, (Philippines: self published, 1993).
5.1 Soldier 1942-1945

After a short time with the U.S. forces on Leyte, Grant was sent to participate in another landing at Blue Beach in Lingayen on Luzon Island to the north. Involved in the Army’s pursuit of the Japanese up toward Baguio City, the mountain headquarters of Japanese General Yamashita, Grant’s entire platoon was wiped out leaving him the only survivor.\(^{339}\) He saw combat as an artilleryman for 87 days from 19 February to 15 May 1944, at which time he was sent to a rest camp in the rear of the action.\(^{340}\) It was here that he experienced something that deeply affected him and which he later said influenced his return to the Philippines as a missionary some thirteen years later. In Grant’s own words:

> While in our camp in Sison, Pangasinan, I went to a barrio one evening to buy wine made from rice. Of course we got pretty well drunken by late at night and during our conversation the Bible Scriptures were mentioned…

> While this was going on, there was a young lady on a mat…listen[ing] to the conversation and then about time for us to get back into our area before daylight, she began to beg for a New Testament or Bible. Of course, none of us had one. We surely were not Christians or even believers – just a bunch of soldiers getting drunk to take away the horror of the days to come in combat with the Japanese. I returned to my camp but then I could not sleep. My mind was on that woman and her request for a Bible. She was so sincere and humble.

> Finally a thought came to my remembrance. I had a New Testament given to me as I left home for the service. My father-in-law gave it to me as a remembrance from him. I had carried it quite a few months and never once read or opened it that I could remember.

> This stayed with me. I could not shake off the picture of her crawling to us on the floor and asking so pitifully for the Bible. At last I could not stand it any longer…I went and carried the Bible to the barrio. There, approaching her, I told her why I had come. This woman cried and crawled on her knees to me, kissed my feet and shoes and held on to me until I was about ready to break down. Her thanks and appreciation never left me from that time on. So many times God brought to me the picture. I do believe it was the Lord. Even though I was a vile

---

\(^{339}\) Ronald McCall, personal interview, 21 November 2014 at his home in Rancho Cucamonga, California. McCall was Grant’s nephew, but was more like a son, living with Grant at long stretches of time.

\(^{340}\) Grant, *Military Secrets* book, entry from 15 May 1945. *Military Secrets* was a booklet arranged like a diary, with blank pages and various headings. Military personnel would use these books like diaries or journals. Thanks to Ron McCall for providing a copy of Grant’s *Military Secrets* book.
sinner, wicked and undone, yet He was moving upon me. Many times in that area, I saw her reading the Bible, but never considered that someday, God would call and use me to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Philippines. Today, as I write, I firmly believe this incident was God’s way to soften my heart and bring about my conversion long years later, and finally place a call or burden upon my soul.341

This rather long quotation is significant in that it reveals first, that in his battle weariness Grant sought forgetfulness in drunkenness; a common remedy for those in combat. Emoy Buada, interviewed in 2015, remembers Grant during this time as “drunk every day.” When asked what kind of man Grant had been at that time, Buada replied, “He was a devil.”342 Reading Grant’s words, one gets a picture of crude, drunken men discussing the Bible while a sincere woman, possibly the wife of one of the Filipinos, listens in the background. Grant includes all the drunken soldiers in his broad comment that “We surely were not Christians or even believers…” There is no pretension here. He remembers himself as he was. As the drunken party was breaking up toward daybreak the woman makes her move, begging on her knees for a Bible. It was an extraordinarily moving moment. Because of it, Grant, having been up all night, was unable to sleep when he returned to his camp. Finally he remembered the New Testament that he carried but never read. Taking it back to the woman, another poignant scene unfolds as she crawls on her knees, holding on to his feet and kissing his shoes in a likeness of the sinner woman at Simon’s house kissing the feet of Jesus.343 This imagery, so reminiscent of the Bible story, albeit with a drunken soldier in the place of Jesus Christ, remained with Grant for years. As he later stated, it contributed to his own conversion as well as to his call to the Philippines.

341 Grant, 6-7.
5.2 Conversion and Training 1945-1948

Within a few months of Grant’s discharge from the Army in 1945, he and his wife visited a Oneness Pentecostal church in Ironton, Ohio where they were living. The assembly was pastored by Roosevelt York, a district elder with The Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ (PAJC). They attended during special revival services being held by an evangelist named Roshon. Catherine Grant received the Holy Ghost one night and Carlos the next. They were both baptized in water. After two years under York, Grant felt an urge to go deeper in God. Working a late night shift alone, he had an experience that weighed heavily on his decision to go to the Philippines.

On this job one night, reading scriptures as I waited on my press to operate, God spoke to me, as if an audible voice in the factory spoke. Yet I knew it was the Lord speaking to me.

His word, “I want you for the Philippines,” penetrated my soul. I answered, “I cannot, because I hate that country and the situation there. I am not a preacher or missionary. I have no knowledge of God’s work, I cannot go.” He never spoke again. I told no one. I kept it hidden in my heart.

One night, my wife and I were praying before I went to work. God’s Spirit moved upon her. She wept and cried out so strong, I was late for my work. As I waited to see and find out why God was dealing with her, asking her when she was finished, she told me, “I saw the Philippines, the entire nation, with their heads bowed down as wheat for harvest.”

Now God reminded me of His call to me. I confessed to her what had come to me. We agreed to keep it quiet and not to tell anyone.

Grant’s words demonstrate that both he and Catherine had spiritual encounters focused on the Philippines. Because they had no experience in the ministry and barely any in the church, these encounters and the ministerial future they pointed to scared them.

---

344 The Pentecostal Outlook, 14:2, (February 1945), 2, 7.
346 Grant, 8-9.
Grant threw himself into church work with the same abandon that he had given to drinking as a soldier. They both became committed and involved members. Eventually Grant attended Bible school at Apostolic Bible Institute in St. Paul, Minnesota, after which they worked as itinerate evangelists and then pastored in Dayton, Ohio. Just as they were feeling comfortable W. T. Stairs, the Foreign Missions Director of the UPC, called them from New Brunswick, Canada, wanting to know about their plans for the Philippines. He said God had impressed him with both the Grants and the Philippines. When Grant explained all that had taken place Stairs insisted on coming to see the Grants at once, and he did, staying for several days and discussing the need for a missionary in the Philippines. Stairs may have by this time already received word of the group of ex-Baptists in Fabrica, Negros Island who had departed from their church in favor of the Oneness doctrine. This group will be examined more closely below where their history merges with that of Carlos Grant. In any case, Stairs was at some point aware of an opportunity in the Philippines that required a missionary. Initially, in spite of what both Carlos and Catherine had experienced during their first couple of years in Ironton, they were quite adamant that they would not go to the Philippines. Eventually they acquiesced and met the UPC Foreign Missions Board in Tulsa, Oklahoma during the UPC General Conference in September 1955, where they received appointment to the Philippines.  

They bade farewell to the Dayton congregation 9 June 1957 and departed for the West Coast where they would board a ship bound for the Philippines. Their trip across the U.S. was not easy. Sickness and financial difficulties plagued them. The day before they were to sail from Seattle, Grant collapsed on the street from exhaustion. The local pastor, Albert Dillon, came and got him, and took him home where he soaked in a hot bath, after

---

which Dillon’s wife, Roberta, massaged his muscles. (Four years later Grant was to return the favor, manually operating an iron lung and possibly saving Roberta Dillon’s life as she lay close to death in Mindanao where her and her husband had gone as missionaries.) The next day, sore but mobile, Grant was able to board the ship, *Canada Mail*, for Manila, via Yokohama, Pusan and Hong Kong with his wife and daughter. It was not an auspicious beginning.348

### 5.3 Missionary to the Philippines

The Grants arrived in Manila 15 August 1957 with 108 dollars, of which the customs officials promptly relieved them. The forlorn family stood in the rain with their luggage, no money, no home and no contact in Manila. Eventually they were approached by a helpful Filipino man who hailed a taxi and took them to a hotel where he spoke on their behalf to the manager, who agreed to extend credit for a room. Late that evening a woman showed up at the door of their room. She was a Presbyterian missionary who had been returning to the Philippines on the same ship as the Grants. She said God had directed her to them and gave them a check for two hundred dollars. The Grants were able to buy food and pay for their hotel room. The next day, the same man who had taken them to the hotel helped them collect their belongings and find a house to rent. The “house had no windows, just the shutters, bamboo strip floors, nipa roof, rats, bats, lizards, flies and mosquitoes by the million.”349 Grant passed out religious tracts on the streets of Manila, and he travelled north to Rosario near where he had been involved in fighting during the war. There he met some of the people he had known during his time

---

348 Grant, 19-22.
349 Grant, 27.
in the Army. Emoy Buada remembers his father offering Grant whiskey during this visit, and Grant explaining that he was now a missionary and did not drink anymore.\textsuperscript{350} Grant thought that he would probably start a church in the area and he eventually did, but not for several more years. He spent several days there but “was not able to convert or convince any.”\textsuperscript{351} When he returned to Manila, a group from Rosario went with him to meet his family.

\section*{5.4 The Negros Island Connection}

Grant made numerous trips to the post office hoping to receive money from headquarters, but nothing arrived for quite some time. The two hundred dollars were spent and Grant was reduced to selling some of their furniture and parts off his vehicle to feed his family. One thing that did show up at the post office was a letter from Meliton Zarsuelo of Fabrica, Negros Occidental.\textsuperscript{352} Zarsuelo was the head of one of seven families who had left the Fabrica Evangelical Church (Baptist) early in 1957 over the issue of the Oneness of God and baptism in Jesus’ name.\textsuperscript{353} Zarsuelo had been in correspondence with Oneness missionary Ralph Bullock in Hong Kong since early 1955. Bullock published a monthly paper called \textit{Wing Shang Moon}, and Zarsuelo had been receiving it regularly. Salustiano Cataluña and Jose Diamante, other members of the group of seven families had been corresponding with Oneness believers in the United States by the names of Homer Hall and Gus Marlais. The Halls and Marlais had sent Oneness literature,

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Emoy Buada.
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\item As mentioned in chapter 3.3.1 of this work, under the Comity Agreement, the Baptists were assigned to the Western Visayas region. The Protestant Church union was known as La Iglesia Evangelica, or The Evangelical Church, regardless of which denomination.
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including tracts entitled *The One True God* and *Are You Baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ According to Acts 2:38?* by B. E. Echols.

In February 1957, Zarsuelo wrote Bullock, inviting him to come to the Philippines, something Bullock was inclined to do before his plans were changed by the sudden death of his wife. Bullock wound up in Jamaica and, at Zarsuelo’s suggestion, he published the Fabrica group’s need for a missionary in his paper. Bullock, or someone, also forwarded the request to the UPC headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri. By this time of course, Grant had already felt led to go to the Philippines and, according to Zarsuelo, the two had been in correspondence since May.  

These tracts had earlier been shared with their Baptist pastor, Catalino Buensuceso, who had used the Oneness view of the three manifestations of God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost, rather than the three persons understanding of the Trinity, to win a public debate against the Iglesia Ni Cristo (INC) held in Calatrava, Negros Occidental in January of 1957. The topic of debate was “Jesus is the true God,” with Buensuceso taking the affirmative side and Pastor Refuela of Iglesia Ni Cristo taking the negative side. The INC did not believe in the Trinity but they also denied the deity of Jesus Christ. 

---

355 For more information on INC, see Chapter 3.3.4.
When Grant, in Manila, received the letter from Zarsuelo, he did not have enough money to purchase airfare to Negros Island. About that time a visiting sailor from San Diego came by and paid enough tithes for Grant to purchase his ticket. He booked a flight and notified Zarsuelo by telegram that he would arrive the next day. Thus when Zarsuelo met Grant at the Bacolod airport on 20 September 1957, there was already a group of more than 60 persons, including children, who had been meeting under the name of Church of Jesus Christ (Pentecostal Oneness) for at least 4 months.  

Grant accompanied Zarsuelo to Fabrica, 75 kilometers north and east of Bacolod City, and stayed in his home for the next two weeks. Those two weeks turned out to be momentous for the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines.

---

356 Photograph of 26 May 1957 identifying the group as “Affiliated with the United Pentecostal Churches in the United States of America.” This picture, from the collection of Carlos Grant, courtesy of Ron McCall, shows the group of Zarsuelo had strongly identified with the UPC, probably as a result of their correspondence various UPC members.

357 Grant, 30-31. This is one of the minor differences between the accounts of Grant and Zarsuelo surrounding these events. Zarsuelo placed the date of Grant’s arrival in Bacolod as 21 September. Grant’s
It began with Grant teaching a Bible study in Zarsuelo’s house the afternoon of their arrival, lasting from about 3:00 until close to midnight with a break for supper. He began at John 3:5-7, and pointed “them to the book of Acts as the only the plan of salvation.”\textsuperscript{358} He could barely teach because of being interrupted continually with questions that he attempted to answer. The first major issue arose when the meeting resumed after the meal break. When Grant taught specifically from the second chapter of Acts, the basis of most Pentecostal salvific teaching, Zarsuelo spoke up in behalf of the group. “We have the Spirit. All we want is to be baptized in Jesus’ Name.”\textsuperscript{359} The problem was, they had not received Holy Spirit baptism. In fact, in all that Zarsuelo had written about the history of their group leaving the Baptist church until after the time Grant began to baptize, there was no mention whatsoever of Holy Spirit baptism. It appears that they were not familiar with the Pentecostal experience. Apparently no other Pentecostal denomination had penetrated into this area with the Pentecostal message. The Assemblies of God had arrived at the provincial capital, Bacolod, three years earlier with AG missionaries Calvin and Olive Zeissler. Like Grant, Zeissler had served in the Philippines with the U.S. military during the war, and also like Grant, had “received his call to missions as a result of his experience in the military.”\textsuperscript{360} The AG had no works in the Fabrica or Sagay area, but were “concentrated mostly in Bacolod City and a few places outside of the city limits.”\textsuperscript{361} In addition to the AG presence in Bacolod City, a Sabbatarian Oneness Pentecostal from Palmdale, California, named James Bishop Carr

\textsuperscript{358} Grant, 32.
\textsuperscript{359} Grant, 32.
\textsuperscript{360} Dave Johnson, \textit{Led by the Spirit}, Assemblies of God World Missions, (Springfield, MO, 2009), 107-8.
arrived in Bacolod in 1955 for the first of three visits. During these visits (the others were in 1956 and 1960) Carr and his converted Seventh Day Adventist preacher from Bacolod, Maximino Rubino, established Kingdom Preparation Ministry.\textsuperscript{362} Although they traveled to Panay, Luzon and Mindanao, there was no lasting organization from their efforts. Their message apparently did not penetrate as far as Fabrica where Grant was now preaching. Therefore, in spite of the fact that Zarsuelo’s group had identified themselves as Pentecostal for at least 4 months, they were not Pentecostal at all. They were Baptists who had left their denomination, rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity and the Trinitarian formula of baptism. Due to their exposure to the tracts on the Oneness of God and Jesus’ name baptism by Echols, and their correspondence with missionary Bullock in Hong Kong, and his periodical, they had embraced those two foundational doctrines of the Oneness Pentecostal movement. However, somehow they had missed or ignored the fundamental Pentecostal tenant of Spirit baptism evidenced by speaking with tongues. They continued to view Spirit baptism in typical Baptist fashion as occurring at conversion. That is, when one accepts Christ as personal Savior he or she is born again of the Spirit, which is the equivalent of being baptized with the Spirit.\textsuperscript{363}

Grant found himself in the position of needing to convince these people that they did not have the Spirit. “Th[is] caused me to think very quickly, ‘this cannot be.’ They do not have the Holy Ghost as taught by the Scriptures.”\textsuperscript{364} After using “every Scripture that pertained to the New Testament experience,” Grant told them, “I am not interested in just

\textsuperscript{362} Information on Carr and Rubino from Rubino’s grandson, Jester Rubino Federico, who confirmed the information with his mother Clotilde Butiông Rubino, the eldest daughter of Maximino Rubino, and gave it to the researcher in hand printed form at Bacolod City, 21 November 2015.

\textsuperscript{363} For a more thorough discussion the Oneness Pentecostal view of Spirit baptism being the same as receiving the Holy Spirit or being born again, see Chapter 2.4, 2.5.

\textsuperscript{364} Grant, 32.
baptizing you, because water baptism alone will not save you.”365 But some in his audience would not believe “that they did not have the Spirit of God.”366 The controversy raged on until eleven o’clock that night and continued all day Saturday with Grant going over the same Scriptures all day long. On Sunday morning the group gathered at Ernesto Remata’s home, “a larger house…on the river bank.”367 The same subject was covered at this meeting, at the conclusion of which Grant told the crowd that he would depart the next day, but if anyone wanted to be baptized they should “be here at the river at three o’clock in the afternoon, today, September 22, 1957.”368 At three o’clock, several hundred curious people showed up at the edge of the river. Grant walked out into the water and reasoned from the second chapter of Acts. Twenty-six adults stepped out of the crowd and into the water. As the baptisms began one more young man joined them. Later that evening six more were baptized. Grant was conflicted. “Everyone slapped each other on the back, shook hands and rejoiced, yet I could not rejoice very much as no one received the Holy Ghost, and I had promised, by the Word of God they would receive…My heart was torn and so burdened…”369 Wanting to be alone, he left the house and walked along the riverbank, praying,

   Why? What is wrong? Lord, I am alone. I cannot pray or tarry as the Church in the United States. I am convinced you will pour out Your Spirit and I cannot see where tarrying was practiced in the early Church.370

Actually, the Day of Pentecost occurred while those in the Upper Room were ‘tarrying’ or waiting. They had ‘tarried’ for several days.371 In like manner, the first outpouring of
the Holy Ghost in Samaria did not occur until sometime after Philip had baptized his hearers, and Peter and John had arrived to lay hands on them. Nevertheless Grant, like many Pentecostals, believed that any period of time elapsing between water baptism and Spirit baptism is unnecessary and unscriptural. Grant obviously was not considering the tarrying that occurred in Jerusalem and Samaria. Perhaps he focused on the outpourings in Caesarea and Ephesus, found in Acts 10 and 19 respectively. Late that night, after walking along the river and pouring out his troubled heart in prayer, he returned to the Zarsuelo home “still with a burden and feeling of helplessness and hardly knowing what to do.”
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Map 4 Locations of Earliest Oneness Pentecostal Baptisms

1. Umingan Baptisms
   Diamond Noble—1947

2. Baguer Baptisms
   Urbano Aventura—1948

3. Bacolod Baptisms
   James Carr—1955

4. Fabrica Baptisms
   Carlos Grant—1957

The next day he could not feel at ease about leaving and returning to his family in Manila. As they were eating lunch a young woman, Elisa Remata, interrupted them with, “Bro. Grant! Come at once. Something awful is happening!” Finally she settled down enough to explain that her mother had been found “lying on the floor shaking, talking in some kind of language and laughing…” Grant cried, “That’s it!” Running to the scene they found a crowd gathered around, “and oh, what an experience, as God really honored His Word and she was the first to receive the promise…” From that time there was a steady outpouring of the Spirit and an increase in the number of the congregation. Zarsuelo said, “The Gospel spread rapidly and the whole barrio was filled with the new Pentecostal message.”

Holy Spirit baptism is always an ecstatic experience, but the way it happened in Fabrica was extraordinarily eventful and caused it to be noised abroad in a manner reminiscent of the second chapter of Acts. One old woman received the Holy Spirit in the marketplace, throwing her groceries into the air and falling to the ground speaking in tongues. The police were called and one who was familiar with the recent happenings said, “She is not crazy…she is one of those baptized by the American.” One of the policemen soon joined the Pentecostals and received his own Spirit baptism. He became a pastor. One man began praising God on his job; he threw away his hammer and fell on the floor talking in tongues. Grant said, “By Wednesday, nine had received the Holy Ghost and there was no tarrying service. I was not present when God moved upon them,
yet I witnessed every one of them, as I would be called to where they were.”  Grant spent ten days in Fabrica on his first trip. Most of the men worked at the lumber company and would get a long lunch break in the finest Spanish siesta fashion. They would gather at Zarsuelo’s house to discuss the Scriptures. Services were held nightly, followed by going to the river to baptize and then return to the house for more preaching. “One felt as if he were surrounded by a curtain of God’s presence.”

Grant returned to Manila to get his family and arrange for their remaining possessions to be shipped to Negros Island. In what seems an amazingly short time, especially by today’s standards, Grant was able to register the United Pentecostal Church (Philippines), Inc. on 4 October 1957, less than three weeks after he first met Meliton Zarsuelo and the group in Fabrica. Grant served as the first Chairman of the Board of Trustees. The other board members all worked in the same department at the lumber company. They were Salustiano Cataluña, Meliton Zarsuelo, Federico Remata and Ernesto Remata Jr. They were also the first four baptized by Carlos Grant on 22 September. The honor of the very first person baptized by Grant goes to Salustiano Cataluña. Grant had offered to baptize Zarsuelo first, but Zarsuelo deferred to Cataluña because he was older. These formed the first Executive Board of the UPCP. That means that with the exception of Grant, the original Executive Board members had been baptized and Spirit filled less than three weeks before becoming the founders of the UPCP, something that would be unimaginable today. Unusual times demand unusual actions. As organizations age they lose the flexibility that allowed for unorthodox
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methods. The rigidity they develop brings about sluggishness in some areas. Leadership positions tend to become dominated by those with the most longevity and loyalty in the system. Young people and new converts like the Fabrica group, who are full of zeal and faith, are often not utilized to the fullest extent. They are perhaps told, like Diamond Noble was told by the UPC, to wait and prove themselves before given the go ahead for ministry. Those who comply with the instructions to “settle down and wait your turn,” may eventually rise to positions of leadership, but by then their evangelistic fervor might have cooled. Any innovation they might have introduced has been lost in conformity to the system. Those who are unwilling to “settle down and wait” may set out on their own course, or find a church or organization where they are free to work as they feel. This is a form of schism that has at times been justified and at other times unjustified. It may take the wisdom of Solomon to discern between the two.

Upon their move from Manila the Grants settled in Bacolod City, the largest city in the province, where they established their second work in 1958, driving to Fabrica for the Sunday morning service and back to Bacolod for the evening service. Continuing to work at Fabrica, Grant oversaw the erection of a church building within the space of four months. A photograph taken a year later, during the Fabrica UPC 1st Anniversary, shows 167 people of all ages gathered outside the neatly painted structure. (See Photo 9 below.)
5.5 Analysis of Success – Cooperation, Training, Healings and Women

The events leading to the initial success and growth of what was to become one of the largest Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines, and one of the largest national works within the UPC, deserves examination and comparison with the relative successes of Diamond Noble and Urbano Aventura. By comparing these three major pioneers of the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines--Aventura, Noble and Grant—we get a glimpse into the makings of success. In basic chronological fashion, this chapter focused on Carlos Grant, who was the last of the three pioneers to begin ministry in the Philippines. This research has found Grant to be more influential in the development of the movement in the Philippines than those who preceded him, and possibly more influential than any of those who came after him. What were the
contributing factors to his success, and how do they compare with these other two pioneers? The term ‘success’ is inadequate.

Success is relative to whoever is judging the ‘success.’ Men and organizations tend to quantify success. In religious denominations, if a movement or a local church grows numerically or materially, it is generally considered successful. In examining these more obvious characteristics, this research does not profess to be the final arbiter of success. Nor is it intended to overlook the less humanly tangible evidences of success. God is much less impressed with results than men are. God counted Abraham’s faith as righteousness.\textsuperscript{382} Abraham believed God and his belief caused him to obey. While men struggle with numbers, God watches for faith that produces obedience. Therefore in the final analysis it would be incorrect to assume that Grant was ultimately more successful than either Aventura or Noble. Only God can determine success. This should be kept in mind as this study moves into an analysis of the tangible.

5.5.1 Joint Effort

Grant’s story is also the story of those who left the Fabrica Evangelical Baptist Church and self-identified with the Oneness part of Oneness Pentecostalism. The combination of a hard driving American missionary and an already good-sized group of excited new converts proved successful for a quickly growing organization. Without the ready participation of the Filipinos in Fabrica, Grant’s story might have been dramatically different. He was steadily losing his possessions in Manila. He made no headway in Pangasinan, where he had contacts from his Army days, and his trip there produced nothing at the time. The man who had started with almost nothing in Dayton, Ohio, and

\textsuperscript{382} Romans 4:3, Galatians 3:6, James 2:23.
built up a self-supporting congregation there, was in a pitiful state after arriving in the Philippines before he made contact with Meliton Zarsuelo. It is open to speculation how long he might have stayed in the Philippines before having to ask the organization for funds to return to the United States. A long distance network consisting of a missionary in Hong Kong and two couples corresponding from the U.S. had prepared the way for Grant’s impressive results even before he had arrived.

Grant’s point of contact with the group in Fabrica appears to have been missionary Ralph Bullock’s periodical, *Wing Shang Moon*, without which Grant might never have connected with those Baptists aspiring to be Pentecostals. The overlapping connection of Gus Marlais and Homer Hall sending literature to Cataluña and Diamante of the same group helped cement that connection. Therefore, unlike AG missionary Benjamin Caudle who had lasted less than two years before returning to the United States, Grant had a stronger foothold by virtue of his connections. Connections that someone else had initiated. Caudle might have benefited from a similar connection had he been aware that the AG had another preacher in the Philippines when he arrived in 1926, but it appears that he was unaware of Max Somosierra in Iloilo. Whereas Caudle left nothing to show for his time in Manila, Grant was able to establish two lasting organizations that have had a great impact on Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. What is apparent is that a missionary in the Philippines without adequate Filipino help will not be successful. In Grant’s case, a primary key to success was having the right Filipino contacts. This same principle should hold true for any missionary, in
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383 Dave Johnson, 7-9; Trinidad E. Seleky, “Six Filipinos and One American: Pioneers of the Assemblies of God in the Philippines” *AJPS* 4/1 (2009), 121; Sonny Morper, grandson of Benjamin Caudle, personal communication 8 August 2013, in consultation with his mother, Benjamin Caudle’s youngest and only surviving child.
any nation. There must be some type of local or regional network for cooperation. There was in Caudle’s case, a lack of recognizing or exploiting a network. With Grant the network was realized and exploited.

Urbano Aventura in Baguer, Mindanao had no missionary help from the time he began testifying in 1947 until after Grant arrived in the Philippines. He had “been praying for a missionary here in the Philippines for 12 years…” During that time, due to “…lack of aid…lack of anything…” his work had not spread beyond his local congregation. When Albert Dillon who had come to help Grant, arrived in Baguer in 1960, he found sixteen people meeting in a small grass chapel sharing one worn Bible among the entire community. After a two week revival with the American missionary, the total number of those baptized had risen to sixty-six, possibly a greater harvest in 2 weeks than the local Filipino pastor had seen in 12 years. However, had Aventura not
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labored faithfully for those 12 years there would have been no harvest by the American missionary. This congregation affiliated with the UPC in 1960. Dillon moved to Mindanao, though not Baguer, in mid-1961. He was only there for six months before his wife’s health required them to return suddenly to the United States. In the less than two years of association between Aventura and Dillon, the Baguer congregation which had languished for 12 years, had grown to at least 150, dedicated a new church building, and started another three congregations in different cities of Mindanao.\footnote{Dillon, 25,54. UPC 50\textsuperscript{th}, 54-55.} This shows the potential of partnership between the Filipino and the missionary. Just as Aventura benefitted from the presence of Dillon, so did Dillon benefit from the Filipinos during his short time in Mindanao. Without a base of Filipinos on his side, however small, it remains unknown what Dillon might have accomplished even had he remained there longer. It must not be assumed that the missionaries’ greatest contribution is financial. It is not known how much financial help Dillon or the UPC was able to provide for Aventura. That there was some financial help might be assumed by Aventura’s wording that even in Dillon’s absence, “he has helped us much.”\footnote{UPC 50\textsuperscript{th}, 76.} But even without financial help, the missionary presence brings prestige and credibility to the disadvantaged Filipinos. One early pastor, Ricardo Zabala Sr., said of the missionaries, “We didn’t want their money, we wanted their message.”\footnote{David R. Banta, The United Pentecostal Church in the Philippines and its Implications to Community Development: An Evaluation, MA Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School, Angeles University Foundation, 1986, 48.} Whereas Grant and Aventura were both beneficiaries of a joint effort between Filipinos and missionaries, Diamond Noble, as mentioned earlier, was not. Although Noble’s accomplishments were significant, they
might have been greater if his ministry had been facilitated by an encouraging missionary or organization.

5.5.2 Bible Training

Urbano Aventura never had a Bible school. His congregation was too small to need or support such. After the UPC missionary became involved, and the Baguer church affiliated with the UPCP, the organization provided the training. Diamond Noble “was not able to start a Bible school, though it was his dream.” He was not opposed to Bible school education. He was a Bible school graduate himself. Although he was not able to start his own Bible school, he sponsored some students to attend the United Pentecostal Bible School.390 Grant, on the other hand, started a training school within nine months of his arrival in Negros Occidental. It was made up of young people who had been baptized and Spirit filled. His standards in who could attend the training were higher than those who succeeded him. Grant would not allow them to attend unless they had been baptized and Spirit filled. Some later leaders routinely allowed young people to attend Bible school before either experience.

Ruth Figueroa, one of Grant’s early workers, recounted how she eagerly desired to attend the first training session that was about to begin. Ruth attended the Baptist church in Fabrica. Her father was among the first batch to be baptized by Grant. (Filipinos use the term ‘batch’ to describe a certain group or class. Thus, those baptized by Grant the afternoon of 22 September 1957 will always be known as ‘the first batch.’) Though Ruth’s father had tried to get her to come with him to the new Pentecostal church, Ruth resisted because she was close to the youth group at the Baptist church.

390 Dialyn Noble Estillore, personal communication, 20 February 2015.
Finally, her father promised her money, and she said she would go for the money. So for the first time, she accompanied him to the Sunday morning service. “I never thought that the power of God was so strong in there. I never experienced that in the Baptist church. But He took hold of me. There were four of us. We went to the river.” She was baptized that morning. She was only sixteen and about to turn seventeen. Grant said he was only accepting those eighteen and older. She pressed Grant to allow her to attend the Bible School, pleading that she was about to turn seventeen. Grant told her that she needed to have the Holy Ghost if she was to go to Bible School. If she had the Holy Ghost, she could go. She asked her friends, “What is that Holy Ghost? There is no Holy Ghost in the Baptist church.” When she returned to her home in Victorias, down the road from Fabrica, the rest of her family went to a wake for a dead relative. She stayed home and prayed for the Holy Ghost. She did not sleep. Early in the morning she was Spirit filled and began to speak in tongues. She was allowed to join the Bible School. “We had six months of rigid training in Mambucal, only 24 of us. I am the youngest.”

Grant started his work with families. The seven families that had left the Fabrica Baptist church gave him strength at the beginning. But the future of the movement was its youth. He took them, housed them in a cool, mountain area, fed them and trained them. Most of them became workers, at least until they got married. The focus on training young people shows the farsightedness of Grant, and is still paying dividends in the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines. Ruth Figueroa was interviewed standing in the chapel of the work she pioneered in Alicante, her ninth work. She has also
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391 Ruth Figueroa, personal interview at Alicante, Negros Occidental, 16 November 2014.
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393 Ruth Figueroa, personal interview at Alicante, Negros Occidental, 16 November 2014. Teresita Azuelo Nunez, interviewed at Victorias, Negros Occidental on the same date, remembers the Bible School in Mambucal lasting nine months and having seventeen students.
started a branch work, her tenth pioneering work. She started as a sixteen-year-old Bible school student. She was assigned as a worker immediately upon completion of Grant’s training program that lasted between six and nine months, and has been working steadily since, putting 56 years into the ministry. The role of women in ministry will be examined more closely below. She is only one of the many young men and women who were trained by Carlos Grant.

5.5.3 Healings

All three of the first pioneers these last two chapters have examined practiced divine healing, but each had a different style. Urbano Aventura received his Pentecostal experience under leadership that strongly believed in and practiced prayer for healing. Healing was a central part of the Apostolic Faith Church in Hawaii. Even on their way to Hawaii in 1923, founders Charles and Ada Lochbaum “were called to pray for [the ship’s painter who was dying of blood poisoning] and he was instantly healed.”394 One early announcement of revival services held by the Lochbaums emphasized healing as the main order of business. “EVANGELISTIC AND DIVINE HEALING SERVICE DAILY … JESUS WORDS ‘Go preach the Gospel and heal the sick’ MANY WONDERFUL HEALINGS, BLIND SEE; LAME WALK; DEAF HEAR, Come, bring your sick in faith believing…”395 This was the atmosphere Aventura was converted in, and spent the first years of his Pentecostal experience within. When he began to hold services in his home in 1947, “God encouraged me to testify about divine healing. One woman had been sick for 3 years and the doctors could not cure her. I testified about God’s power…she believed
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[and] was healed. …Many other kinds of sicknesses were healed.” He seems to have taken the middle position about healing, located somewhere between the positions of the other two pioneers examined in this section. He was teaching and believing it, experiencing healings, perhaps emphasizing it more than Grant, but not as much as Noble, and not building his ministry around it.

Diamond Noble, on the other hand, seems to have built his ministry around the healing crusade. After his extended fasts Noble was endowed with the “gift of faith, gift of miracles, and gifts of healing.” He relished the confirmation of the American, Bro. Redding, who, after witnessing the “signs, wonders and miracles…at the inception of my Crusade…cried out – ‘I believe now Bro. Noble that you have the gifts of healing.’” It was at his healing campaign in Manila, in 1955, that a young woman with “an acute complicated disease” was healed. Fifty-eight years later, that woman, who became Noble’s wife, stated, “I was suffering from [an] ailment. I went there to [be] prayed over, and, ‘Praise the Lord! God healed me. I’m still living now.’” It was Noble’s primary focus on his healing ministry that caused him to issue the challenge, “Here is the petrol, and here is the match. You may burn me alive if there are no miracles at this crusade!”

While Carlos Grant experienced healings in his ministry, his approach was very unlike that of Diamond Noble. How Grant approached healing can best be seen from his own account. During his first days at Fabrica,

Many were healed of different afflictions from their testimonies, yet at no time did I stress healing. I believe in diving healing and have been healed of broken
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arm, and heart attacks – three of them. I have been healed many times from various afflictions, yet do not believe healing is a message…my message is the message of salvation of the soul. God will take care of these bodies in His own way. And there were many questions about the people who come to the Philippines with great healing campaigns. Answering the best way possible, I tried to emphasize the need of salvation.

One Sunday morning they brought in a young woman covered with some kind of sore. I had never seen any like. She was just a running sore and could hardly wear clothes to touch her. They asked me to heal her. Oh, God, what could I do? …she asked…if she could also be baptized. …when they led her to the water, the devil spoke and said, “Watch now. You do not know what it is, and you have a wife and daughter. They may catch it.” It staggered me for a moment.

Then I spoke out. “Devil, whatever it is, my God is greater and He will take care of it.” And I put her into the water in Jesus’ Name. She came up and went back into the house, I took my Bible, gave them [a] lesson in the Book of James, God’s plan of healing for the Church. Then I anointed her in the name of the Lord and prayed like this, “Lord, You can see the need, and I believe You will [heal] her. But do not do it now. I do not want to be classed or called a healer. I want them to be saved.” I felt His presence and so many others felt His Spirit so strong, yet she was not healed and so many wondered why. I was sure in my heart God would work.

That night they brought her back and wanted me to anoint her again. I answered, “No. We have anointed her once and now leave it in God’s hands.” It brought frowns to some faces, yet I knew what I was doing. She returned home after the service and went to bed still in the same miserable condition, not even dreaming what would take place during her sleeping hours. She awoke next morning saw her hands and body completely clean – no sores, no pain, no sign of disease. Well try and imagine if you can the joy of this precious woman.

She ran out screaming, and laughing. People came from the entire barrio and she showed them, of course. All wanted her to thank Mary, to call the priest but no, she gave the glory to Jesus and His Name. The priest was called and here he came with his sprinkler and incense to rebuke her, but she would not recant and told him she was healed and it was Jesus who did it. The priest kept on, “We must repent or we excommunicate you.” She answered, “I do not care. Yesterday I was baptized in Jesus’ Name. My sins were all washed away.” And he raged at her, all at once God poured out the Holy Ghost on her. She began to speak in other tongues.402

The young woman in the story was 18-year-old Teresita Amagan Azuelo. When interviewed for this research in 2014, at the age of 76, she verified every detail of the story. She clarified that she had actually received the Holy Ghost the day before her healing, following her water baptism, but that she had been speaking in tongues after the

402 Grant, 36-7.
priest arrived, while she was worshipping God for her healing. She also said that she had the disease as long as she could remember. She said it was “leprosy.” The disease never came back and she has never had any major sickness since the day of her healing.403

![Photo 11 Teresita Azuelo Nunez, in 2014.](image)

Grant’s purpose in recounting this affair seems to be three-fold. First, he wants the reader to know that he never stressed healing and did not want to be known as a healer. He contradicts himself by saying that healing is not “a message,” and then tells about teaching a “lesson” on “God’s plan of healing for the Church.” What he means to say is that healing is not the message. It is not the most important message. It is not the message of salvation, which brings us to the second point Grant is making, which is that the most important message is the message of salvation. “My message is the message of salvation

403 Teresita Ambagan Azuelo Nunez, personal interview at Victorias, Negros Occidental, 16 November 2014. To the researcher, Teresita’s skin looked unusually young and healthy for a 76 year old.
of the soul.” This is what Grant taught during his first days in Fabrica. He focused on the majority Oneness Pentecostal message of Jesus’ name baptism and the essentiality of Spirit baptism evidenced by tongues. But finally, Grant did believe in healing, and used the dramatic story of Teresita’s healing to demonstrate that point. He wanted the reader to understand these things in their proper priority.

Grant’s attitude towards healing as a secondary function may have influenced the Missions Director for the UPCP. He migrated into the UPCP from the AG. He said, “Most of us in the UPC were converted in Bible truth, but most AG were converted in miracles. AG was crusades. UPC was mostly doctrine. UPC also had miracles but mostly doctrine. Most of the UPC converts in the Philippines were AG because all they needed was baptism and that’s it.”

This statement was examined in Chapter Two. There is a wide spectrum of emphasis on healing and miracles that still exists throughout the many different Oneness Pentecostal groups in the Philippines.

5.5.4 Women in Filipino Oneness Pentecostal Ministry

The history of women in the ministry in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism is as variegated as the various views of healing. For almost 500 years, the Philippines has been a Catholic country. Catholic priests have always been men. It is natural to Filipinos that men fill the roles of the ministry. On the other hand, it is a matriarchal society. Women hold the keys of the home. They are the pictures of domesticity. Men are viewed largely as irresponsible, loving to drink and gamble, while women are seen as steady, responsible
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404 Antonio Gallemit, personal interview, Manila, Philippines, 25 February 2014. Gallemit had left the UPC several years before this interview. He claims to have baptized 22,000 people in the Manila area.
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and dependable.\footnote{See chapter 3.1.4.} Again, the study of the three pioneers of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism offers a good range of views on this subject.

Aventura was baptized by a woman. Ada Lochbaum appears to have been her husband’s equal in ministry. Photographs show her, in Aimee McPherson style, dressed all in white except for a black cape, and holding a large Bible. “Her delivery of the Word of God was very passionate and dynamic.”\footnote{The Kingdom of God Crusader, 52.} The section of the 2013 edition of the compilation of \textit{The Kingdom of God Crusader} devoted to the Lochbaums is headed, “Pastors Charles and Ada B. Lochbaum.” Under the title is a separate photograph of each of them. The caption under his photo reads, “Pastor Charles Lochbaum.” In like manner, the caption under her photo reads, “Pastor Ada B. Lochbaum.”\footnote{The Kingdom of God Crusader, 39.} It is not known how much of the ‘woman preacher’ culture Aventura picked up during his years in Hawaii. Although he was baptized by Ada Lochbaum, he may not have sat directly under her ministry, or under the ministry of her husband. He lived on Molokai Island when he was baptized, and possibly remained there after his baptism until he returned to the Philippines. He is silent on this issue. There is no mention of the subject in his written testimony, and there is no record that he was ever re-baptized because he felt his baptism by a woman was invalid. It is ironic that the first known Oneness Pentecostal in the Philippines was baptized by a woman, while so many Filipino Oneness Pentecostals strongly feel that women are unauthorized to perform baptisms. It probably never became an issue before the arrival in Mindanao of UPC missionary Albert Dillon, because there was only one congregation, and it was very small. After affiliating with the UPCP, Aventura may have simply accepted what soon became the UPCP norm, that women

\footnote{See chapter 3.1.4.} \footnote{The Kingdom of God Crusader, 52.} \footnote{The Kingdom of God Crusader, 39.}
were accepted as workers, but discouraged from baptizing. The founding missionary, Carlos Grant possibly had a lot to do with this view of women in the ministry. His methods will be examined below. This ‘norm’ has changed over time, with the UPCP allowing women to perform baptisms.

Diamond Noble had been baptized in a church that did not believe in women preachers. In fact, founding Bishop R.C. Lawson had left G.T. Haywood’s PAW over women preachers and the divorce/remarriage issue. Lawson was strongly opposed to women preachers. Noble, however, had also attended the UPC Bible School in Tupelo, Mississippi with a co-ed student body. By the time he returned to the Philippines he had been exposed to various elements of American Oneness Pentecostalism and was able to observe both sides of the women preacher issue. He most likely heard women students during his Bible school days taking their turn at delivering sermons or devotions in chapel services and classes. The Harvester was the yearbook of PBI. The year Noble attended, it was dedicated to Mrs. Georgia Regenhardt, former student and “the first PBI student to sail as a missionary to a foreign field.” In any case, Noble never questioned God’s leading on women preachers nor prohibited them to baptize. Two of the students he sponsored to attend the UPCP Bible School were young women, his nieces Virginia Bejec and Linda, who both became pastors. He did not encourage women to be preachers, but he did not prohibit them, especially if they felt it was God’s leading.

Carlos Grant did not address the subject of women preachers in his book, but those who served under him in the Philippines remember him as not viewing women pastors or woman leadership in a positive light. Grant did however believe in training and
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using women in the ministry. His first short term Bible school in Mambucal was two-thirds women. Although Grant did not believe in women pastors, he used women extensively to pioneer new works. When a convert was ready for baptism, the woman pioneering the work would call for a man to come and perform the baptism. This is what happened with Anna Malipiton, who has pioneered a work in Tibiao, Antique, Panay Island. When an American woman, Anita Rapien, a former Catholic nun, asked Anna to baptize her, Anna said, “No, but I will send for a man to baptize you.” After Anita’s baptism, she worked together with Anna in the church in Tibiao, and they taught Bible lessons in several outstations in the hills in Antique Province. Anna says that she and Anita are “teachers, not preachers.” The difference between teachers and preachers may seem confusing, but Anna’s meaning should be understood in context of style and audience. Teaching here implies a method of delivery that assumes no authority of the speaker, only of the message. It could perhaps be seen as a scaled down version of preaching, or preaching without the anointing. It would be calmer, quieter, thus befitting of delivery by a woman. The teacher’s audience could embrace a broad definition, which would include children’s and youth classes such as in Sunday School, as well as a larger congregational setting. Preaching might assume a greater authority than teaching, be louder, more masculine, and claim an anointing of the Spirit. Generally, preaching would be for larger, and more age and gender inclusive crowds compared to teaching. This definition is not true in every case, and it is purposefully simplistic to explain why Anna claims that she and Anita are “teachers, not preachers.”

412 Anna Malipiton, personal interview, Tibiao, Antique, 12 November 2014.
The subject of women in the ministry is still a very debated subject within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. Some organizations are led by women, while, as has been already mentioned, some organizations will not allow women to pastor or to baptize. The stark truth is that there are women who have gone into areas no man wanted to go, and do work that few men want to do. They are among the hardest workers in the ranks of Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines, and get the least credit. The controversy is not unique to the Philippines. Oneness Pentecostals in North America are divided on the issue as well. Some organizations do not give credentials to women. Among organizations that officially recognize women in the ministry, there remains disagreement among many members on the subject. For instance, even though a woman may be licensed by her organization, there are many men within the organization who would never entertain the idea of having her preach in their pulpits. It is also unusual for a woman to be a featured speaker at a major conference except to a group of women. So in judging what may have influenced the attitude concerning women preachers in the Philippines, both culture and North American influence should be taken into consideration. Culture probably weighs more heavily on this issue, so that any movement toward more acceptance of women preachers in North America will not necessarily be followed by the Filipinos, and if it is, it will be more slowly.

5.5.5 Ruth Figueroa

Ruth Figueroa was, at sixteen, the youngest of the students at Grants first short term Bible school, and believes she is the only one still involved in the ministry. Immediately
following her training, Figueroa and three other young women were sent to Antique province on the west side of Panay Island. The other three were Maximina Zarsuelo, Teresita Azuelo and Elisa Remata. Things did not go smoothly. There were frequent arguments among them. Figueroa said she was always arguing, so she was brought back to Bacolod church and placed under discipline. “I could not do anything but sit there. I could not sing. I could not testify. It was the most miserable time for me.”

Molocaboc Island was two hours by banca boat from the northern tip of Negros Island. Gloria Zarsuelo was a schoolteacher on the island. She was the first Oneness Pentecostal witness there, and told Grant there were people who were interested in their message. When Grant told Figueroa that she could go to Molocaboc Island, she jumped at the chance, even though it was very remote, and there was no fresh water on the island. Her diet on Molocaboc was rice, corn and rainwater. March and April were dry months, and she used coconut water for drinking and cooking her rice and corn. She learned to ration her water. With one gallon she could take a bath, wash her cloths and clean the floor in that order, by reusing the same water. Or if she didn’t bathe, she could make one gallon of water last for a week. She was the only worker on the island for seven years, beginning when she was 18 years old, except for four months when Teresita Azuelo was with her. At one point she became frustrated because none of the group of boys she had gathered for services had received the Holy Spirit. She decided to preach a one-week children’s revival starting on a Sunday. There were 12 boys, the youngest being 4 year old Noel.

For six nights nothing happened…On Saturday night I got angry with God. That night I told the Lord, “I am tired.” … I said, “Lord, if tonight nothing will happen, I’m going home tomorrow.” I was standing behind the pulpit with my hands
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raised and my eyes closed. I heard a voice say, “Look to your left.” I looked, and I saw an angel of God with his hand stretched out over the platform. I quickly shut my eyes. The voice said, “Look to your right.” I looked, and I saw another angel with his hand stretched over the platform. I closed my eyes and said, “Lord, this is it!” When I said that, I heard the sound of a great wind. The nipa walls of the chapel were scattered. The boys were scattered and all of them were speaking in tongues except the youngest, Noel. I watched him. He would raise his hands to praise the Lord, and his shorts would fall down. He would stop praising, reach for his shorts and pull them back up. But I saw that this was bothering him. So I went to encourage him to keep reaching for God. I used the story of Jacob’s ladder. I said, “That is the Holy Ghost. When the trumpet will sound the angels will come down, and you must grab hold of the ladder to go up to heaven.” I told him he had to grab the ladder. Then I left him to check on the other boys. When I looked back, his shorts had fallen to the floor and he had his hands raised and was jumping. I heard him saying, “Lord, shorts or no shorts. I want my ladder.” So he received the Holy Ghost and was speaking in tongues. Noel is now an engineer, and is still serving the Lord.415

After seven years on Molocaboc Island, Figueroa went back to Fabrica and worked under the leadership of Pastor Ricardo Zabala Senior, who was independent at that time. Shortly after Figueroa’s arrival in Fabrica, three women missionaries, Geneva Baily, her niece Rosemary Hubble, and Lucille Stewart came to Fabrica and were voted in as their missionaries. Ruth Figueroa acted as interpreter for the three women for about 3 years. After this she was assigned to Sigma, Capiz Province on Panay Island. She stayed in Sigma for two years, working in an area where there were many witch doctors and much practice of witchcraft. She had many encounters with the power of witchcraft while she was there, but many people received Holy Spirit baptism. Finally, perhaps concerned about her safety, the missionaries recalled Ruth to Fabrica. But she fretted there because she did not feel that she was being used to the fullest of her capabilities.

Throughout these early years of Figueroa’s ministry, organizational infighting and schisms began. Grant had left the UPC and formed the ACJC. Baily, who had been a UPC missionary in Liberia, had left the UPC and joined the PAJC before coming to the
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Philippines. Some of Grant’s converts had remained with the UPC. Now, Figueroa decided to go back to the UPC. She went to Bacolod, where the church pastored by Ernesto Zabala was meeting in the house of the Tong family. Bacolod was where she had first received her call into the ministry. For more than three years Ruth taught Sunday school to more than 50 couples. Under her direction as Sunday school supervisor, attendance reached 1,000. It was during this time that the building in Taal was erected, where the congregation eventually located. But Ruth still felt the pull to pioneer and pastor a work. After three years in Taal/Bacolod, she stood up in a Thursday evening meeting and announced, “On Saturday I will go to Antique.”416 She stayed in Antique province for 25 years and pioneered 8 churches there. Then, about 2005, she went to San Michael, between Fabrica and Bacolod, to pioneer her tenth church.417 In her more than 50 years of ministry, Ruth Figueroa has never baptized anyone.

Many times I was tempted. [But] I believe that the work only belongs to the man. It is my conviction. Many missionaries and officials tried to convince me but I would not. I said, “Lord, if a woman belongs in apostleship, you put them there. But there was not one put in there. Bro. Adams (former missionary superintendent of the UPCP) said, “Sister Ruth, it is because you do your part. That is the reason why you are still in the ministry.”418

Ruth Figueroa never thought that baptizing was a woman’s part. Carlos Grant probably taught her this, but Grant was only her supervisor for the first ten years of her ministry.

Interviewed in November of 2015, she said,

This year I was in my struggle. Physically, I am struggling. I’m tired. Really, I’m tired. I will be 74. More than 50 years. On Sunday morning I have to preach. This morning when I stand behind the pulpit, I’m holding on to the pulpit. After, I am drained.419
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She volunteered, “The two giants in my work were misunderstanding and jealousy.” She then explained that time-after-time, she would pioneer a work, starting with a handful of children. She would teach the children until they became teens. Some of them married and started having families. When the congregation would reach the size to provide some support for a pastor, Ruth would turn it over to a young pastor. She might stay for a while to see if things were running smoothly, but usually she would just go to another location in Antique province and begin to pioneer another work. But the people she had converted were accustomed to going to her for advice. She was like a mother to them. Some of the ladies and young people would seek her out for counsel. The new pastor, typically young, and his wife would begin to get jealous. Also, because she was a woman, she was taken advantage of in ways that perhaps a man would not. She had recently tried to salvage a ‘back-slidden’ preacher. This man had been a pastor, but was out of church for four years. Figueroa said,

I tried to encourage him and put him back in the ministry. So I used him to emcee the service, and to preach and to baptize. I wanted to see him in the ministry again with license. But one Sunday morning somebody told me he was not coming anymore. I have only five in church. He took them all. I was waiting for him to come and start the service. That day he was installed as pastor in an independent church by [a missionary].

Misunderstanding and jealousy. It has often been the case that some men are jealous of the woman who, because she is a hard worker, and faithful, has been blessed or recognized in some way. Some men do not wish to exert themselves and pour themselves into the ministry, but when a woman does it, they can be extremely cruel in their comments, and feel justified in taking what she has worked for. Although quantitative values can be placed on the number of churches she has started, and the number of years
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she has been in the ministry, it would be difficult to know the number of lives Ruth Figueroa has changed and the ministers she has influenced. One of her many Sunday school pupils in Bacolod City was Alfredo Bodegas, who was elected General Superintendent of the UPCP in 2007.422

Photo 12  Ruth Figueroa in 2015, her 58th year of ministry. Alicante, Negros Occidental.
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5.5.6 Women in Organizational Leadership

Seldom are women appointed or elected to positions of leadership over men. Carlos Grant used women to pioneer works, and identified them as “workers.” Under Grant, they were not allowed to baptize, and were not referred to as pastors. The UPCP today allows women to baptize and to pastor local assemblies, but they are not allowed the highest level of ministerial recognition within the organization, which is ordination. The lack of ordination effectively bars women from holding leadership positions such as District Presbyter, or serving on the Executive Board. The UPCP is not alone in this practice.

A woman who leads an organization usually does so either because she started that organization, or she assumed the leadership after the death of her father or husband who was the leader. Such is the case with Lucy Mann Clay, whose late husband, Larry Lee Mann, was the leader of the Philippine Apostolics of Jesus Christ (PAJC). When he died suddenly in 2010, Lucy, a Filipina who has since remarried, assumed leadership of the organization. She remains one of the few women who lead a Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines. It is probably significant that her husband held title to the properties owned by the organization, so that Lucy Mann Clay remains legal owner of these church buildings. The Philippine Ministerial Association (PMA) was started in 1959 by Eugene Garrett. The 525 congregation strong PMA is now led by Garrett’s daughter, Becky Garrett Dalumpines and her husband, Omar, although he is, in fact and
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in legality, the head of the organization. (Omar Dalumpines was Garrett’s assistant before assuming leadership of the PMA.)

Zebedea Sinen, founder of the Gospel of Christ, was examined in the previous chapter. As was stated, she is the only woman known to have actually founded a Oneness Pentecostal Organization in the Philippines. The Gospel of Christ experienced quick growth from its founding in 1974 until the death of Sinen in 1983. In spite of the bias against women leadership within this movement at large, those organizations that were the result of schisms following Sinen’s death are not hesitant to claim Sinen as their spiritual forerunner.

Lew Ambler founded The Jesus Church in 1971 with the help of Lydia Ramirez, a widow supporting 6 of her 9 children by selling handicrafts made in her hometown of Baguio City. Ambler, a businessman, was exporting handicrafts from the Philippines to Hawaii and met Ramirez as a business connection. Ramirez was the first of Ambler’s contacts in the Philippines to be baptized and receive the Holy Spirit baptism. Ramirez and her six children became Ambler’s first congregation. Shortly afterward, in a home Bible study, the Spirit fell upon all gathered except one, and 31 more were Spirit filled, including all the Ramirez children who were present. Of the thirty-one, all except one were females. Ambler started a Bible school, and the student body consisted of 32 females and 10 males. Though Ambler did not encourage women to preach or pastor, like Carlos Grant, he did use them to pioneer works. The Jesus Church of today has a number of women pastors. The story of Ambler, Ramirez and The Jesus Church demonstrates the value of women throughout the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. Although they seldom achieve positions of leadership and prominence
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within Oneness Pentecostalism, women have been indispensable in the pioneering of local churches and the overall success of the movement.

Although he no longer considers himself a Pentecostal, Apollo Quiboloy expressed his preference for using women as his assistants and representatives over local branches of his organization. He prefers using women because they have shown themselves more trustworthy and loyal. As long as he was using men to oversee local congregations, he experienced problems with men who wanted to take over the congregation and be in charge. In his experience, women are more content to work under his leadership and are at less risk to cause problems by attempting to usurp authority.427

5.6 Conclusion

The ministry of Carlos Grant has not been fully appreciated by the overall Oneness Pentecostal movement within the Philippines. Because he left the UPC, there was an attempt to write him out of its history that has only recently begun to be rectified by the Philippines branch of the organization.428 Not only was he the first successful Western Oneness missionary to the Philippines, but also he founded two organizations that have together spawned at least 30 other organizations and numerous independent works. Grant’s success can probably be attributed to his joint effort with the Filipinos, emphasis on short-term intensive Bible training, healings and use of women in pioneering works even though he did not allow them to baptize or pastor. His strong, hands-on leadership

427 Apollo Quiboloy, personal interview at the Kingdom of Jesus Christ Prayer Mountain complex, 7 February 2013.
style probably contributed toward a continued dependence upon the Western missionary. It also set the stage for the serious schisms that were to follow as will be seen in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6
Schism Continues

6 Introduction

Following Grant’s successes during his first two years in the Philippines, he was joined by other missionary families of the UPC. Grant’s leadership, which was accepted without question by the Filipino converts, was neither accepted nor unquestioned by other American missionaries. The disagreements between missionaries soon became near open warfare, leaving the Filipinos confused about which missionary to follow. It wasn’t only the UPC that experienced these difficulties. Virtually every organization started by American missionaries experienced schism as a result of competition among the Americans who were vying for the loyalty of the Filipinos. Filipinos watched and waited, and before long they too were competing for followers, often at the expense of an established organization. The result was a proliferation of Oneness Pentecostal organizations that divided so much they were hard to keep track of. This chapter attempts that difficult task.

6.1 Schism in UPC – Grant’s Extreme Words

Grant wanted to see what he called “a solvent church”, meaning a self-supporting organization and local churches.429 His approach was not to seek financial help from abroad, but rather to teach the Filipinos to be financially independent. Grant may never have heard of Roland Allen’s work, or the concept of the ‘three selfs’ contended for by

429 Grant, 40-41,56.
Allen, and later popularized for Pentecostals by Melvin Hodges.⁴³⁰ This view saw the church as self-supporting, self-propagating and self-governing. From his writings and example, Grant did not promote an indigenous church envisioned by Hodges and Allen. While he sought to create a self-supporting work, and realized the essentiality of the native workers in propagating the Gospel, he kept a firm hand on the leadership of the work, first while in the UPCP until he was replaced as chairman, and then within the ACJC, until he died. When Grant spoke of “a solvent church,” and “a solvent work,” he meant that the members of each congregation should contribute to their assembly through tithes and offerings, and that the organization should not support the pastors in the long term. He believed that in addition to supplying the funds or raw material to erect a place of worship, they would also use their own strength and skills to literally construct the building. Whether Grant realized it or not, this method appealed to the Filipinos. For centuries, they had worked together to help one another construct their homes, and plant or harvest their crops. Even today, adults and children living in a small fishing village will join together to pull a fishing net from the sea. Standing on the shore, fifty or more people will grasp the ropes attached to the net, and draw the net to shore.⁴³¹ This is the spirit of bayanihan (community solidarity).⁴³² Filipinos were good at this, and so long as this was the only method they knew, they were probably happy. While Grant labored to create a “solvent work,” he nevertheless welcomed support from North America whenever he could get it. Financial support for missionaries in the early days of his

⁴³¹ I observed this in November of 2014 in Tibiao, Antique, Panay Island. After the net had been pulled to shore, the largest fish was given to the village chief, or barangay captain, then the fishermen who had manned the boat and done most of the work would take their pick. Finally, the others who had helped draw the net to shore would get their share.
⁴³² See Chapter 3.1.3.
missionary activity was extremely limited, but it was necessary. The work he began in the Visayas was growing quickly under his leadership until other missionaries from his sending organization arrived to help him. Grant declined to name the missionaries in his history, but to anyone familiar with the earliest UPC missionaries to the Philippines, it is clear to whom he was referring. This research also, shall refrain from naming the individuals to whom Grant referred for the following reasons. First, only Grant’s version of these events is available. Some of those named are dead and cannot tell their side of the story. Secondly, the events can be examined and analyzed without knowing the names of the persons involved. The important thing to remember is that the events described by Grant are a sample of what has happened all too often within Oneness Pentecostal missions efforts in the Philippines, and presumably elsewhere. In the examination of schism, it is the event and the causes that are important to this part of the research, not necessarily the persons.

After two years working as the sole UPC missionary in the Philippines, Grant was happy with his progress, and “thrilled that others were coming to help.” He described the work at this time as “building a solvent work” that had “such a wonderful spirit of cooperation and fellowship…daily we saw souls added to the church.” Shortly after the new missionaries arrived, according to Grant, they began undermining his authority by attacking his character and his motives. The Filipino members were told that Grant was taking their money. “Meetings were held behind my back…Many letters were written to start rumors against me…” One of the new missionaries was “stealing workers by
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promises and money, also by turning them against us, by now the churches were in turmoil. No fellowship, no cooperation, division among the people...” Grant wrote of the “lies and dirty dealings” of two missionaries, and that they “were caught by organization officials.” In his opinion, “the evil effect these people caused in the Philippines” was because the missionary board of the organization sent “out others to make them missionaries or ministers when they are not called or sent by God at all.” He said, “There is no word to express the hardship and suffering caused by these people…”

The extremity of Grant’s words, to describe the action of the other missionaries from his same organization, demonstrates the depth of feelings that he experienced. As will be seen below, the Filipino converts who were under the supervision of these missionaries were also deeply emotional about the things that were happening. Grant said,

Not being a political figure or interested in an office...I could not grasp the idea that any man or group of people would deliberately destroy a work or mission to obtain prestige or a name for themselves, yet it happened just as I tell you it.

What Grant describes here could very well fit with the Diotrephes attitude. (6.1.6 below)

Though Grant may not have been interested in an office for its own sake, he was the first chairman of the organization in the Philippines. He felt it strongly in 1962, when after five years as the founding member and leader of the organization, two of the missionaries he was having problems with were made superintendent and assistant superintendent, in
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effect, his superiors. Grant was made “secretary of the organization, a BIG DEAL.” 442

His emphasis, in the original, of the words “BIG DEAL”, indicates that he thought it was just the opposite. Grant knew that he could not work for long under that arrangement.

Finally, he resigned from the UPC in 1965. He “turned all equipments, churches, people” over to the UPCP, except for “six or eight people who refused to be turned over.” 443

Writing about these events after 1979, Grant said, “Today in all the groups in the Philippines of the Oneness Faith so called, there is the ever-constant power struggle, slander, stealing men, and the jealous attitude that prevails among them.” 444 In many cases, Grant’s words were as true in 2016 as they were when he wrote them. There are at least 120 different Oneness Pentecostal organizations and many more independents in the Philippines that have evolved mostly from the four different original organizational founders discussed in this work, Noble, Grant, Garrett and Willhoite. The organizations they founded and the schisms that resulted from them will be discussed below.

The disagreement among the missionaries deeply affected the nationals. Some of the organizations that are in existence today are the result of disagreements that occurred more than 50 years ago. Even sources from the time reveal the toll taken on national workers by the missionaries’ squabbles. Writing to Arthur and Roberta Dillon in late 1965, the pioneer pastor of Mindanao, Urbano Aventura, mentioned the ongoing problems. More than three pages outlined the continuing fight among the three remaining UPC missionaries. Some of the early Filipino families had stopped attending church services, and young ministers were complaining to Aventura and asking if they should “separate from the organization.” Toward the end of his letter he wrote:
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Oh! They have much trouble. I don’t believe they have the spirit of Christ do they? …Most of Bro. Richardson’s workers in Davao step out already. Bro. Momar (Mumar), the one who open the work in Tamayo[ng] also separated…

Aventura himself remained with the UPCP until his death and is considered by them as “The Forerunner of Apostolic Faith.” His son, however, Urbano Aventura Jr., did not remain with the UPCP, choosing rather to belong to the Apostolic Faith Church that was his father’s Hawaiian roots. The Apostolic Faith Church was established in Balogo, Cotobato in May of 1974 when Chief Pastor William M. Han Sr. travelled from Hawaii to meet with a group of members who had left the UPCP and had been worshipping separately under the leadership of Raymundo Jalandoni. The UPCP started by Grant has grown into the largest missionary founded organization among Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines. It has also been the reluctant mother of many other organizations as can be seen by the chart on page 196.

6.1.1 Cipriano Mumar

The growth of the movement in the Philippines hinged on the work of little known men and women, who often led the missionary to other key contacts. Thus it was with Cipriano Mumar in Davao, Mindanao. This man was converted under the short ministry of UPC missionary Arthur Dillon in mid to late 1961. Mumar was the only one of his father’s family to be converted to Oneness Pentecostalism. His wife and children had also converted. His family and one other family continued in the faith after the Dillon’s departure in early 1962, and until the Denzil Richardson family arrived in Davao during June 1963. Mumar had not been idle. He had been witnessing and preaching during the
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446 UPCP, Celebrating 50 Years, 75.
447 The Kingdom of God Crusader, 64.
eighteen months without a missionary. Shortly after Richardson came to Davao, Mumar led him to some of his contacts in Tamayong, a small village where he was living in the foothills of Mt. Apo, the Philippines’ highest mountain.\footnote{Roberta Dillon, letter of 15 October 1963. Courtesy of Andrew Dillon.} Most of Mumar’s contacts attended the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA). Because of the groundwork done by Mumar, Richardson was allowed to preach in the CMA church. At the end of the service, six men said they desired water baptism and were baptized the following Sunday in the ocean near Davao. On Richardson’s next visit, eight more expressed a desire to be baptized. Finally, all the elders of the assembly and most of the members had converted. The CMA church became a UPCP church.\footnote{Denzil Richardson, in \textit{My Philippines} by Roberta Dillon, 50-51.} Among these contacts was the family of Jose C. Quiboloy Sr., who attended the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Quiboloy was baptized by either Richardson or Mumar, and Mumar became the pastor of the congregation in Upper Tamayong.\footnote{UPC 50\textsuperscript{th}, 56.} Four of Jose C. Quiboloy Sr.’s sons became preachers.\footnote{Franc Mendoza, 29 May 2015, private message. Mendoza is a nephew of Jose C. Quiboloy Jr.} Urbano Aventura’s letter, mentioned above, pointed out Mumar’s separation from the UPCP.\footnote{Urbano Aventura, letter of 21 December 1965. Courtesy of Andrew Dillon, son of Arthur and Roberta.} Sometime after this, Mumar converted to Mormonism, the only known case of a Oneness Pentecostal becoming a Mormon discovered during this research. According to Romy Navallo, Mumar did not live long after his conversion to Mormonism, dying sometime in the early 1970s.\footnote{Romy Navallo, personal interview in Davao City, 28 November 2015.} From the evidence presented in Aventura’s letter to Dillon, it seems apparent that the quarrels among the UPC missionaries contributed to Mumar’s decision to leave the organization. It would be
difficult to calculate the number of those like Mumar, who have been discouraged to the extreme of giving up on Oneness Pentecostalism due to the negative effects of schism.

6.1.2 Apollo Quiboloy

The Quiboloy family became some of the earliest leaders in the UPCP. One son, Jose C. Quiboloy Sr. became the Assistant General Superintendent of the UPCP. For a while he pastored the assembly in Baguer, Cotabato that was founded by Urbano Aventura in 1946, the first Oneness Pentecostal church in the country. He also pastored another historic church in Agdao, Davao City. Jose eventually left the UPCP and pastors an independent work in the greater Manila area. He is also the representative in the Philippines for the Apostolic World Christian Fellowship (AWCF). Another son, Apollo, attended the United Pentecostal Bible Institute (UPBI, later named Apostolic Center for Theological Studies, or ACTS) in 1970. Among his classmates were Victor Alcantara, Absolom Gamayon, Celedenio Ompad, and Romeo Navallo, who all went on to hold high positions in the organization.454 He was elected as national youth president for the UPCP in 1974, but was disfellowshipped by the organization in 1979 after his involvement with an independent preacher known as Major Sanchez. Sanchez had been placed out of bounds by the UPCP pastors in Davao.455 He re-applied for license, expressing sorrow for the misunderstanding, and was accepted back. Shortly thereafter, about 1980, he became the pastor of the Agdao church. Apollo Quiboloy was a good speaker. But he lost favor with the neighboring pastors when he began to teach that they and other pastors were just ignorant men, and not qualified to be pastors. He came under

454 Apollo C. Quiboloy, personal interview, Covenant Mountain Paradise Garden of Eden Restored, in Mt. Apo, Tamayong, Davao City. 7 February 2013.
investigation by the district board in 1985. On the Sunday before the district board was scheduled to show up at the Agdao church, Quiboloy and the congregation vacated the building. Quiboloy reports that only “15 members” from “the denomination” accompanied him that Sunday, 1 September 1985.

Quiboloy’s ministry is now known as the Kingdom of Jesus Christ The Name Above Every Name with headquarters in Davao City. According to Quiboloy it has 6 million adherents, including 3 million full members and another 3 million who are followers but not in full membership. If these figures are accurate, it would place Quiboloy’s organization near the top of Pentecostal/Charismatic organizations for size. The organization’s headquarters includes restaurants, television studios, the Jose Maria College which offers government approved education for pre-school, elementary and secondary education as well as college courses granting Bachelor degrees in several areas. At the time of this research, construction was ongoing for a 50,000-seat auditorium to be called The King Dome. Although Quiboloy is strongly anti-Trinitarian and baptizes in Jesus’ name, he no longer considers himself to be Pentecostal. Quiboloy has also modified typical Oneness theology by announcing that he is the Appointed Son of God. Quiboloy does not forbid speaking in tongues, but it is not emphasized and is not considered the evidence of being Spirit filled. Apollo Quiboloy has migrated outside of the Oneness Pentecostal movement but maintains that his reason for leaving the UPCP in
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456 Romeo Navallo, personal interview, Davao City, Philippines, 19 February 2013. Navallo was the sectional presbyter at the time these events took place. Navallo provided information about Quiboloy being disfellowshipped and reinstated, losing favor with neighboring pastors and being investigated by the district board.


458 Apollo C. Quiboloy, personal interview, Covenant Mountain Paradise Garden of Eden Restored, in Mt. Apo, Tamayong, Davao City, 7 February 2013.

459 Apollo C. Quiboloy, personal interview, Covenant Mountain Paradise Garden of Eden Restored, in Mt. Apo, Tamayong, Davao City, 7 February 2013.
1985 was because of administrative differences. He accuses the UPCP of placing too much emphasis on man-made bylaws rather than the Word of God. Regardless of what caused the schism, the most striking thing about Quiboloy’s separation is that it started so small yet has grown into a massive organization within a mere 30 years. Notwithstanding the serious doctrinal differences with Oneness Pentecostalism, Quiboloy’s accomplishment shows the amazing possibility of totally Filipino leadership in creating what appears to be a wildly successful autochthonous organization. His success probably resulted from his very charming personality, his preaching skills, his superior organizational abilities and, he credits, his eventual reliance on mostly female assistants.
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6.2 Schism in ACJC – A Lesson Well Learned

Following Grant’s resignation from the UPC, he founded the Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ (ACJC) in 1967. Having lost his financial support from the UPC, Grant would work in the United States for a few months at a time and raise funds to support his new organization. The same methods that he found successful in founding and building the UPC were employed in his new organization. After the trouble Grant experienced in the UPC, he refused to affiliate the ACJC with another Western organization. However, he was himself a member of the ALJC for some time and received limited funds from them for his own support and several building projects.

In 1988 Grant selected one of his Filipino converts, Pastor Carlos Garganza, to be his successor in case of Grant’s death or retirement. The decision was not publicized but Grant showed Garganza some sort of will or testament to this effect. Another pastor, Efren Dela Cruz had ambitions to be Grant’s successor. When he heard that Grant planned for another man to be the leader, Dela Cruz led a break-away group of 14 ministers, including three of his brothers, and formed the Apostolic Jesus Name Church (AJNC). It wasn’t long before the AJNC experienced schism that saw all four Dela Cruz brothers each start their own organizations. Other schisms followed, amounting to at least 15 different Oneness organizations with roots in Grant’s ACJC. (See the chart following this section). Edgardo Camalon, founding chairman of the ALJC, Philippines (not to be confused with the ALJC that was registered by Diamond Noble), and current chairman of International Oneness Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ (IOAC), was asked why there were so many Oneness organizations. His immediate answer was,
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461 Edgardo Camalon.
“Many pastors feel, ‘Why follow if you can lead?’” He went on to cite the lack of American leadership that provides a stabilizing force. “Americans have something we do not have, but [we] respect.” When asked what that was, he replied, “Money! Who among the Filipinos will refuse that? Unless they have principles.” He said it is more difficult for a Filipino to command loyalty from other Filipinos because of the common perception that one Filipino knows as much as another Filipino. “Why should I remain under your leadership? I know as much as you. I will go out and start my own work.”462 But Camalon now pastors a large church and oversees an organization of some 20 different congregations. When asked, “What changed? Why do you no longer feel the need of a missionary,” he replied, “We now have financial capabilities because we have a school and some business functions.” James Carr Federico, chairman of Convention Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ (CACJC), and one of the 14 who left Grant to form the AJNC, said the key word to the reason for all the schisms is “trouble.” He said the division is caused by “human frailties, not doctrinal division.”463 These and other causes of schism are examined more closely in Chapter Seven.

462 Edgardo Camalon.
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6.3 Eugene Garrett and the Philippine Ministerial Association

About 1959, Eugene Garrett started what eventually became the 1,000 congregation strong Pentecostal Ministerial Association (PMA). Garrett, who had experienced a notable healing as a younger man, had an effective healing ministry throughout the United States, Mexico and Canada before his call to the Philippines. After arriving in the Philippines, Garrett continued to emphasize healing, and self-published a 71 page book, probably in 1988, detailing many healings and miracles. The PMA suffered several schisms through the years that reduced the number of churches from a high of 1,000 to the present number of around 500. Omar Dalumpines, Garrett’s son-in-law and current chairman of the organization, says the splits were the result of “People wanting to be in charge, like the rebellion of Satan. It was all, ‘I, I, I, me, me, me.’” Garrett and another son-in-law who helped him establish the work, Raymond Knapp, were members of the International Ministerial Association (IMA) located in the United States. Garrett died in 1999 in New Brunswick, Canada.

6.3.1 James Childs

One of those who separated from Garrett, was James Childs, who worked with Garrett around 1969 for approximately a year and a half. Although both were members of the
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464 Raymond Knapp, email 28 October 2014. Knapp is the son-in-law of Eugene Garrett. He and his wife, Carol, Garrett’s daughter, worked with Garret in Mindanao.
467 Omar Dalumpines, personal interview, Manila, 14 November 2015.
IMA, Childs taught the essentiality of water baptism and Spirit baptism, while Garrett did not.\footnote{Raymond Knapp said both himself and Garrett belonged to the International Ministerial Association. He also explained his and Garrett’s belief that water baptism was not essential to salvation. Knapp email, 28 October 2014. Childs said that although he and Garrett were both members of the IMA, they differed on the doctrine of essentiality of water and Spirit baptism. Childs, personal interview, Cebu City, 24 November 2015.} Childs said that he left Garrett over “standards.” Standards are one of the most controversial issues within the Oneness movement. Standards are the lifestyle rules of a local church or an organization, and include dress codes that members are expected to follow. Standards vary among organizations, and even from church to church within the same organization. Childs said, “When I tried to preach standards, Garrett got upset with me and wouldn’t fellowship with me. I had to start my own organization.”\footnote{James Childs, personal interview. Cebu City, 24 November 2015.} Childs stated that his organization, currently known as the Philippine Bible Apostolic Holiness Church (PBAHC), were the “strictest Apostolics in the Philippines.”\footnote{Childs, personal interview, 24 November 2015.} Garrett’s adopted daughter, Becky Dalumpines, stated that her father did not preach standards. “He said, ‘Don’t preach standards. Preach Jesus.’”\footnote{Becky Dalumpines, personal interview, Manila, 14 November 2015.} Garrett did fellowship however, with John Willhoite of the Apostolic Ministers Fellowship (AMF), who held very high standards. Willhoite and Garrett loved each other in spite of their differences and held crusades together.\footnote{Mark Willhoite, telephone conversation, 11 April 2015. Mark is the son of John Willhoite.} If the Garrett/Childs schism was a result of differences in standards, it was certainly not an isolated incident.

Childs converted the leader of a Trinitarian organization, Christ is the Answer Incorporated, and got the name changed to Apostolic Pentecostal Church.\footnote{Childs, personal interview, 24 November 2015.} The Filipinos did not like the word ‘Pentecostal’ in the name because they did not want to be
confused with Trinitarian Pentecostals, and so the name was changed to Bible Apostolic Church (BAC).\textsuperscript{475} Childs said that an American preacher named A.D. Higdon took the BAC away from him by turning most of the pastors against him. A United States based organization took the BAC away from Higdon. Two more American preachers, Donald Lance and Steve Hancock came over to help a discouraged Childs to save what was left of the work. They formed the Apostolic Independent Missions (AIM) in 1982, but wouldn’t let Childs be part of it because he had earlier expressed that he had lost his burden for the Philippines. So Childs formed the PBAHC in 1985. There were no known schisms of the PBHAC since its founding, but the AIM split into at least 7 different organizations. PBAHC grew to over 300 churches at one time, but by late 2015 it was down to 27 churches. Childs, who was chairman for life, resigned in December 2015 and turned the leadership over to Tim Joiner, a missionary from Belize. The chart below shows the schism from Eugene Garrett’s work only through James Childs. There have been numerous other schisms from the PMA that could not be traced and organizations that are not represented on this chart.

\textsuperscript{475} Many people within Oneness Pentecostalism in the Filipinos associate the name Pentecostal with Trinitarians, and refer to themselves as Apostolic.
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In late 1970 the John Willhoite family went to the Philippines as missionaries with the Apostolic Ministers Fellowship (AMF). Willhoite had no contacts in the country and no connections with any existing organization other than his former membership in the UPC in the United States. Because he was not connected with any groups within the Philippines and had no congregation with which to worship, he would visit churches of various denominations. One Sunday evening he visited Bethel Temple and was asked to preach by Pastor Dan Morocco. At the conclusion of the service over 200 people received Holy Spirit baptism. As Willhoite was leaving, some of the people approached him and said, “You are different. What is it that makes you so different?” Willhoite answered, “I baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus.”\textsuperscript{476} The people wished to visit his home to receive a further explanation about baptism in Jesus’ name. The next day, several of them went to the Willhoite home. Over the succeeding days, Willhoite baptized more than two hundred. Among this group was a young woman named Venus Almeda. She was the first one in her family to convert to Oneness Pentecostalism. Her mother and father followed, as did the rest of the family. The last one of the Almeda family to convert was the brother of Venus, Wilde Almeda, who has since become the leader of the largest Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines, and one of the largest in the world. (See below.)

Willhoite’s approach to missions was to elevate the nationals and tell them that they must learn to lead, for they would one day be in charge of the organization. He would build them up by saying, “You will be the one to carry this message on. I’m not

always going to be here. You are going to be in charge.”\(^{477}\) It seems that Willhoite was building to leave. He laid a foundation that he knew the Filipinos would continue to build upon. Regardless of what many other missionaries vocalize about the Filipino learning to be in charge, the reality is quite different. Too many missionaries act as though they are indispensable. Willhoite appears to have had the proper balance in this area. He ministered throughout the Philippines as an AMF missionary in the early 1970s and returned in 1980 as a UPC missionary. His efforts in establishing the AMF was significant in that it eventually divided into at least ten organizations and many other independent works. (See chart below.) John Willhoite was also the root from which sprang the largest Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines, Wilde Almeda’s Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry (JMCIM).

---

\(^{477}\) Mark Willhoite, phone conversation, 11 April 2015. Mark is the son of John Willhoite.
6.5 Wilde Almeda and the Jesus Miracle Crusade

Wilde Estrada Almeda has possibly received more media attention within the Philippines than any other Oneness Pentecostal. In spite of this, he remains relatively unknown within the overall Pentecostal movement, and perhaps misunderstood by other Oneness Pentecostals who are aware of him. He was born 28 June 1935 to Prudencio Orillaneda Almeda and Leonila “Mommie” Estrada Almeda. The family was Catholic but migrated into Pentecostalism through Bethel Temple in Manila sometime in the 1960s. Wilde himself was testified to by a Filipina missionary named Corazon Gatdula. At that time of his life he had been suffering from insomnia for the previous six years. He had been unable to sleep but about two or three hours per night, and “felt like the walking dead.”

He was prayed for, delivered from insomnia and began attending Bethel Temple.

After being exposed to the Oneness doctrine by Willhoite, Almeda was baptized by Jack Langham, who was a furlough replacement for Willhoite. The parents of Wilde Almeda attended the church pastored by Willhoite for a time. Willhoite recounts an incident that demonstrates the faith of Wilde’s mother, Leonila Almeda.

Julia was a hunchback beggar that begged in the Pasay market near our church. She was bent completely double and could not straighten up...One day Sister Almeda stopped to witness to Julia. She responded. Sister Almeda brought her to the church where she was baptized in the name of Jesus.

Julia remained a hunchback even after her baptism, but Sister Almeda told her to stay with her in the church until she received her healing. Sister Almeda promised to fast until she was healed. They fasted together for forty days. They drank a little water, but they did not eat for forty days.
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478 Gatdula died in 2015. She had been attending the Jesus Miracle Crusade assembly in San Francisco, California at the time. Source: Annaliza Almeda Smith.
479 Annaliza Almeda Smith, personal interview in Manila, 1 December 2015.
480 John Ayudtud, personal correspondence, 7 April 2015. Ayudtud was one of Willhoite’s early students, and married Venus Almeda, the sister of Wilde.
The thirty-sixth day of their fast, Julia heard a cracking sound in her back. This continued until...the fortieth day. Upon completion of the fast, she was standing straight and tall. She was a walking, living, breathing miracle of the power of God.  

It was in this spiritual atmosphere that Wilde Almeda was influenced before he began his ministry. His mother continued periodic lengthy fasts throughout her life. For the last several years of her life, Leonila Almeda fasted two meals a day, eating only once daily. She died in February 2007 at 94 years of age.

Wilde Almeda came to Willhoite seeking a license to preach, but he had not yet received Spirit baptism so Willhoite could not comply with his request. Shortly thereafter, Willhoite received a letter from Almeda. It said, “I am in jail. I came down to Surigao Island to preach. Because I had no license, I was put in jail. Pray for me.” Two weeks later, another letter arrived. This one said, “Brother Willhoite, I was praying on the fifteenth day of my being imprisoned and I received the Holy Ghost with the evidence of speaking with other tongues. I was released the next day. I will see you in Manila.” Later, when Willhoite offered him a license, Almeda said, “Brother Willhoite, Jesus gave me my license. I do not need a license to preach.”

With the very active assistance of his wife, Lina C. Almeda, Wilde Almeda started the Jesus Church in Novaliches, Quezon City, Metro Manila 14 February 1975. He overcame his resistance to being licensed, and later that same year, on 23 November, Almeda was ordained by the AMF, and John L. Willhoite signed his Certificate of Ordination. He did not stay long in the AMF. One of the reasons he left involved an incident concerning another AMF missionary. Almeda had been on a long fast when the
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482 Annaliza Almeda Smith, personal interview at Manila, 1 December 2015. Anna is the daughter of Wilde Almeda.
483 Willhoite, 147-8.
missionary, American Charles Hanchey, was due to arrive at the Manila airport.\textsuperscript{484} Hanchey, who was in the Philippines less than one year in 1976-77, had let it be known that he wanted to be met by a large contingent of ministers. Almeda did not go to the airport because of his fasting. Hanchey became angry at Almeda’s perceived lack of respect and let his anger be known. Almeda responded that he was not serving man, but God.\textsuperscript{485} This was quite possibly a culture clash and it caused him to pull away from the AMF. It may have been the best thing that ever happened to him. It is hard to imagine Almeda’s organization, since 1983 called the Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry, becoming the largest Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines, and possibly the second largest in the world had it remained under the direction of the AMF.\textsuperscript{486} The Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry (JMCIM) currently claims 1,500,000 members in the Philippines and 15 other countries.\textsuperscript{487} With only 36 satellite assemblies outside the Philippines, the bulk of their membership is within the country. The AMF had 20 or 21 churches in the Philippines as of 2014, including all the branch works, and their conferences have about 400 in attendance.\textsuperscript{488} The JMCIM has several services each week at the Amoranto Sports Stadium in Quezon City in Metro Manila with Sunday attendance in the tens of thousands at that location alone. The 40\textsuperscript{th} anniversary

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{484} Hanchey was sent to the Philippines about August 1976 and only stayed until April of the following year. Information provided by Ed Wheeler during a personal interview conducted at Global City, Metro Manila 25 February 2014. Wheeler was another AMF missionary, who first arrived in March 1975 to be over Willhoite’s Bible school. Wheeler worked off and on in the Philippines until 2015.

\textsuperscript{485} Annaliza Almeda Smith and Wilde James C. Almeda, Jr., personal interview at Manila, 1 December 2015.

\textsuperscript{486} The True Jesus Church publishes their total membership as “1.5 million in 48 countries” on their official website, http://www.tjc.org/about/factsHistory.aspx (accessed 7 December 2015). Another large Oneness Pentecostal organization is the Apostolic Church International, from Ethiopia, claims “more than 3 million members all over the world,” on their official website, http://acimembers.webs.com (accessed 7 December 2015).

\textsuperscript{487} Annaliza Almeda Smith and Wilde James C. Almeda, Jr., personal interview at Manila, 1 December 2015.

\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
celebrations for JMCIM were held in 2015 at the Cultural Center of the Philippines in Pasay City, Metro Manila, and saw an attendance of over 300,000 on the Center’s six hectares of open grounds.\footnote{Annaliza Almeda Smith and Wilde James C. Almeda, Jr., personal interview, 1 December 2015.}

On 23 April 2000, a Filipino Moro group known as Abu Sayyaf abducted 21 people from a Malaysian dive resort in Sipadan and took them to Jolo Island in the Philippines. Thus began the Sipadan hostage crises. On 1 July Wilde Almeda and 12 of his members known as prayer warriors went into the Abu Sayyaf camp where the hostages were being held in a widely publicized effort to secure their release through prayer and fasting. Almeda had reportedly been fasting for 40 days without food before arriving at the camp. He and his prayer warriors continued fasting during their time with the Abu Sayyaf, taking only water mixed at times with fruit juices.\footnote{Sam Smith, \textit{Miracles in Moroland: A Journey of Faith, Love \\& Courage – The Inside Story of the Sipadan Hostage Crises} (Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry: Novaliches, Quezon City, 2015), 136,168.} On 24 July a press release signed by the Abu Sayyaf commanders stated in part, “The prayer and fasting of the Jesus Miracle Crusade headed by Evangelist Wilde E. Almeda has pacified us. Their prayer succeeded.”\footnote{Sam Smith, 186. The original press release was in the vernacular.} Almeda suffered a serious physical setback 8 July, following 47 days of fasting.\footnote{Sam Smith, 161. \textit{Divine Grace Magazine}, Volume 2, Number 6, June-September 2007, p 23. \textit{Divine Grace} is the official publication of the Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry.} The men accompanying him thought he would die. In fact, they reported that three times he had no discernable pulse. Something similar to a stroke has caused Almeda to lose the use of his right side from the time of this incident. On 2 October, Almeda and his group were found by Filipino military forces and brought to
safety. Jesus Miracle Crusade claims that all the hostages were released by this time due to their intercessory prayer and fasting. They also maintain that the group were not hostages or prisoners, and that they stayed of their own free will to see the release of all of the Sipadan hostages. The Jesus Miracle Crusade hosts an annual celebration during the month of October to remember and offer thanksgiving for the “Victorious Mindanao Peace Mission.”

Jesus Miracle Crusade is a highly structured organization that looks to Wilde Almeda as Dearly Beloved Honorable Evangelist Pastor Wilde Almeda. He remains their only pastor. All other ministers have the title of Beloved Ministers or Beloved Preachers and work under the authority of Almeda. Their members are referred to as Beloved Brethren. Almeda’s wife, now deceased, is called Assistant Pastor Lina C. Almeda. The organization published a 252-page bilingual (English-Tagalog) Preacher’s Handbook in 2011 that offers standard instructions for all ministers covering subjects including doctrines and how to conduct services for weddings, child dedications and so forth.

Wilde Almeda was influenced briefly by American missionary John L. Willhoite and those who followed him. Willhoite can be credited for bringing the Oneness Pentecostal message to Almeda’s family. Almeda’s independence might be seen in his being the last one in his family to receive water baptism in Jesus’ name. He also demonstrated independence in departing from the AMF. Jesus Miracle Crusade was built, and became the largest Oneness Pentecostal organization in the Philippines without ever

---

494 Sam Smith, 273.
495 Divine Grace, Volume 1, Number 4, 2006, front cover.
having the oversight of a non-Filipino missions organization. It can truly be considered a
totally autochthonous organization. As has already been pointed out, it is inconceivable
that this organization would have achieved its success had it been under the control and
administration of missionaries with a typical Western mindset. The temptation for
Americans (or other Westerners) to recreate in foreign fields a duplicate of what they see
at home is not easily resisted. The separation of Almeda from the AMF, though small at
the time, should be seen as essential schism that had a very positive outcome.

6.6 Current Figures for Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism

It is not known how much the overall Pentecostal movement has grown since NIDPCM
numbered them at 765,814 in 2002. Since that time, membership in the Philippine
Council of Evangelical Churches has increased from 51 to 71. If the “18 Pentecostal or
Pentecostal-like denominations” found among those entries have grown in a
corresponding fashion, there should be at least 25 of those groups in the PCEC in early
2016. The article acknowledges that there are “many smaller pentecostal groups…not
accounted for by the PCEC.” If the classical Trinitarian Pentecostals in the Philippines
have experienced schism and growth like the Oneness Pentecostals there, these numbers
may be too conservative. This research has discovered 120 separate names of Oneness
Pentecostal organizations or groups. Of this number, at least 16 of them have 4
congregations or less, including at least 4 with only one congregation. The founder of one
organization, Apostolic Christian Church (ACC), has since joined another, Assemblies of

496 Ma, NIDPCM, 201.
497 Ma, NIDPCM, 201, and http://pceconline.org/about/denomination.htm (accessed 1 January 2016).
498 Ma, NIDPCM, 201. On 1 January 2016 the PCEC website listed 71 member bodies. It does not
distinguish between Pentecostals and other denominations.
499 Ma, NIDPCM, 204.
the Lord Jesus Christ (ALJC). The Bible Apostolic Church, founded in 1969, experienced schism and the name was abandoned. Some of the other names of Oneness Organizations found during the course of this research may likewise be obsolete. For 45 of the 120 organizations, this research was unable to discover the number of churches or members.

Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines use the term “Apostolic” as a self-designator more often than any other term. Fifty of 120 organizations use “Apostolic” in their names, more than twice as many as use “Pentecostal”. The terms “Pentecostal” or “Pentecost” were used a total of 20 times, and 12 of those times they were used in conjunction with “Apostolic.” On two other occasions, the use of Pentecostal was joined with “Oneness,” to differentiate from Trinitarian Pentecostalism. Sometimes individuals took exception to being called Pentecostal. They would say, “I am not Pentecostal. I am Apostolic.” Others were more accepting of identifying as Pentecostal when Apostolic was used as a prefix, as in “Apostolic Pentecostal.” Though most people understood the meaning of the term being used throughout this research – Oneness Pentecostal, they very seldom use that terminology and are much more comfortable being identified as Apostolic, or Apostolic Pentecostal. The fact that academics use the term Apostolic to identify the portion of the Pentecostal movement, “…both Oneness and Trinitarian, who emphasize the authority of present-day “apostles” and “prophets”…”500 in no way discourages the vast majority of Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines from using it as their preferred self-identification. This is true not only in the Philippines. The movement as a whole commonly uses Apostolic as “its own self-

The largest known Oneness Pentecostal organization in the world, the Apostolic Church of Ethiopia, likewise uses this name.502

From the figures obtained during this research, it appears that the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines could number about 2 million in over 120 different organizations. Fully three quarters of this number is the 1.5 million membership claimed by the Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry. Even without the JMCIM, there appears to be over 500,000 Oneness Pentecostals. There are over 4,724 local churches and outstations among the movement, and more than 4243 ministers. None of these numbers count the 44 groups about which no figures could be obtained. It also does not count the scores or hundreds of independent churches in the movement.

Illustrative of the many schisms this movement has experienced, most of today’s organizations were spawned from a half dozen organizations started by four American missionaries and one Filipino. The earliest was the Filipino, Diamond Noble, whose original ALJC has become at least 11 different organizations located primarily in Luzon, north of Manila. Carlos Grant was the first American missionary to establish a lasting organization. From his ministry came the UPCP and ACJC family of organizations scattered around the country. The next was Eugene Garrett who founded the PMA, which has given difficult birth to several other organizations. James Childs went to the Philippines in 1969 in the same organization as Garrett. He began by working with Garrett but soon split over what he called “standards.” But there were serious doctrinal differences also. Childs was an Essentialist and Garrett was a non-Essentialist. Childs’

501 French, Our God is One, 13.
502 Apostolic Church of Ethiopia, International. According to Samuel Smith, Chairman of the Apostolic Christian World Fellowship of which ACE is a member organization, the ACE claims a membership of 4.1 million. Telephone conversation with Samuel Smith on 6 January 2016.
BAC then split into at least 8 different groups. Johnny Willhoite founded the AMF in 1972. The AMF split into more than 8 organizations. Willhoite himself left the AMF and rejoined the UPC (which he had left in order to join the AMF). There were other early pioneers, but none more successful in establishing organizations than these. Most of the 120 organizations discovered during this research can be traced back to one or another of the above-mentioned men. There were, of course, other influential men and women like Wilde Almeda and Zebedia Senin whose roots can be found in these men, but whose ministry surpassed the ministry of those who converted them.

6.7 Conclusion

The root of schism, never far from the surface of Oneness Pentecostalism, has become very visible in this chapter. That there are 120 different groups or organizations here is not the result of multiplication. It is the result of division. These were, for the overwhelming majority, not pleasant separations. They were ugly. Missionaries, pastors and organizational leaders continue to exhibit that after all, they are but flesh. Nonetheless, the movement has grown, sometimes because of necessary schism, and sometimes in spite of unnecessary and hurtful schism. It would be interesting to see if future research of the Oneness Pentecostal movement in other countries shows a comparable rate of schism, or if the movement in the Philippines experienced a higher rate than normal, whatever ‘normal’ is. Doubtless, missionary infighting was responsible for the beginning of schism in the UPCP. The Filipino preachers who witnessed the division among the Americans, or who heard about it later, were thus exposed to the avenue of schism as a possible route for them should the proper, or improper,
circumstances exist. While discord among Western missionaries cannot be entirely blamed for the proliferation of schism among Filipinos, the Americans were the teachers, and the Filipinos were the students. And they learned their lessons well. There are many causes of schism, as has been seen in this chapter. The next chapter closely examines the first recorded schisms from the Biblical record, and the various possible causes of schism to help understand why it occurs.
CHAPTER 7
Examination of Schism

7 Introduction

Schism is a thread woven through the history of Christianity in general, and of Pentecostalism in particular. The thread has been alternately visible and invisible throughout this study of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, but it has been ever present. This chapter examines schism in more detail, beginning with a concise introduction of the subject and then will look at various schisms, or conditions and human behavior that lead to schisms, in the Bible. It will then take a look at David B. Barrett’s Schism & Renewal in Africa, in an attempt to identify any features that might apply to Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. Barrett is examined because his work was possibly the most detailed research ever undertaken to discover the causes of schism from the founding mission organizations in Africa, and because Barrett’s conclusion fits the schism within the Oneness movement in the Philippines, howbeit with an alteration. There is no equivalent research pertaining to the Philippines. Examples will be given with an attempt to isolate notable causes of schism in the Movement. Schism as approached in this study is defined as division, separation, or, using Barrett’s word, independency. The word schism “has regularly been applied to any withdrawal of any group, from the full fellowship of other congregations, which they shared before.”

As was seen in Chapter Three, from the perspective of the Philippines, religious schism got off to an honorable and patriotic beginning in the person of Gregorio

---

Aglipay. While most Filipinos remained firmly within the Catholic Church, Aglipay nonetheless remains a hero of the Revolution in the Filipino mindset. Of course, Martin Luther is a hero too, for most Protestants, while being anything but a hero to the Catholic Church. Whether a protester is a hero or a villain is in the eye of the beholder. Is every schism a form of protest or disagreement? If so, it would make every facilitator of religious schism a protest-ant. Indeed, the Philippine Independent Church founded by Aglipay eventually became part of the Anglican Communion through the Episcopal Church in the United States. Had the Catholic Church yielded to Aglipay’s desire for the Filipinization of the Church within the Philippines, something that happened eventually, there would probably never had arisen the Philippine Independent Church. The Aglipay schism was based almost solely on nationalistic feelings. Because of that, Aglipay’s most enduring contribution to Filipino society might have been making religious schism respectable.

It was not only the Catholics who suffered from early schism. “From the outset, Protestant churches in the Philippines were plagued with disunity and schism.” In fact, division was said to be inevitable. Barrett referenced the high number of Protestant missionaries in populations in Africa where schism was prevalent and said, “Separatism therefore arises out of a Protestant climate.” Schism seems to be the norm among Pentecostals in the Philippines and earlier. The great Pentecostal Azusa Street was a

505 See Chapter 3.3.3, Agliypayism.
schism. Oneness Pentecostalism was a schism. The Assemblies of God in the Philippines contributed to, and benefitted from, a schism in the Methodist churches of the Manila area during the time of Lester Sumrall. Manila’s Bethel Temple and the Philippines General Council of the Assemblies of God (PGCAG) experienced schism early on, and more recently the PGCAG experienced nearly three years of internal strife that resulted in a court ruling in 2014 to decide the legitimate officers of the organization.510

Although generally viewed as a negative occurrence, this research points to the overall results of schism within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism as having a generally positive impact on the growth of the movement. Often times schism has been a painful process, sometimes separating families like some type of spiritual civil war. But whatever discomfort and antagonism schism has caused, it has probably been a necessary ingredient to the growth and strength of the movement. That is not to say that it is always helpful. In many cases schism has resulted in division without multiplication as ambitious but incompetent people struggle vainly to prove their leadership skills. A number of independent works examined in this study have remained stagnant for years. The only quantifiable result of schism in these cases is the increase in the overall number of Oneness Pentecostal organizations. Of the 120 separate organizations discovered by this research, most have less than 10 churches.

Those of the group from which the separation takes place almost always view schism negatively, possibly even as sin. On the other hand, those who separate tend to justify their action and might deny that they are schismatic, or that schism has even

510 Reynaldo Calusay, General Superintendent/President of PGCAG wrote a letter 29 August 2014, addressed to “All Members & Affiliated Churches of PGCAG, Inc.” announcing the ruling of Valenzuela Regional Trial Court, which found “Calusay, the rightful General Superintendent…” Court decision was by Presiding Judge Lilia Mercedes-Encarnacion A. Gepty on 16 July 2014. Calusay’s letter and order of the court accessed on Facebook site of PGCAG, 9 August 2015.
occurred. At any rate, there are no studies similar to an examination of schism within Oneness Pentecostalism, much less in the Philippines. Perhaps a look at schism and behavior causing schism in the Bible will be helpful in understanding schism within the movement being studied.

7.1 Toward an Understanding of Schism

Aaron Wildavsky used the Biblical account of Moses and the developing nation of Israel to develop his political theory. Wildavsky (1930-1993) was chairman of the political science department at the University of California Berkley from 1966-1969, and the president of the American Political Science association for 1985-86. His minute examination follows the development of different types of government of the nation, from slavery in Egypt to hierarchy under Moses, including the necessary schism called the Exodus, and proves the acceptability and effectiveness of using the Bible in academy for such purposes. In an examination of the history of a religious movement, such as this is, the use of scripture to assist in an understanding of schism should be perfectly acceptable. It is with this in mind that the following is presented.

7.1.1 And There Was War in Heaven

Schism is as old as the world. In a descriptive proverb that has often been seen as referring to Satan, we see that the roots of the first schism existed before the beginning.

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!
How are thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!
For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven,

---

511 Aaron Wildavsky, Moses as Political Leader (Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2005).
512 Wildavsky, see especially Chapter 2, ‘From Slavery to Anarchy’, 70-102.
513 Revelation 12:7.
I will exalt my throne above the stars of God:
I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north:
I will ascend above the heights of the clouds;
I will be like the most High.\textsuperscript{514}

This passage highlights the view, commonly accepted among Pentecostals, Catholics and others, that Lucifer (Satan) is a fallen angel. He once held a high position in the heavenlies, but he aspired to an even higher one. Because of his desire for preeminence, he rebelled against God and was cast out of heaven along with a third of the angels, who had followed him. Thus, from a time before recorded time, a pattern was set for endless political and religious schisms that have followed. This first schism, like many that followed, is equivalent to rebellion. It was an unnecessary rebellion motivated by desire for power. This kind of schism is typified by a desire for promotion that brings glory, power and preeminence. Promotion itself is not bad. The Biblical view is that promotion comes from the Lord.\textsuperscript{515} It is self-promotion that has been at the root of the satanic type of schism. Omar Dalumpines heads the 500 congregation strong Philippines Ministers Association (PMA). The PMA had approximately 1,000 congregations before several schisms saw that number cut in half. Dalumpines said the reason for the schisms was “people wanting to be in charge. Like the rebellion of Satan. It was all ‘I, I, I. Me, me, me.’” The connection can be made between his analysis of schism and the words of Satan in the above passage. “\textit{I will exalt my throne…I will sit…I will ascend…I will} be like the most High.” (Emphasis added.) Schism of this nature is commonly found in the Philippines according to those from whom the schismatics secede. Of course, those who

\textsuperscript{514} Isaiah 14:12-14. This proverb, which begins in verse 4 of this chapter identifies “the king of Babylon” as the subject, however, many Pentecostals also see the portion of the passage mentioned here as referring to Satan.

\textsuperscript{515} Psalm 75:6-7.
separate would never admit to falling under this category. The schism of Satan is closely associated with that of Diotrephes, which will be examined below.

7.1.2 Schism in Pre-national Israel.

Not all schism is an attempt to grab power and not all schism is unnecessary. Sometimes schism and rebellion are necessary for survival. Before the Exodus, the Israelites did not exist as a nation. The patriarch Israel, accompanied by his eleven sons, went to stay in Egypt by the invitation and blessing of the Pharaoh of that day. (Joseph, his other son, was already in Egypt and held a high position in the government.) After approximately 400 years, the descendants of the twelve sons of Israel had grown into twelve tribes so vast that the Egyptians began to be concerned that these immigrants they called Hebrews would become a threat. (The ‘immigrants’ had been in Egypt about as long as ‘Americans’ have been in America.) Egypt implemented strict birth control measures on the Hebrews and put them to hard labor. Moses, a Hebrew raised by Pharaoh’s daughter, was disturbed by the inequality he witnessed and attempted to remedy it in his own way. He failed and had to flee the country. After an encounter with God, Moses returned to Egypt with the mission of delivering the Hebrews. What followed can doubtless be described as schism and rebellion. But when an authoritarian regime is forcing abortions on your people, killing your baby boys that survive to birth, making slaves out of your daughters, placing burdens too hard to be borne and making unreasonable demands upon you, in short, attempting to erase your identity, there is little choice but to rebel.

There may be no greater example in history for the justification of schism. What the Egyptians viewed as rebellion was, in Israel’s eyes, independency. It was justified
rebellion. Whereas Israel had entered Egypt as an honored guest and had been freely offered the best of the land, time and regimes had changed. Gradually a free people had become enslaved. The only way for them to regain their freedom and maintain an identity as a people was to rebel. Thus, rebellion became essential. Schism was unavoidable.

History repeats itself. Many churches and organizations welcome with open arms, those who desire to join them. They are treated as honored guests, recognized and feted as they are coming in. Often it makes no difference that the new members, be they individual laity, ministers or entire congregations, have just left another organization, perhaps under less than ideal circumstances. At the end of the year, reports go out that highlight the increase in the number of members in the congregation, or ministers and churches in the organization. Most often it is not acknowledged that they have just been playing musical chairs, a game in which the players simply trade chairs when the music plays, removing one chair before the music stops, thus leaving one player without a chair. But if these same people who were so welcomed when they first joined the organization, decide for whatever reason to leave, they are usually not allowed to depart with the same grace that they were allowed to come. Accusations of ‘rebellious’ and ‘insubordinate’ might be true, or not. It is normally much easier to go into Egypt than to go out of Egypt. Although it is seldom recognized by all involved parties, there are schisms that are necessary and, as in the case of the tribes of Israel leaving Egypt, ordained by God.

7.1.3 Schism in the Kingdom of Israel.

Israel as a monarchy experienced schism from its very first king. The first schism of the kingdom was brought about because of King Saul’s refusal to leave spiritual matters in
the hands of the prophet Samuel. The resulting schism was described using terms such as- The Lord has “rent the kingdom of Israel from [King Saul]…” and it will be given unto David.\(^{516}\) (Emphasis added.) Thus are most schisms a ‘renting,’ a tearing, and a ripping. They are acts of violence. Power is not released easily. Once having tasted of power, the power holder develops an appetite to hold on. Power also has the ability to transform the holders thereof from average people into despots. The story of King Saul demonstrates human behavior that causes schism. Saul was physically imposing, standing head and shoulders above “any of the people.”\(^{517}\) At the time he was chosen to be king, he was reticent to boast of his appointment as king, he suffered either from shyness or lack of confidence, or both. He was non-assuming, self deprecating, humble or meek, “little in thine own sight.”\(^{518}\) After he had served as king for a while, he began to view with suspicion, David, who was extremely loyal but had leadership potential.\(^{519}\) He also became increasingly unreasonable in his demands and was even about to put his son, Jonathan, to death for a minor offense before the people stopped him.\(^{520}\) In this last instance, Saul’s hubris is evident by the unreasonable and probably unnecessary oath he made, and his willingness to sacrifice his own son’s life because of it. Not being satisfied with being the secular ruler of all Israel, Saul’s exalted sense of self-importance eventually caused him to meddle in the spiritual affairs of the kingdom.\(^{521}\) Finally, after Saul’s death, his followers prolonged the reign of the house of Saul for another two years by placing his remaining son, Ishbosheth, on the throne.\(^{522}\) During these two years, Israel

\(^{516}\) 1 Samuel 15:28, 28:17.
\(^{517}\) 1 Samuel 9:2, 10:23.
\(^{518}\) 1 Samuel 10:16, 21-22, 15:17.
\(^{519}\) 1 Samuel 18:7-16.
\(^{520}\) 1 Samuel 14:24, 43-45.
\(^{521}\) 1 Samuel 13:8-14.
\(^{522}\) 2 Samuel 2:8-10.
was divided with part following David and part following Ishbosheth. After the end of this time, two of Ishbosheth’s captains killed him and brought his head to David, thinking to be rewarded. Instead, David had them killed for slaying “a righteous man in his own house upon his bed.” At this point, all the tribes of Israel accepted David’s leadership. Now, the schism was healed. That which was rent in two was made whole. David ruled a united kingdom for the rest of his life.

Not only does the foregoing account give a biblical perspective of schism, but it foreshadows many other schisms that have taken place to the current time. There are many parallels in this story that can be seen today and if the lessons of Saul’s failures can be taken to heart by those in leadership, painful schisms might be avoided. Many schisms would be prevented if leaders maintained the same attitudes that caused their election or selection in the beginning. In the early days of building relationships, or of leadership, leaders may commend themselves to those they lead by being humble and respectful of others. Unfortunately, in a strange reverse of Saul’s misappropriation of power, many spiritual leaders become discontented with being spiritual advisors, and seek to broaden their influence into the secular matters of those they lead. As Saul delved into matters that were beyond his scope of leadership, some pastors or organizational leaders become full of themselves, and begin to meddle in the personal lives of their followers in areas that do not have a direct bearing on their spiritual wellbeing. When this is practiced, it becomes easy for the leader to gradually assume more and more power. From the time of Samuel the prophet until now, history is replete with examples of spiritual power being abused.

---

523 2 Samuel 4:9-12.
524 2 Samuel 5:1-3.
that often includes sleeping with the women of the congregation. Schism almost always follows abuse of power. There will be a further examination of pastoral power and organizational power later in this chapter.

7.1.4 Judas – Problems with Money

One of the most painful schisms in the biblical record was the personal separation of Judas Iscariot from Jesus Christ and the disciples. The man whose name has become synonymous for traitor is known to have sold out Jesus to the authorities for thirty pieces of silver. But he was also the treasurer of the band of twelve, those disciples closest to Jesus Christ. The Gospel of John further identifies Judas as a thief. Obviously Judas did not have a following, but his personal schism, resulting in his own death as well as the crucifixion of Jesus, is another case of human behavior that is the root of some schism. The Apostle Paul said, “The love of money is the root of all evil…” Greed has certainly claimed its share of victims, and it has been the cause of many schisms.

Developing countries hold no exclusive rights on corruption, but they do have a higher rate of perceived corruption. The Philippines has seen improvement in lowering their perceived corruption rate, but in 2015 they were still rated for perceived corruption with a score of 35 out of a possible 100. They ranked 95th in a list of 168 countries on the website of Transparency International. Of course, not everyone in a developing country is corrupt. People who live in relative poverty are not accustomed to handling

525 1 Samuel 2:22.
526 Matthew 25:14-16.
529 1 Timothy 6:10.
larger amounts of money than it takes to provide daily sustenance, or to pay for weekly or monthly rents or moderate payments for purchases. When a leader takes a sum of money and uses it for personal reasons, it is not always a clear case of thievery. For instance, when one pastor in the Manila area gave his assistant the equivalent of nearly two thousand U.S. dollars to deposit in the bank, the assistant used it to purchase medicine for his sick mother. In his own eyes, he was probably borrowing the money, not stealing it. Never mind that he would probably never be able to pay it back. And besides, his mother was sick. Loyalty to clan often claims precedence over loyalty to employer or church organization. The Filipino pastor in this instance, understanding the nature of things in the Philippines, refused to involve the police. He lost the money and his assistant, and seemed to take it all in stride.\(^{531}\)

It should be kept in mind that there might be an entirely different mindset concerning the use of money from one culture to another. In the United States and Canada, there are laws that govern how some of the funds received by a charitable organization may be spent. One of the strictest controls concerns disbursement of designated funds. Funds given to a charitable organization for a designated purpose must be used for the purpose so designated.

When John Willhoite of the AMF gave funds to one pastor for the building of a chapel, he was disconcerted when that pastor distributed those funds to the men of the congregation so they could plant their rice crops. Willhoite remonstrated with the pastor about misuse of funds, but the pastor was not overly concerned. He explained it was no big deal, that the men needed the funds to plant their rice, and when they harvested the

\(^{531}\) This happened in a church in the Manila area in 2012. Information provided by the pastor, who shall remain anonymous to protect the identity of the assistant.
rice they would repay the funds, which is exactly what happened. There was no negative fallout from this case.\footnote{Willhoite, 153-5.} Another case did not turn out so well. One pastor built a comfort room in his church with the funds he was given for another purpose.\footnote{Comfort room (CR) is a toilet room.} He was fully intending to pay the funds back, and would probably have done so had not the American missionaries, enculturated by North American views of misappropriation of funds, accused him of fraud and theft. The end result of this episode was a split that saw a group of ministers leaving the organization and beginning a new, Filipino run organization.\footnote{James Childs, personal interview 24 November 2015 in Cebu City.} Contributing to this schism were money, misunderstanding and culture (loss of face).

Schism has also occurred when a group of ministers felt that the missionary was not properly distributing funds that they believed were sent to the missionary for their use. These types of misunderstandings over money are exacerbated by visiting preachers from North America who are touched by the need they witness during their visit, and make generous offers to raise funds for various projects, such as buying property and building a place of worship. On their return home, however, the preachers often forget what they have promised, or they find that it was easier to make the promise than to raise the funds. Time and distance intervene, and the promise is never carried out. Or it may be that funds are sent through the organization, which fails to forward the funds, or takes a percentage off the top. In any case, many national pastors have had their hopes dashed when promises, or expectations of money were not forthcoming. The missionary, as the face of the organization, suffers the brunt of displeasure and suspicion for ‘missing funds.’
The above-mentioned John Willhoite travelled in the United States and Canada for one year about 1973 in order to raise $34,000 that was to build 26 church buildings in the Philippines. He described this time as “very strenuous…My nerves gave way about half way through furlough. I was under such pressure to raise money that I could not take it.” He succeeded in raising the funds, but by the time he returned to the Philippines, costs of building supplies had doubled.

The Filipino ministers were very poor. Most of them were living on one U.S. dollar per day. Their food consisted of nothing but rice, salt, and a little vegetable. They knew I had been to the States and felt that I had plenty of money and they wanted part of it. A steady stream of ministers came to my house and I had to tell them the money I had was only for church buildings…The pressure was so great that I started falling apart again. My nerves would not let me face the ministers. I hid in my room a good part of the first two months that I was back in the Philippines.535

This illustrates the pressure upon a missionary to supply funds for national ministers, although in this case there was no schism as a result of his failure to do so.

Missionary James Childs said the organization he founded in 1985, Philippine Bible Apostolic Holiness Church (PBAHC), had over 300 congregations at one time but by 2015 it was down to 27. When asked the reason for the drastic decrease, he replied, “An American came over and divided them over money.”536 This means that, according to Childs, a visiting American pastor offered some type of financial support to the Filipino ministers under Child’s leadership, and lured them away and into another organization that could be controlled by the American.

Prior to the formation of the Worldwide Pentecostal Fellowship Philippines in 2008, several meetings were held throughout the Philippines with groups of ministers

535 Willhoite, 154-155.
536 James D. Childs, telephone conversation, 13 October 2015.
who had expressed an interest in joining the organization. The meetings were informational in nature, sharing the by-laws and articles of faith of the organization. One such meeting in the Manila area concluded with a question and answer session. One of the interested ministers asked, “If we join the WPF, how much will you give us per month, and for how many months?”\textsuperscript{537} This was a common question among ministers who attended these meetings. It would be difficult to know how many ministers had left one organization to join another because of the promise of some kind of financial benefit. This became a repeated story, heard several times during the course of this research. However, not all national ministers could be bought. As Ricardo Zabala Sr. stated of the missionaries, “We did not want their money. We wanted their message.”\textsuperscript{538}

7.1.5 Pharisees and Sadducees – Violence and Doctrinal Differences

Judaism during the first century was suffering from a schism because of differing viewpoints of doctrine. Pharisees were the religious conservatives and Sadducees were the liberals. Each group argued against the other, and even presented their opposing cases to Jesus on occasion. The apostle Paul, trained as a Pharisee, was well aware of the competition and disagreements between the two sects. He even took advantage of the schism to deflect attention from himself while he was being examined by the Jerusalem council.

But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissention between the Pharisees and the

\textsuperscript{537} The author was present at this meeting February 2008. The answer to the question was, “Zero for zero!”

\textsuperscript{538} David R. Banta, The United Pentecostal Church in the Philippines and its Implications to Community Development: An Evaluation, Master’s Thesis, (Graduate School, Angeles University Foundation, 1986), 48.
Sadducees: and the multitude was divided...And there arose a great cry: and the
scribes that were of the Pharisees part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in
this man...And when there arose a great dissension, the chief captain, fearing lest
Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go
down, and to take him by force from among them...  

The preceding Biblical report of schism points to the extreme and sometimes violent
emotions that arise due to doctrinal disagreements. Anger and force is seen in the schism
that shook Bethel Temple, the “flagship Assemblies of God church” in Manila during the
1960s and 1970s. Competing pastors “physically struggled for control of the microphone
in front of the whole congregation.” Numerous court cases occurred in attempting to
gain control of this local church that had been instrumental in giving “the Assemblies of
God name recognition throughout the country.” The police were called in to evict the
group occupying the premises, locks were changed, uniformed guards were stationed
onsite, and a crowd forced their way back into the building past the guards. “Fist
fights” broke out between competing congregations that resulted in police intervention.
The similarity of violence notwithstanding, the Bethel Temple schisms were unlike the
longstanding doctrinal differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Differences
were not really doctrinal but concerned administration, independence of local
congregations, and control of property. The current research has not discovered any
incidents of physical violence within the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the
Philippines, but there have been cases of legal action to confiscate property claimed by
more than one group.

540 Dave Johnson, Led by the Spirit (Pasig City: ICI Ministries, 2009), 195.
541 Dave Johnson, 79.
542 Dave Johnson, 202.
543 Dave Johnson, 199.
544 Dave Johnson, 196.
There have also been cases of doctrinal disputes within the movement. As seen in Chapter Two, it was a doctrinal dispute that caused the Assemblies of God to formulate their doctrinal creed, and to identify themselves as strongly Trinitarian. It was this difference of opinion over the primary question of theology, the study of the nature of God, which influenced the birth of the “New Issue” or Oneness Pentecostal movement as it is seen today. Faithfulness to doctrine was not the sole prerogative of the Oneness camp however. In fact, it was the Trinitarian majority at the fourth General Council in 1916, who “…barred from the fellowship, the Oneness contingent…”545 While the Oneness group seemed willing to remain within the AG, the Trinitarians took a stand preventing this from happening. Thus, schism over doctrinal issues can be caused by either side of a doctrinal dispute. In some cases, those considered heretical are forced out. At other times, those who differ from the majority depart of their own free will, believing that separation is necessary for them to be faithful to their beliefs.

While most doctrinal differences within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism are not as major as those that resulted in the New Issue schism, they have nonetheless been the cause of schism within the movement. Disagreement over whether or not women should be allowed to pastor, or even to preach, is one example of this. When Geneva Baily was voted in as missionary by the Fabrica congregation in 1969, Pastor Manuel Blanca was in fellowship with her, and sent his young people to the Bible school being conducted there. This stopped after he found out that Baily was baptizing. In an interview in 2014, Blanca said, “For us, in the Apostolic teaching, ladies do not baptize.” Baily pleaded with Blanca, saying, “Can you not give me liberty?” Blanca could not. He told her frankly,

545 Reed, 164.
“Sis. Baily, I cannot go with you. I cannot agree…I have to pull out my young people.”

How this subject relates to schism within Oneness Pentecostalism will be discussed in more detail below.

7.1.6 Diotrephes – Loving to Have the Preeminence

The Epistle of 3 John identifies Diotrephes as loving to have the preeminence among the church. Diotrephes appears to be a man in the leadership of a congregation, perhaps the primary leader. From the little written about him, two verses, he seems to have authority to refuse “the brethren” who either visit or become members of the congregation. He also possesses power to excommunicate those who would accept the brethren. Diotrephes once again demonstrates human behavior that causes schism. Schism caused by a Diotrephes-like-leader, or by those who love to have the preeminence, is all too common among the Filipino Oneness Pentecostal movement. What may be related to the love for preeminence is the refusal to be corrected. Hendriks and Soko point to schism in the Reformed Church of Zambia as due to a pastor refusing to accept discipline. He went across town with his loyal followers and started a new organization, howbeit with only one church.

There are probably a good number of organizations and independent works within the scope of this research that were started because of “loving to have the preeminence,” an inflated sense of importance, or simply the desire for significance or to be important. It is not always easy to distinguish between the natural desire for significance and the love
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546 Manuel Blanca, interview at Bacolod City, 14 November 2014.
of preeminence. The former is arguably the greatest of human emotional and spiritual needs. Humans seek to be significant. They want to know they are needed and appreciated. From the crib, where babies cry to be picked up and held, to the deathbed, where the dying hope to be surrounded by those who love them, humanity searches for significance. Education, occupation, marriage and relationships are possibly motivated by the desire for significance. People want their lives to count for something. This is one of the most prominent draws to a religion that promises a value to life beyond what is proposed by materialists. To desire significance is not a bad thing. It is good and natural. The love of preeminence is possibly the desire for significance that exceeds what is normal and decent. Significance can be found in the midst of others, like a violinist in an orchestra. The love for preeminence cannot be satisfied being one musician in an orchestra, but must be the conductor. Lovers of preeminence are willing to destroy others in order to maintain their own position on the top. They would rather be a one-man-band, performing on the street corner, than one member of a great orchestra playing in a large concert hall. The Diotrephes style of love for preeminence does not mind that it drives others off and reduces the size of the congregation, so long as he is in charge. To Diotrephes, the most important thing is not the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of Diotrephes.

7.2 David Barrett’s Study of Schism

Imminent statistician David B. Barrett published his landmark study of religious schism in Africa in 1968. Although Barrett used the term schism in his title, within the text he preferred the term independency, which sounds much more positive than schism. He said
the scale of secession from mission churches was “a phenomenon unprecedented in history.”

In the current study the use of the term ‘schism’ does not imply negativity. In most schism, independency, in one way or another, and for one reason or another, is the goal. His search for causative factors focused on the long-term situations that were viewed as the root causes, rather than more immediate flash points. He reviewed non-religious factors including historical, political, economic, sociological and ethnic influences.

Barrett looked at religious reasons, among which were the desire to find satisfaction in religion, and the “striving for cultural integrity and spiritual autonomy of religious and spiritual movements.” He also looked at theological factors, which he defined as “not doctrinal issues in the sense of controversies over specific dogmas, but some profound theological reasons which are usually unknown to the participants in the drama.”

Barrett rejected any single one of the above factors as causing “the phenomena of independency,” and settled rather on a multiplicity of causes. He developed a list of 18 variables that would determine “The Tribal Zeitgeist: a Scale of Religious Tension for a Tribal Unit.” Barrett used the German term zeitgeist meaning ‘spirit of the times’ as “a specific concept…the basic explanatory concept underlying independency.”

An examination of Pentecostalism in general, almost points to schism or independency as being an unavoidable part of “the spirit of the times.” This is graphically illustrated by Keith Warrington’s statement that “there are so many different Pentecostal churches that it now takes two dictionaries, and a regular supply of books and articles to explore them.”
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He also stated that in the first hundred years of existence, the Pentecostal movement grew from 200 denominations to 20,000.\(^{554}\) This is possibly never more evident than in the study of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. Barrett’s variables were arrived at in order to measure the religious tension within the tribal unit in Africa, and thus the propensity for religious independency. On the surface, the variables have little or no relevance to a study of schism among Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines. This is evident upon examination of the questions used to arrive at the variables. The questions are placed into five distinct categories approximating chronological order. The first category concerns “traditional culture”, and asks if the tribe is Bantu, exceeds 115,000 population and whether polygamy is common. The second category is about “traditional religion.” It seeks to determine if the ancestor-cult is important to the tribe and if there is an earth goddess. Barrett’s third category examines the “colonial period,” asking if colonial rule arrived over 100 years earlier, did white settlers occupy tribal territory and is the national per capita income greater than US $70 per year. (Approximately US $500 in 2016 adjusted for inflation.)

As can be seen, these questions were designed specifically for a tribal unit in Africa. Most of them would be difficult to apply to the Philippines, primarily because with the possible exception of some of the indigenous people, usually found in the mountainous areas, the Philippines can no longer be considered a tribal society. The large population centers in costal regions, formerly inhabited by lowlanders, have become heterogeneous due to years of cross migrations. The capital, Manila is the most densely populated city in the world, with an overall urban area population of more than 21

million. It is a mix of people from throughout the Philippine Islands, not to mention large representations of Americans, Chinese, Spanish and Koreans.555 Because most Filipinos are not easily identified as tribal people, and do not reside in tribal territories, it would be difficult to view the Philippines through the lens developed by Barrett. It must also be kept in mind that this study focuses on the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, not on the history of any particular tribe or even language group. Nonetheless, there are some of Barrett’s variables that might exist in the Philippines either in isolated tribal areas, or in the population at large. For instance, much of the ancestral cult from Filipino traditional religion survives today in the Catholic observance of All Saints Day when much of the population visits the graves of deceased family members, often leaving gifts of food for the dead. Another of Barrett’s questions that must be answered in the affirmative for the Philippines is number 6, “Did colonial rule arrive more than 100 years ago?” The answer, of course, is yes. As to whether “white settlers” occupied tribal land; while “white settlers” during the Spanish rule occupied land in the Philippines, it was not primarily tribal land, and such occupations largely ceased following Spain’s exit from the country. Of more significance might be the 400,000 acres accumulated by the friars during Spanish rule, but this problem was resolved (more or less) by the Philippine Commission of 1903.556 Barrett’s ninth question is found at the beginning of his next category, the “missionary period” and asks if “the missions arrive[d] more than 60 years ago”.557 The answer in the case of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines is “no”. Those of Barrett’s variables that might be


556 Francia, 160. Earlier mentioned in Chapter 3.2.
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found in the Philippines could hardly be used to create a tribal zeitgeist. There are however, some areas where Barrett’s questions might at least help to give insight into schism or independency.

7.2.1 Barrett’s Variables 10 through 13 – Exposure to the Bible

Questions 10 through 13 deal with the availability of the Bible to the people in their own language. Though the Bible was available for many years, the Catholic population in the Philippines were not always encouraged to read it. Thus, when George Torres Sr. heard his priest, Father Saragoza say, “You should read the Bible, for the Bible is the word of God,” it was as though the Bible was made available to him for the first time in his life. The Torres story adds perspective to the history of the movement, and to Barrett’s variables that deal with exposure to the Bible.

George Torres Sr. was born 20 August 1918, and like most Filipinos, was born into a Catholic family. His children described him as a normal Catholic. He liked to drink alcohol, smoke cigarettes, watch movies and engage in all types of gambling, especially the cockfights. In 1969 Torres and his son, George Torres Jr. attended a Samaritan weekend retreat, which was described as the poor people’s Cursillo. (Cursillo, or ‘Little Course’ is the three-day course offered by the Catholic lay organization- Cursillistas. In the Philippines, the Cursillistas were made up of the elite within the church. The Samaritans was the same type of organization for the normal or poor people.) During the Samaritan course, one of the instructors, Father Saragoza of the San Sebastian Cathedral in Bacolod City, held up a Bible, saying, “You must read the Bible, because the Bible is
the word of God.” According to George Torres Jr., who was interviewed in 2014 for this research,

George Sr. did not have a Bible. The Catholics taught that if you read the Bible you will go mad. We were not encouraged to have a Bible. We listened to the priest attentively. George Sr. borrowed a Bible from another Samaritan, who had a Bible but didn’t read it.

In this case, perception was reality, because the Torres family did not own a Bible and had never read it. This in spite of the fact that they were part of the Samaritans, who would hold prayers to Mary in a different house of the Barangay every night beginning at 6:30 pm, and lasting over an hour. They were members of the oldest cathedral in Bacolod City, attending 4:00 AM mass every Sunday. George Torres Sr. began to read the Bible for the first time in his life. George Torres Jr. said in 2014:

When he read in the book of Exodus about graven images, he gathered all the Catholic images in his house and threw them into the septic tank. At once, he felt something like a current hit him in the top of his head and spread through his body to his feet. He felt great joy. He also felt very light, like he was floating. He had been smoking cigarettes since nine years of age and had a bad cough. Immediately he was healed of his cough. Immediately he also stopped smoking, drinking, going to movies, and all forms of gambling including cock fighting. He also began to read in the Bible that you should not repeat or have repetition in your prayers, so he stopped saying the Hail Mary.

Torres began going to the public plaza, directly across from the cathedral where he used to worship, to share the Bible. He saw in the Bible where baptism was by immersion, so in 1969 he found someone to baptize him by immersion. The man who baptized him was Leon Pangantihon, a clerk in a law office. He said, “If your baptism is not done in the name of Jesus Christ according to Colossians 3:17, then it is not valid.” When he administered the baptism he said, “I baptize you in the Name of the Father and of the son

558 George Torres Jr., personal interview, Bacolod City, 22 February 2014. According to Torres Jr., Father Saragoza later left the priesthood to get married.
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560 Demetrio Torres, personal interview in Bacolod City, 21 November 2015.
and of the Holy Ghost. Father, I do this in the name of Jesus Christ. Father, thank you for writing the name of George Torres in the book of life.” Pangantihon had been a member of the Trinitarian Protestant group but left them because they did not believe in divine healing. George Jr. said, “When we heard about baptism in the name of Jesus we confronted him. He said the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus. I was confused because there was only one baptism.”

George Torres Sr. returned home from the public plaza one day in 1971 after sharing the Bible and said, “The word of God boomeranged, because I was preaching about Acts 2:38 and I am not baptized in the name of Jesus.” He did not consider his baptism by Pangantihon to have been in the name of Jesus because of his use of the formula found in Matthew 28:19. In the Torres house that day was the family and a friend, Alphonso Alcade, an accountant. They all went down to the ocean where George Sr. baptized Alcade who then baptized George Sr. and then his sons, George Jr., Demetrio, his son-in-law Freddie Clauor and the wife of George Jr.

Before this happened, Demetrio had already been witnessed to by Victoria Torres (no relation) who was a member of an ACJC church pastored by Manuel Blanca. They visited this church where, in September 1975, George Jr. was baptized by Blanca, “Because I was convinced the word ‘name’ in Matthew 28:19 was singular. Name, not names. The word convicted me. Name. The name of Jesus.” Even though they had been baptized in the name of Jesus by the accountant, Alcade, it never felt complete to them. As George Jr. put it, “He was not authorized to baptize.” Demetrio was baptized in October 1975. George Sr., his wife and three daughters, and the youngest brother, Martin, were also baptized by Blanca in November 1975. Eventually all nine of the Torres
children were baptized in Jesus’ name. Counting their infant baptism in the Catholic Church, this was the fourth baptism for most of the family. After 1975 they all attended Blanca’s church. The family of George Torres Sr. was instrumental in the conversion of about 30 men and women who later became ministers or workers in the Oneness Pentecostal movement, including influential leaders Edwardo and Edgardo Camalon and Samson Cordova. His son, Demetrio Torres was the chairman of the ACJC.

George Torres Sr. died 23 June 1979. Although he received credentials from the ACJC, he was primarily an assistant to the pastor, working in the local church or being tasked to oversee worship services in one of the outstation works. He might be considered an example of one of the many lay preachers in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. Although their contribution to the movement has been considerable, their recognition has remained minimal or nonexistent. What was unusual about him is that he came to believe in, and experience baptism in Jesus’ name before ever being exposed to other Oneness Pentecostals. It took association with a Pentecostal church, however, before he and his family experienced Holy Spirit baptism. His response to Father Saragoza’s challenge to read the Bible, by borrowing and reading the Bible, led to his personal independency, and that of his family, from Roman Catholicism and began a journey that arrived at Oneness Pentecostalism.

An entirely different case, but relating to the same variables, is that of Thomas Macleod who, along with his wife Marjorie, created the written language for the Umiray Dumaget tribe on Luzon’s central east coast in the 1960s. In the process of translating the New Testament into the vernacular that they had created, Macleod arrived at the understanding that tongues was evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit. He also
experienced Spirit baptism and tongues, which led him to approach his missionary 

sending agency, the Plymouth Brethren in British Columbia, Canada with a confession of 

his experience. Macleod had already been baptized in Jesus’ name, as that is what his 
group practiced. The Plymouth Brethren (Closed Brethren), who supported the Macleods 
by sending offerings from several congregations, dropped him over the tongues issue. An 

Open Brethren congregation in Calgary, Alberta assumed responsibility for their 
support.561 While Macleod remained part of the Plymouth Brethren until his untimely 
death in 1977, he might be considered, by virtue of his Spirit baptism, an unidentified 
Pentecostal.562 This is an example of how the act of translating the New Testament into 
the vernacular had the effect of bringing about schism, albeit only on the part of the 
translator and his family, and only from the Closed Brethren to the Open Brethren. But it 
also affected what this particular translator/missionary taught his audience, part of which 
later migrated into identifiable Oneness Pentecostalism as a result of ministry by 
Macleod’s son, James beginning in 2001.563 

A similar, but more complete conversion happened about 1969 when Benvenido 
Patts was asked to translate some Oneness Pentecostal religious tracts by Chuck Maly, a 
UPCI member corresponding from Modesto, California. Patts was a member of the 
Assembly of God and assisting his uncle who was the pastor of the Evangelical Church 
of Christ, which was affiliated with the Assemblies of God in General Santos City. He 
was a college professor teaching at Marine Bible School, and was a member of 

562 Thomas Macleod died of hepatitis contracted in the Philippines. 
563 More than a decade after his death, Macleod’s son and daughter became members of a Oneness 
Pentecostal church in Calgary, Canada. Additionally, some of those the Macleods worked with in Matawe 
have been evangelized and brought into Oneness Pentecostalism by Macleod’s son, James, who has 
returned to the area for ministry purposes on several occasions.
International Translators. In the process of translating these doctrinal tracts from English into Cebuano, he was converted to the doctrine they proclaimed.\textsuperscript{564} Patts and his immediate family joined the UPCP, and he went on to become an instructor at the first formal UPCP Bible School in the Philippines that opened at Balibago, Angeles City in 1970. Barrett’s variables concerning the availability of scriptures in the vernacular can be extended to individual exposure to the Bible or to looking at the Bible in a new way as a translator might. The above incidents illustrate that just as having the scriptures available in the vernacular might be one of the factors contributing to independency in African tribes, so does the action of translating those scriptures have a potential effect upon those doing the translation. It causes the translator to look at long familiar scriptures in new and possibly revelatory ways.

\textbf{7.2.2 Barrett’s 18\textsuperscript{th} Variable – Exposure to Independency}

Barrett’s last category of questions is for “the current period”. There are four questions, the first three of which are probably irrelevant to the causes of schism in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. “Are Muslims in the nation less than 50 per cent?” (Yes, and they are concentrated in the extreme southwest of the Philippines, in Mindanao.) “Are Protestants in the tribe 20 per cent or over?” (Less than 20 percent in the entire country.) And, “Are Catholics in the tribe 20 per cent or over?” (Probably over 80 percent in the entire country.) As mentioned above, application of Barrett’s “tribal zeitgeist” can hardly be applied to today’s basically non-tribal Philippines. Another, perhaps more relevant, of Barrett’s variables is found by the last question, number 18. “Is there independency in

\textsuperscript{564} The tracts were entitled, \textit{Why We Baptize in Jesus Name} and \textit{The Mystery of Mysteries}. Information provided by Ben Patts Jr. 30 September 2015.
any physically adjoining tribe?” Perhaps more than any other of the 18 questions, this one might relate to the actual propensity of schism within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. While the African tribal zeitgeist frame cannot be easily placed over the movement under consideration, if a local church, or a group of local churches in close fellowship, can be considered in a similar manner to a tribal unit, then question number 18 becomes relevant. The question might be rephrased thusly: “Is there independency in any church or group of churches in close fellowship with this one?” What this seems to be asking is, “Has this pastor or group been exposed to other schisms?” The obvious implication is that knowledge of, or exposure to schisms in nearby populations might suggest the possibility of, and encourage the participation in schisms. Plainly put, “If they can do it, so can we.” Where one pastor has separated from an organization, that pastor’s friends, family or acquaintances might more easily do the same. The pertinent application for Oneness Pentecostalism becomes apparent when looking at two areas of the movement’s history. The first is the history of migration into the movement and the second is the history of schism within the movement.

The first might be applicable to religious migration from any religious movement into any other. What this means is that once a family member or friend breaks from one faith, or organization, to join another, it becomes easier for a relation or acquaintance to do likewise. Whether the migration is from Catholicism to Protestantism, or Methodism to Pentecostalism, or vice versa, schism seems to become easier when someone else does it first. Migration usually starts with one person, who then goes on to influence his or her family, friends and acquaintances. This might explain the case of the Dela Cruz family from Negros Occidental. The entire family of parents and eleven children originally
converted from Catholicism into Oneness Pentecostalism under the ACJC of Carlos Grant about 1976. It began when one of the brothers, Elias, married a woman who attended the ACJC church pastored by Samson Cordova in Bacolod City. It was against the rules of the ACJC for the woman to marry someone outside the same belief system, but it gave Elias the opportunity to be exposed to Oneness Pentecostalism. He was so impressed with his first service that “he was bubbling.” He witnessed to his family, but they resisted until Elias’ first-born daughter, who was the darling of her aunt and uncles, died at the age of 2 years. The entire family attended the funeral, which was the first time they had attended Elias’ church. The whole family was converted. Five of the ten brothers became ministers. They split from ACJC about 1988 and became founding members of the AJNC. Eventually they all left AJNC and became members of five separate organizations, four of them founding their own.565 This also illustrates the second area of schism, that which is within the movement. Migration into the movement and schism within the movement are related. If a person separates from one belief system, perhaps from one he or she has been born into, they may find changing churches or organizations later, easier to do. Making application of the present example, once the Dela Cruz family cut their lifelong association with Catholicism, it became easier for them to separate from the ACJC, and then from the AJNC. After all, their separation from Catholicism was a major and life changing event in that it required a clean break from one belief system and acceptance of radically different beliefs. In comparison, schism within the movement can be considered minor because it only required changing organizations, or creating new ones, within the same belief system. Therefore, migration

565 Ricaredo Zabala Dela Cruz, personal interview, 16 February 2013.
into Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines often facilitates schism within the movement at a later date.

7.3 Independency of Founding Missionaries

What has occurred in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism on more than one occasion, that might possibly not have been a concern in Barrett’s study, is the independency of founding missionaries. Among the first three pioneers discussed in Chapters Four and Five, Aventura, Noble and Grant, the latter two were also pioneers in schism. Aventura arrived in the Philippines in 1937 as a member, but probably not a minister, of the Apostolic Faith Church. He later affiliated with the UPCP. When the first UPCI missionaries were having severe problems getting along with one another, the idea of independency was suggested to him by some of his young ministers. In the end, Aventura remained with the UPCP until his death. Other than his migration from Catholicism into the Apostolic Faith Church and finally the UPCP, Aventura cannot be considered a pioneer of schism. Diamond Noble, on the other hand, joined and then left the UPCI in 1947 while he was still in the United States. Subsequently he joined and then left COOLJC. Finally, he joined and then left the ALJC. He can certainly be considered a pioneer in schism within the movement, and his work went on to split into at least 12 different organizations. Like Noble, Carlos Grant can been seen as a pioneer of schism. He first came to the Philippines as a UPCI missionary. After experiencing problems with other Philippine based UPCI missionaries who came later, he left the UPCI and started the ACJC. He was then, concurrent with being the leader of the ACJC, a member of
ALJC from around 1967 until the late 1990s when he withdrew.\textsuperscript{566} Another missionary, Johnny Willhoite, went to the Philippines about 1970 and founded the AMF there in 1972. Willhoite, who had originally been with the UPCI before joining the AMF, rejoined the UPCI while in the United States on furlough, returning to the Philippines as a UPCI missionary. From these three men, Noble, Grant and Willhoite, can be traced, directly or indirectly, at least 51 of the 120 separate Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines discovered in the course of this study. Almost one half of the total! (See the organizational charts in Chapters Four and Six.)

While exposure to others who have separated may not be an actual cause of independency, it does create a culture where schism is not unknown, and may be viewed as an acceptable alternative. As Pentecostalism as a whole was birthed in this culture, and continued to promulgate it, so was the Philippines, as a whole, exposed to religious schism from the time of national aspirations for independence. As was seen in the case of Gregorio Aglipay, both national independence and religious independence were birthed from the same womb.\textsuperscript{567}

\textbf{7.4 Causes of Schism}

In a brief examination of sectarianism and organization in the early post-Azusa years, Allan Anderson points to several causes of schism. They include racism, leadership ambitions, excesses of leaders, and doctrinal issues.\textsuperscript{568} Racism does not appear to play a major part in schism within this movement. That is not to say there was a total absence of
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racism, but in most cases it was muted. The researcher noticed obvious signs of micro-aggression on the part of some American missionaries in the Philippines as will be discussed below. Leadership ambitions, excesses of leaders, and doctrinal issues have certainly contributed to schism in this movement as seen in the historical chapters and in the sections that follow. Anderson also cites Frank Bartleman’s belief that divisions were caused by “the ‘organized church’, ‘human manipulation’ and ‘party spirit’.”

Anderson, like Barrett before him, did extensive work on independency of African churches. In *African Reformation: African Initiated Christianity in the 20th Century*, he devoted a full chapter to the “Origins and Causes” of the “emergence and growth” of what he called “African Initiated Churches” (AIC). Anderson examined five possible “underlying causes”, some of which overlapped with Barrett’s root causes. Anderson’s “Social and Political Factors” were part of Barrett’s “Non-Religious” category. And although racism has been discounted as influencing schism among Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines, the “desire for African self-expression and freedom from missionary control” that Anderson cited in his work are also applicable to Filipinos, and must be remembered when examining nationalism below. Whereas Barrett pointed to a “reaction to European missions”, Anderson’s second possible underlying cause, as an important cause of schism in Africa, Anderson felt that “The majority of AICs today [2001] did not begin in secessions from European missionary churches…” This has been found to be negligible in this study as well. Anderson then examined “Protestant Denominationalism”, and while this explains some of the migration into the Oneness
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Pentecostal movement, it is less likely to affect schism within the movement. The fourth of Anderson’s causes was, like Barrett’s variables 10-13, “Bible Translations”. As seen above, this has had an affect on movement into Oneness Pentecostalism, but more on a personal level than on a collective one. “Religious Factors” constituted the fifth area of causative factors for Anderson. These would include the reasons most people join the movement, causing their separation from other denominations. This study has found that religious factors are generally divided into two categories, doctrinal and experiential. As seen in the survey in Chapter Two, the healings and Spirit baptism witnessed or experienced by friends, family members or visitors to church services remain the number one motivating factor for becoming a part of this movement. Second only to that was the Bible studies and pulpit teaching/preaching that focused on the doctrines of One God, water baptism in Jesus’ name and essentiality of Spirit baptism. It was the former that appealed to non-Pentecostals and the latter that attracted whatever Trinitarian Pentecostals and Charismatics made the change to Oneness Pentecostalism. The religious factor also included, Anderson said, “Powerful people – charismatic leaders who attracted followers through their preaching and healing attributed to the power of the Holy Spirit…This concept of a man or woman “of the Spirit” was a leading factor…” The history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines has certainly found this to be true as seen in the histories of those like Diamond Noble, Zebedea Sinen and Wilde Almeda.

Added to Anderson’s group of five underlying causes was a final cause he called “Precipitating Factors”. These were not to be seen as root causes, but only the “accidental
or incidental” spark that “may arise to trigger off the explosion.” In this study these might include misunderstandings over money, miscommunication, failing to show up for a meeting, false accusation, an ill-timed reproof, or perceived disrespect. As seen earlier in this chapter, Barrett proposes “multiple causation” and he cautions that care must be taken in placing too much emphasis on any single factor that has been mentioned. Anderson likewise warns against isolating any single factor as causing independency. He closes his chapter on “Origins and Causes” by advising, “The causes for the AICs should rather be seen as multiple, complex and idiosyncratic.” This also holds true for the schisms discovered in this study.

7.4.1 Doctrinal Issues

The Finished Work and Oneness doctrines were major issues in their day and remain so today. Those who embraced the Finished Work doctrine of William Durham believed that it was a revelation of greater truth than what they had previously been taught. Likewise with the New Issue, Oneness believers were convinced that the doctrines of water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and the Oneness of God were a return to original Christianity as practiced by the first century Church. This remains one of the primary factors for migration into the movement as was seen in the Survey reviewed toward the end of Chapter Two. These are certainly theological issues, but unlike those in Barrett’s theological category, which were “…not doctrinal issues in the sense of
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controversies over specific dogmas…’’ the issues which precipitate movement into
Oneness Pentecostalism are almost always either primarily or secondarily doctrinal.577

Oneness Pentecostals, most of whom are Essentialists, radically present their
beliefs in the Oneness of God, the necessity of baptism or rebaptism into the name of
Jesus Christ, and Spirit baptism evidenced by tongues. The extreme exclusivism inherent
in such doctrinal distinctives is one of the chief causes of schism. They generally feel no
obligation toward other faiths that do not share these beliefs. Therefore, they have no
reluctance to proselytize preachers or members from other churches or organizations. On
the other hand, it is this same message presented in such a strong manner that resonates
with so many people. Perhaps if they were satisfied in their former churches, they would
not be susceptible to the claims of Oneness Pentecostals. It should be remembered that,
according to the Pew Survey, sixty-six percent of Pentecostals in the Philippines were
formerly Catholic, and six percent were from some other religion. That compares with
fifty-nine percent and twenty percent respectively for the Oneness Pentecostals. For one
reason or another, usually for some dissatisfaction, a significant number of people will
change their religious affiliation. All such changes reflect schism in some form.

It is not unusual, even within the movement, for preachers to claim special
‘revelation’ for any number of doctrines. Perceived greater truth may also include
teachings that many would consider much less important, but obviously they are
important enough to cause schism. These are things like, women preachers, the eating of
balot (the Filipino delicacy of duck or chicken egg in which the embryo has been allowed
to develop before being eaten), keeping Saturday as the Sabbath, allowing women to trim
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their hair and so forth. This tendency can only be exacerbated by the extreme literalism common among Pentecostals.

The lack of education and extreme literalism of early Oneness pioneers was a trait shared by other early Pentecostals and does not appear to have had a major effect on schism within the Oneness movement in any discernable degree of difference with other Pentecostal movements in the Philippines. By the time Oneness Pentecostalism was introduced in the Philippines, Diamond Noble was well educated and had attended at least one Bible school in the United States. The first Oneness missionaries were also educated in Bible schools in the United States. Although it is understood that these Bible schools were, in the 1940s and 1950s, a long way from any form of accredited education, it was the norm for that time among Pentecostals of all types, and was a great improvement over the education of the early Oneness pioneers. Filipinos, in particular, place great emphasis on education. For example, many hotels and restaurants in the Philippines will only hire graduates with a three-year Hotel and Management degree. Considering the importance of education for Filipinos, it is likely that Filipino Oneness Pentecostal preachers would have a higher level of both secular and religious education than a comparable number of Oneness preachers from North America. However, extreme literalism is still a hallmark among most Oneness Pentecostals, and one they are not ashamed to admit. Although it has not been seen that literalism has had a measurable effect on schism, it may be one of many factors that combine to foster it.

Perhaps the primary cause of the schism between Diamond Noble and Pedro Siao was that Siao came to believe and teach that humans were fallen angels. Noble could not
countenance that teaching and would not condone Siao’s teaching it.\textsuperscript{578} Sometimes differences in doctrine are not the cause of the schism, but are later used as the reason to justify and maintain the continued separation. Sometimes differences in doctrine evolve slowly, after schism has already taken place. An example of a doctrinal issue that developed following schism can be found in the Philippine Apostolic Mission Incorporated (PAMI). Twenty years after founding PAMI, Chairman for life Ziegfred S. Lake posted a study of water baptism on the organization’s Facebook page on 22 March 2015 entitled, “INTO WHAT NAME WERE YOU BAPTIZED?” The study concluded with the following command.

In closing, I, Rev. Ziegfred Lake, command every minister under my ministry from this day on, to baptize every believer “in the name of Jesus Christ,” “in the name of the Lord Jesus,” or “sa pangalan ng Panginoong Jesus.” That there shall not be any other utterance except the aforementioned phrases during baptism. Further, all ministers and believers who have been baptized “in Jesus’ name,” “sa pangalan ni Jesus,” “sa pangalan ni Jesucristo” or “sa pangalan ni Jesu-crasto” are instructed to undergo re-baptism using “in the name of Jesus Christ,” “in the name of the Lord Jesus,” or “sa pangalan ng Panginoong Jesus.”\textsuperscript{579}

The sharp pronunciation of such a statement sets apart the PAMI from most of the other Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines and is one way to effectually maintain a stark difference from them. This allows the leader to promote the superiority of his organization. It works toward building respect for the leader as more intelligent, more spiritual or more biblical than others. It also discourages ministers and members from considering a lateral move into another Oneness organization that does not share the same revelation.

\textsuperscript{578} Avelina Noble, personal interview 11 November 2015.
\textsuperscript{579} Phil Apostolic Mission, Facebook, 22 March 2015 (accessed 24 October 2015).
If a religious leader has ‘discovered’ an exclusive doctrinal ‘truth’ or ‘revelation’, it can lead to feelings of spiritual superiority. It is not unusual for the leader of an organization to cement his authority by receiving ‘special revelation’ that few or no others have. This might develop into a greater perceived spirituality, or it may morph into a doctrinal issue. Often greater perceived spirituality and greater perceived truth go hand in hand. It is typical for the preacher who has received a revelation of greater truth to consider himself or herself as more spiritual than others who do not have the same revelation. Many individuals have separated themselves from local churches as a result of a ‘revelation’ they have received. Sometimes, this results in the beginning of a new church or organization.

7.4.2 Administration and Management

Bartleman’s observation (above) that “the organized church, human manipulation and party spirit” is responsible for divisions belongs within “administration and management.” According to Barrett, this would be a non-religious cause of schism. Anderson’s “leadership ambitions” and “excesses of leaders” also fit here. Ministers have left organizations because they did not agree with how they were operated. In some cases, the departures occurred after leadership changes with which they disagreed. Apollo C. Quiboloy cited administrative differences as one of the reasons he left the UPCP. He also disagreed with their “man made bylaws” which he thought they regarded nearly as highly as they did the Bible. In some cases, administrative procedures forced pastors out of the organization because they failed to make their monthly “report.” The report includes sending funds to the organization. This is not an uncommon occurrence within the UPCP.
Disagreement with administration might be used as justification for a separation when the issue is really another matter. For instance, a minister who is under investigation for immorality might leave the organization rather than submit to discipline. By 1997 the UPCP had the most liberal policy within the UPCI on the restoration of a minister who had fallen into sexual immorality. While the UPCI had a strict no tolerance and no restoration policy, the UPCP allowed a fallen minister to be restored to a local license, the lowest available credentials, if he or she would submit to leaving the church they pastored, being silenced for two years and never holding an office. One long time pastor and former official of the UPCP said that he counted ten pastors who had fallen into immorality between 1992 and 1997. Only one of them accepted discipline and was restored. What this means is that those ministers who are guilty of sexual immorality, but who wish to maintain their ministry with some semblance of leadership position will either make a lateral move into another organization, or start a new organization. This is the reason some of the current organizations and independent churches were started. Leadership conflict must be considered an important factor in separation and creation of new churches or organizations.

7.4.3 Nationalism

As has already been seen, Aglipayism was extremely nationalistic in its formation. Its creation can be attributed almost solely to political schism rather than religious sectarianism. Likewise, the Iglesia Ni Cristo, due to founder Felix Manalo’s disagreements within the Seventh Day Adventists over the “customary authority
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581 See Chapter 3.3.3.
relationships between Westerners and Filipinos” could be considered to have been founded with nationalistic tendencies.\textsuperscript{582} Today, the INC is an extremely nationalistic and politically active organization. From the current research however, there does not seem to be a significant amount of nationalism within Oneness Pentecostalism. Although Filipino Oneness Pentecostals are as patriotic as other Filipinos, they mostly retain an appreciation for the American missionaries who brought them the message. Only muted tones of nationalism may be detected in some of the organizations. There are some leaders who have expressed they don’t need a missionary. And others are offended at the way missionaries continue to run their organizations, or have places of honor on the national boards. While these things might be expressed to a sympathetic ear, the feelings are usually not strong enough to cause schism. Nationalistic feelings have affected schism only if the difference of administrative style, and communication between missionaries and national workers is considered.

Recent research that has addressed schism in any depth is generally related to an examination of churches in a particular country far removed from the Philippines, with far different racial dynamics and at least moderately different social structure. Additionally, much of the time, schism involves separation from older colonially established organizations or, at least with regard to Pentecostalism, organizations founded by North American or European led organizations. Many of these schisms must be considered at least partly motivated by the desire of nationals to look after their own spiritual affairs and may include some nationalistic inclinations in a protest against what

may be perceived as paternalism on the part of the founding missions society. Likewise, schism in Southern Shona, studied by Daneel and published in 1974, is also nationalistic at root, although Daneel makes the point against the commonly accepted cause as being ‘reaction’ of Africans against the colonial missions.\textsuperscript{583} The other in depth study of schism reviewed for this study is Barrett’s research that is also exclusively African, and focuses on departure from colonial mission organizations.

But the Philippines is not Africa. Although most early missionaries and some later ones were paternalistic, American missions did not have the same history of colonialization as did European missions in Africa. While overtones of racial superiority were not as pronounced among missionaries in the Philippines as among earlier missionaries in Africa, there could none the less have existed among Filipinos the feeling that they were not trusted to be in charge of their own organizations. In many cases, they would have been correct. This is not to say that reaction to colonialism plays no part in Filipino schism. It certainly did in the formation of Aglipayism. But this was a reaction, fueled by revolutionary fervor against more than three centuries of Spanish rule and accumulated abuse by the friars. This kind of reaction seems to have had little or no effect on the causes of the many schisms in Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism. Therefore, unless evidence emerges to the contrary, nationalism must be discounted as a cause of schism among the Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines.

7.5 Power in Pentecost

The term ‘power’ in Pentecostal studies is most often used to refer to the empowerment of every Spirit filled believer. In his foretelling of the coming of the Spirit, Jesus promised his followers, “But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you…” Pentecostalism as a whole is a power movement. The power of the Spirit is offered “to all regardless of education, language, race, class, or gender.” Unlike more traditional religions where power is concentrated, “in the hands of an elite clergy…Pentecostal churches…provide opportunities in empowering their members through the gifts of the Spirit.” Actually, it is God through his Spirit who empowers, but Suico is correct in saying that “any member in the congregation has equal opportunity to ‘move in the Spirit’ such as prophesying, interpretation of tongues, healing, or discerning of spirits.” Wonsuk Ma refers to the sense of “powerlessness” that afflicts people in Asian nations on both personal and collective levels, and contends that liberation from colonialism and the restoration of national, corporate and personal identity is only possible through change that can only come via “the power of the Holy Spirit…” This has been discovered by those who have become part of Pentecostalism in the Philippines. There must be a distinction between the power that accompanies Spirit infilling (spiritual power), and the power exercised by those at the top of a religious hierarchy (religious power). The religious hierarchy might be as small as a local congregation or as large as a million-member organization. In this regard, spiritual power

584 Acts 1:8.
585 Allan Anderson, To the Ends of the Earth, 251.
is not the same as religious power. The remainder of this section deals primarily with
religious power.

Edgardo Camalon, leader of IOACJC was asked, “Why are there so many
Oneness organizations in the Philippines?” He said, “We lack the American leadership
that we have lacked from the beginning. Filipinos say to Filipinos, ‘Why should I remain
under your leadership? I know as much as you. I will go out and start my own work.’
Many pastors feel, ‘Why follow if you can lead?’” Likewise, when asked, concerning the
Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines, “Why are there so many splits?”
Pastor Jestor Federico immediately and emphatically answered, “Because everyone wants
to be in charge!”

Demetrio Torres, chairman of ACJC quickly agreed.

Egalitarianism is not a reality in the Philippines.

Power in the affairs of people comes basically from two areas- money and
position. Even position is generally associated with money. That is, position is usually
derived either from having money, or being appointed to position by someone with
money. Power in general, is at a premium in the Philippines. In the area of the Philippines
that she studied, Fenella Cannell wrote “practically every conversation…deals with the
problem of powerlessness.” Interestingly, these conversations invariably include the
subject of poverty, so that once again we see power associated with wealth.

One exception to the money-equals-power rule is in religious settings. As has
been seen in the earlier examination of class and the patron/client system, there remains a

589 Demetrio Torres, personal interview at Bacolod, Negros Occ., 22 February 2014.
great amount of deference to those who have power. This is visible in all levels of society, from employment situations all the way through the highest political positions in the country. In religious structures, as in all other segments of Filipino life, position is power. When a man or woman gets into the ministry, they are placed into a position of power that they might never have experienced before. The only way they would experience such power is to operate a business that employs others or come from a family with money, a rare thing among Filipino Oneness Pentecostals. It is therefore understandable that the possibility to obtain power is highly tempting. Among Oneness Pentecostals, and presumably others, the pursuit of power, whether in a local church or in an organization has been the cause of schism.

7.5.1 Power in Local Church Leadership

Local congregations are normally composed of individual members who share common spiritual experiences, desires and rules. In Oneness Pentecostalism, this usually includes water and Spirit baptism, church attendance and living a certain standard of lifestyle as taught by the pastor. The pastor is seen as leader of the congregation by virtue of his calling by God into the pastoral/pulpit ministry, his burden and obedience to pioneer or pastor the congregation, and sometimes by his endorsement or, less often, appointment to the pastoral position by a higher body or board. His calling is seen as unique within the congregation. The individual who is pioneering a church comes into this power gradually, but by the time the congregation has grown to even a handful of families, the power becomes tangible. Generally speaking, the larger the congregation, the greater the power of the pastor. Congregants will usually grant to their pastor a similar deference that they

591 See Chapter 3.1.1 – 3.1.2.
grant to their employer or patron. If not kept in check by humility, and the proper understanding that in the kingdom of God all are equals, positions of power can become intoxicating.

Many promising individuals within local churches have been sponsored by their pastors to attend Bible College. When they return home after completing their studies, some of them have an exalted opinion of themselves. Because education is so highly regarded in the Philippines, some of the members of the congregation may offer these new graduates a greater level of respect. It is not unusual for a new graduate to challenge the pastor; often an elderly man or woman with little education, and who never had the opportunity to attend Bible College. Pressure may be applied to the elder pastor to step down and turn the church over to the younger, more educated minister. Failing that, some recent graduates have started a competing congregation in the same community. These schisms that cause local church splits are not uncommon, and often are motivated by a lust for power.

7.5.2 Power in Organizational Leadership

The element of leadership that has been the cause of so many splits within the movement is that of organizational leadership. To lead a local congregation as a pastor/shepherd has its own challenges, but not to the extent of organizational leadership. To lead local church members is one thing. To lead leaders is another thing altogether. There are greater challenges, but also positions that are perceived to be of greater power than in local churches. Unlike the local church setting, in which the pastor is set apart from the other members of the congregation for the work of the ministry, in most organizational settings
all of the members are ministers with a similar calling. Each is viewed, or views himself or herself, as specially chosen and anointed to the work of God. For this reason, it is much easier leading local church members than leading ministers. Most Filipino organizations are much more powerful at all levels than the Western mission organizations that helped to found them. As an example, the UPC in North America consists of more than 4,000 local churches, all of which “are self governing: the congregation elects its pastor and other leaders, owns its property, decides its budget, establishes its membership, and conducts all necessary business.” To facilitate all of this, each local church should have its own constitution, and be registered with the state, provincial or national authorities as an incorporation or non-profit organization.

However, the UPC Philippines is drastically different. Most of the 2,012 UPCP churches do not have their own registered organization status, and are totally dependent upon the national organization. Because they are not registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the local church is not a legal entity in its own right. It cannot hold property in its own name. The UPCP encourages property to be registered in the name of UPCP. Holding the title of the properties gives the national organization the power to remove a pastor from the church. If the congregation decides to side with the pastor in such a case, the entire congregation may be dispossessed of their place of worship. That would be understandable if the funds to purchase the property and erect the building came from the national organization. Sometimes funds to purchase the property are supplied by the organization, while the local congregation provides funds, material and labor to erect the building or make improvements. In some cases, property to erect a
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592 UPCI official website, upci.org (accessed 6 July 2015). The actual number of churches “including daughter works and preaching points” is 4,459.
place of worship is donated by a member of the congregation, and all funds, supplies and labor for the building is provided from within the local congregation. Even in such cases, if the property is registered in the name of the national organization, there is no protection for the local pastor or congregation should that organization decide to lock them out. From this example one can see that the power of the Filipino national organization over the local church is much greater than that of its parent organization.

While most North American Oneness Pentecostals would find such a system unbearable, Filipinos view it differently. Filipinos are “less autonomous, more dependent” and “oriented to authoritarian ways of thinking…” So while North American readers of this research may feel appalled about the overbearing tendencies in Filipino organizations, Filipinos might wonder “why the fuss?” And it must also be admitted that many Westerners adjust to local circumstances quickly when they are working in the Philippines. In fact, many missionaries have learned to quickly adopt Filipino concepts of power and authority when involved with religious organizations in the country. They might even decide to leave at home the American concepts of egalitarianism and embrace a more Filipino authoritarianism…so long as they remain the authority.

This organizational power is wielded by the handful of people who make up the Executive Board, or, in the case of an individually-run organization, by one man or one woman. The power of a religious organization can be used for good, and has been used for good in many instances. Missionary sending organizations have provided financial help, doctrinal stability, encouragement and an overall positive framework for the

---

missionary to bring the Gospel to the Philippines. Filipino religious organizations have carried on the basic intent of the missionary organizations, to propagate the message brought to them by the missionary. In the process, probably thousands of people have experienced healings, hundreds of thousands of people have heard the Gospel, countless lives have been changed for the better, alcoholics and drug addicts have been converted, and thousands of chapels and churches have been built, providing places of worship and refuge for a basically poor population. Organizations have harnessed the power of unity to accomplish what individuals alone could not have done. They have built Bible schools and provided training superior to what most pastors could offer their aspiring ministers. Doubtless, the great majority of those who are at the top of the organizational structure are sincere about spreading the Gospel.

Some times, a pastor’s hard work, a measure of success, and treating others with respect is rewarded by election to a position, possibly sectional presbyter. Success in this position might bring about an election to a district position, possibly district secretary or district presbyter. The district presbyter then serves on the National Executive Board, and from this board the General Superintendent or Chairman is selected. Not all leaders follow this path, and not all organizations have the same structure. The point here is that most organizational leaders have worked their way up through the ranks of the organization to reach one of the top positions. The promise of obtaining a position, any position, within an organization is equated with power. The higher the position, the greater the power. Some ministers aspire to positions but are unable to obtain them for a variety of reasons. There might be too many qualified ministers available, someone who recognizes his or her cronies may control the appointments, or the aspirant might not
have either the patience or the ability. Schism has often been the avenue taken by someone with a hunger for power. They may be promised a position if they join another organization, or they might just start their own.

### 7.6 Review and Analysis of Schism in the Movement

As has already been seen, the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippines did not arise from a single source. Urbano Aventura brought the message to his family in Iloilo in early 1937, and then after nearly a decade of no religious activity on his part, he began testifying in Mindanao sometime in 1946. Diamond Noble performed the first known baptisms in 1947 on Luzon Island. James Bishop Carr, a Sabbatarian Oneness Pentecostal, baptized Maximino Mina Rubino (1902-1983) at Bacolod City in 1955. Carlos Grant was able to capitalize on contacts between the Fabrica Baptists and various Oneness people, when he baptized a large group at Fabrica, Negros Occidental in 1957. Eugene Garrett founded the most significant non-Essentialist group in 1959. In late 1970, John Willhoite began meeting with a group of young people from Bethel Temple in Manila, eventually resulting in several Oneness organizations being started. Lew Ambler, a businessman, started the Jesus Church in Baguio City after seeing 31 people Spirit filled during a home service in November 1971. From all of these beginnings, and more, the modern Filipino Oneness Pentecostal movement was formed. Most of these groups have had interconnectivity through the years, even if it was only fellowship between leaders, or joint meetings on occasion. There have been numerous separations and confluences, which are ongoing and show no sign of lessening. Sometimes a group will
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594 Jester Federico, personal interview, 22 February 2014, Bacolod City, Negros, Occidental. Federico is the grandson of Maximino Rubino who was born 29 May 1902 and died 21 March 1983.
split and splinter into several organizations, only to come back together years afterwards in conferences and ‘fellowship’ meetings. The schisms greatly outnumber the mergers. The resulting picture cannot accurately be demonstrated in usual ‘family tree’ form, without altering it by the removal and grafting in of branches, and an intermingling of roots. Like a banyan tree, Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines is more of an organism of several interconnected trees than one easily defined tree.

The results of all the above is seen today in 120 different Oneness organizations, more than four thousand congregations and ministers, and over 2 million Filipino members in the Philippines and among the diaspora.\textsuperscript{595} The largest of these organizations appears to be the Jesus Miracle Crusade, an entirely autochthonous organization that is said to have one and one half million members.\textsuperscript{596} The JMC meets for their Manila area Sunday service in the Amoranto Sports Complex, which can accommodate 15,000 people seated. Because of the large number of people standing between the grandstands, there may be as many as 30,000 in attendance at these meetings from the Manila area alone.

What can be done about schism? Fight it? Accept it as normal? Try to control it? Create it? That schism has contributed to the growth of the movement is undeniable. It is enticing to think that if the more than 120 Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines were combined into one large organization, that it would be greater than its constituent parts. And that might be true, but the ideal is seldom realized. Indeed, could unity be achieved it would doubtless produce great results, but it is extremely unlikely that this level of unity could ever be realized. It is unreasonable to believe that so many organizations, with such divergent views on issues as important as whether or not water

\textsuperscript{595} Talmadge French, 1999, 281-283. Talmadge French estimated an average of 100 members per church.
\textsuperscript{596} James Almeda, personal interview at Manila 1 December 2015.
and Spirit baptism are essential for salvation could ever be united. Questions like this are at the root of the creation of so many organizations, and it remains cause for their continued separate existence. But this is not all bad. Wilde Almeda would probably not have flourished as he has, had he remained in the AMF, and was subsequently controlled by that organization. In fact, operating on his own, without oversight by a Western missionary organization, Almeda has outgrown every other Oneness Pentecostal organization, including those with strong ties to organizations within the United States. Perhaps this points to the superiority of autochthonous organizations. Organizations that are encumbered with foreign concepts and administration may inadvertently be forced into an unnatural configuration that hampers their success. That which is good in one culture is not necessarily the best in another. Almeda’s remarkable growth might also be explained by his very centralized form of government. While some organizations, such as the United Pentecostal Church, practice a Presbyterian form of government, approximating the ministry of bishops in more traditional religion, it appears that the JMCIM has benefitted from its leadership and control by one man or family. In this regard it would be well to remember also the phenomenal success of the sole oversight of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, Name Above Every Name by its founder and leader Pastor Apollo Quiboloy.

Often, organizations unintentionally restrict the personal growth of its members in one way or another. Even though some of these groups have much to offer, beginning with conversion and going through the religious educational process and organizational leadership structure, they have rules and regulations that cannot suit every temperament, personality or ministry. Schism simply cannot be avoided. Even if a perfect organization
existed, which would cater to the individual needs of its members while helping them reach their potential, there would invariably be members whose lust for power would demand recognition. If there were not room within the organization to acknowledge their abilities, they would leave and begin a new organization where they could exercise power.

It should be obvious that cases of schism might occur less often if certain precautions are taken. Of course, it would not be advisable or profitable to prevent all schism. It was incumbent on the Hebrews to leave Egypt, or they would never have become a nation. But when schism can and should be prevented it might be helpful to consider the following. First, leaders, from pastors to organizational directors, should be aware that every person has a God-given sense of significance. Those who are created in the image and likeness of God, and especially those who become sons and daughters of God, and who are empowered by His infilling Spirit, are significant. This feeling of significance cannot be denied and should not be stifled. The Church is the greatest place in the world for people to discover and fulfill their ultimate purpose and to satisfy their desire for significance. All leaders should be aware of this. Second, after awareness, the leader should learn how to steer those under his or her leadership into significant work within the local church or the organization. The key word here is significant. The Church is not primarily a political entity, and work should not be created for work’s sake. The tendency toward creating political positions at every level eventually constricts the flow of the Spirit, and should be eliminated. Multitudes of positions cause the organization to resemble multi-level marketing and pyramid schemes. Benefits accrue towards those at the top. True significance can only be found on a spiritual level, and make-work projects
within the Church will fail to fulfill the deep spiritual longing within Spirit-filled believers. If pastors were to be educated to move away from being managers and bosses of people, they might learn how to become effective facilitators. They might see their responsibility as releasing the power and potential of God’s people, and not as controlling it or them. Leaders at all levels are best served when they are able to fulfill their own need for significance in helping others become. They would not feel threatened when their own ministry helps produce someone who may be even more capable or gifted than their self. This is great success, and cause for rejoicing. Schism might be prevented when leaders operate from a sense of understanding their own responsibility to facilitate and steer others to completeness within the work of God. Patience and understanding of others will help them find their place in the Body of Christ.

When one has made up his or her mind that they cannot work within the confines of a certain church or organization, the best thing for leadership to do is allow them to leave with grace. Attempting to pressure this person or group of persons to remain in this particular structure will only cause negative feelings and threaten to destroy the harmony within the organization. Facilitating a quick and easy exit does not always have to be predicated on agreement and approval. Sometimes it is merely a choice of doing what is best for the body as well as for the individual or individuals leaving the body. Forcing those who are determined to leave to do so under a cloud will not help anyone. This is a lose-lose situation. Whenever possible, create a win-win situation. There is seldom a chance for future reconciliation if one party or another burns bridges in anger or spite.

Some schisms can be proactively created or steered. When, for instance, a local congregation has outgrown a worship facility, it might be time to create a separation. This
can be a positive form of schism. A few families may be asked to go to another section of
the town and help pioneer a new church. The pastor might lead them, or possibly the
pastor would remain at the original site and another leader be assigned to have to
oversight of the new congregation. This kind of devolution of power is unusual within
a religious organizational framework, but it could become more commonplace if steps
were taken to properly educate pastors and leaders. The Apostle Paul devolved himself of
power when he assigned elders in various churches in Asia and around the
Mediterranean.  

Schism has been a part of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines from the
beginning. It was essential in the inception for Catholics, Baptists and others to separate
from their churches in order to found this movement. Having once separated, it became
easier to do again…and again. Almost always acrimonious, schism has been a constant,
and it does not appear in danger of losing its power to continue to shape and influence
Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines.

7.7 Barrett’s Bottom Line – A Failure in Love

In all the “complex of causes” of schism discovered in Barrett’s research, he proposed
“…the root cause common to the whole movement…” of independency was, as the title
of his Chapter XII says, “A Failure in Love”.  

He explained the “widespread”
“missionary attitude” as being “characterized by the term paternalism, which may be
described as a kind of love that falls short of the biblical concept.”  

The missionaries in
Africa, according to Barrett, for the most part failed to listen, share, sympathize and
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understand the Africans. In short, they were insensitive. “This mission failure in sensitivity, [was] basically a failure in love…”600 Barrett suggested that,

*The root cause common to the entire movement of independency, therefore, may be seen in this one aspect of culture clash: a failure in sensitivity, the failure of missions at one small point to demonstrate consistently the fullness of the biblical concept of love as sensitive understanding towards others as equals, the failure to study or understand African society, religion and psychology in any depth...* (Italics in original)601

The current research sees the situations in Africa and the Philippines as being substantially different. While it is admitted that the missionaries influenced the Filipinos in the matter of schism, and they were (and perhaps still are) paternalistic, and while “a failure in love” can be seen in virtually all of the schisms studied here, it has not been proven that the root cause of schism has been due to the missionaries lack of “sensitive understanding” towards the Filipinos as equals.

This is not to say that missionaries treated Filipinos as equals. In most cases they did not, and in organizations where missionaries are still present, they tend to practice paternalism and one can tell by their conversations in private that they still do not view Filipinos as equals. This statement would no doubt shock these missionaries. It is not that they are blatantly racist, or unloving. But from their conversations can be discerned a certain micro-aggression. They say such things as, “It’s just so hard to make them understand.” This statement ignores the missionaries’ own inability to understand the Filipino. “I get so tired of incompetence,” can demonstrate a lack of appreciation for the difference between competencies in the West and in the Philippines. There are myriad things that Filipinos can accomplish, that a Westerner would be hard pressed to do. The impatience of Americans cannot change the culture in the Philippines and other majority
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world nations. Americans often say of migrants to their own country, “If they are going to live here, they should learn to do things the American way!” But these same people travel to the Philippines and will not practice what they preach. They lack the knowledge and desire to do things the Filipino way.

Ongoing paternalism can be easily seen in those organizations that are still run by missionaries. Those groups where missionaries are still the superintendents or chairpersons are usually run as though they are a personal fiefdom. It is due to the Filipinos’ gentleness and patience, combined with the cultural attitudes towards need of a patron, respect for Americans, and a sense of self-powerlessness that they allow missionaries to continue to operate in this fashion. Indeed, Filipinos may be reluctant at times to assume responsibility for their own organizational affairs and prevail upon the missionary to remain in a position of authority. This invitation may be sincere or it may simply be the Filipinos’ way of approaching a problem indirectly. In any case, the time has come in the movement for the relationship between missionaries and Filipinos to be that of brothers and as co-workers, not as patron and client. But the problem, as stated above, cannot entirely be attributed to the missionaries’ failure of love toward the Filipino.

The failure of love that can be seen in the schisms studied here exists not only as a failure on the part of the missionaries. In each case of schism, even among Filipinos, there is a failure in love that differs from that described by Barrett. While accepting the faults and failures of missionaries, the schisms here cannot be largely attributed to a lack of understanding Filipino “society, religion and psychology in any depth…”

602 Barrett, 156. Italics in original.
Filipino from Filipino. The problems that first arose in the UPCP were not because of a failure of the missionary to love the Filipino. It was a failure in love among American missionaries.

Barrett refers to the Gospel of John for his description of love. Particularly, he quotes from a commentary on John 13:34 that says this love is a

…willingness to serve and sacrifice, to forgive and make allowances, to share and sympathize, to lift up the fallen and restore the erring in a community which owes its whole existence to the mercy of God and the sacrificial death of his Christ.603

This excellent interpretation of love should apply equally to missionaries and nationals.

But to this description should be added the apostle Paul’s teaching that:

Love endures long and is patient and kind: love never is envious nor boils over with jealousy, is not boastful or vainglorious, does not display itself haughtily.

It is not conceited (arrogant and inflated with pride); it is not rude (unmannerly) and does not act unbecoming. Love (God’s love in us) does not insist on its own rights or its own way, for it is not self-seeking; it is not touchy or fretful or resentful; it takes no account of the evil done to it [it pays no attention to suffered wrong].

It does not rejoice at injustice and unrighteousness, but rejoices when right and truth prevail.

Love bears up under anything and everything that comes, is ever ready to believe the best of every person, its hopes are fadeless under all circumstances, and it endures everything [without weakening].

Love never fails…604

Most missionaries were guilty of a ‘failure in love,’ but not entirely as Barrett has suggested. There was not, in this movement, the same impetus toward schism that was seen in Barrett’s examination in Africa. This was not primarily a failure of love from the missionary to the Filipino, although that was and is a factor that must be considered. But

a very real ‘failure in love’ was at the root of probably every schism discovered in this research. Barrett said, “paternalism…may be described as a kind of love that falls short of the biblical concept.”605 That may be true, but the reverse cannot be said to be true. “Love that falls short of the biblical concept” need not be paternalism. Most often it is not. The first occurrence of failure in love seen in this research was that between missionaries of the same race, the same beliefs and the same organization. It was not due to paternalistic feelings the missionaries had toward one another. It also had nothing to do with failing to understand and appreciate the culture of the Filipinos. It had everything to do with failing to apply the New Testament teaching of love. Filipino leaders, and those aspiring for positions, are as guilty as Americans of a failure in love.

   This failure of love can be seen as a disconnect between the doctrine and the praxis of the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul interrupted his teaching on the gifts of the Spirit in 1 Corinthians chapters twelve through fourteen with a dissertation on the importance of love. Love cannot be separated from the teaching of the Holy Spirit. And love cannot be separated from the practice and operation of the Holy Spirit. Most Pentecostals would agree with this linkage, but the theory is easier than the practice. Though there is the certain knowledge that, according to Romans 5:5, “…the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us”, this great truth is often lost in the humanity of those who have been filled with the Spirit. When more attention is paid to advancing ones’ own cause rather than God’s, both the Spirit and the love it produces are diminished. Every failure of love could be viewed as a failure, not of the Spirit, but of the individual’s submission and sensitivity to the Spirit.

605 Barrett, 155.
7.8 Conclusion

The Pentecostal movement began with lockouts and schisms. The fire at Azusa Street flared brightly, but briefly and then waned as new churches opened across town. The Apostolic Faith Movement was severed asunder by the Finished Work issue. The Assemblies of God had barely celebrated their founding meeting before the New Issue caused a major split. Pentecostalism came out of the womb like Jacob and Esau, fighting from the first in a never ceasing struggle of differing natures, each one eager to claim the blessing and the birthright. To one, the blessing was that he would live by the sword.\textsuperscript{606} Oneness Pentecostalism was not immune to schism, but rather seemed to excel at it. Racism, doctrinal differences, personalities, regionalization, different views over organization; all played a part in the creation of the many groups in North America and wherever their representatives went as missionaries. Strong personalities, disdainful of centralized authority, and possessive of the fruit of their labor on foreign fields, quarreled with one another while their innocent converts stood by and learned, not only their message, but also their methods. The Philippines, with its history of exploitation and colonization, was anxious to find a liberator. The Pentecostal message was as liberating as they come. Powerlessness defined a people who were anxious for a new identity. Power was offered by the Pentecostal experience of Spirit baptism. Power was also offered to whoever was quick enough to grab control of the local church or organization. If one could not be in charge of an organization, that was no problem. Another organization could be started posthaste. Although it got a relatively late start in the Philippines, Oneness Pentecostalism has grown and split, and grown and split again and again. One wonders what might have happened, or what could happen if personal

\textsuperscript{606} Genesis 27:40.
feelings and ambitions could be put aside for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Might an already large presence in the nation make an even more powerful impact that would affect the country for good? Can the promise of the Spirit be presented to others in order to provide their personal emancipation? Will the testimonies of healing and deliverance become available to those who still seek? With representatives, like ambassadors, scattered through almost every nation, could this movement overcome its inhibiting bashfulness and reach out to other nationalities? Is there continued growth with continued schism? Or will the divisions finally reach a point where each new group only exists by the cannibalization of the movement? This movement that has done so much good for so many throughout the Philippine Islands, has also left many in its wake that feel betrayed and embittered. In November 2014, the researcher had finally succeeded in locating one of the first persons converted by missionary Carlos Grant. Hoping to interview her, he went to her home, accompanied by the local pastor’s wife and son. The pastor’s wife went to the door to speak to the woman, now elderly, and explain the researcher’s desire for an interview. The woman, whose mother was the first person recorded by Grant to have received Holy Spirit baptism in his ministry in the Philippines, replied, “I don’t want anything to do with anyone connected with any organization.” She was in Grant’s first group of workers. Early photos show her, smiling and holding her Bible, with other excited young people. She has not darkened the door of the church for many years. Not everyone can survive the pain of schism. Perhaps it would be well to keep in mind the words of Jesus, “Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”607

---

607 Matthew 26:52.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

8.1 Rewriting History

Anderson effectively pleads for a revision of Pentecostal history “to correct past distortions” that have failed to recognize the contributions of national workers in the developing world. This research is not really an attempt to rewrite history, seeing that it was never seriously written in the first place as far as Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism is concerned. As seen in the Introduction, no academic history of this movement existed prior to this investigation. The few books and booklets that were available were mostly self-published, and were concentrated either on the author’s life and ministry, or on the organization of the author. Nothing was heretofore offered about the movement as a whole. Therefore, the primary objective of this research has been the presentation of the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, which accounts for the largely narrative style used therein, and which has been based on the scant material available greatly enhanced by personal interviews. The research questions revolve mainly around the origins, development and current state of this relatively obscure movement, with special focus upon how schism contributed to these subjects. This was done from a blended emic/etic perspective of the author being within the Oneness Pentecostal movement, but outside the Filipino segment of that movement. Although this first attempt is the most comprehensive study to date, it will hopefully begin the discussion of a movement that is worthy to be studied. As emerging scholars within Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism become aware of their collective history, doubtless some of them will

608 Anderson & Tang, 123.
take up the challenge to improve and clarify the present offering. It is unfortunate also that similar research is lacking for Oneness Pentecostalism on a country-by-country basis, so that the global movement remains more of an enigma than it should be. Perhaps the present study will act as both an impetus and a template for the study of Oneness Pentecostalism in other countries. The survey used in this research could be fine tuned and used to get a much clearer picture on global Oneness Pentecostalism.

8.2 Summary

This study began by a brief examination in Chapter Two, of the unique births of Pentecostalism and Oneness Pentecostalism in the early twentieth century. The schismatic nature inherent in the movement can be seen from those earliest beginnings. Schism between individuals like Parham and Seymour are illustrative of the personal animosity, jealousies and even racial prejudices that existed in many situations. The schism caused by the New Issue, which was actually the birth of modern Oneness Pentecostalism, demonstrates the importance of doctrine to the movement. The identifying doctrines of the name of Jesus and the Oneness of God became separating issues from the rest of classical Pentecostalism. The gap was further widened by the majority view that water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit were essential to salvation. The major schism shaped by these doctrines promoted an ‘us against them’ mentality that exists to this day, but did not prevent schism among the ‘us’ group.

The history and culture of the Filipino people was examined in Chapter Three, showing how they might have been predispositioned to perpetuate schism once they were exposed to it. Traditional Filipino values, not easily grasped by foreign missionaries,
prepared the nationals to accept those missionaries as, at least initially, more worthy to lead because of the perception they were in a higher class due to their education, nationality and credentials. They were automatically viewed as patrons because of these characteristics as well as their financial resources. The Filipino virtue of cooperation made them amenable to work together under the missionaries’ direction in the early days of the movement. When they observed infighting among missionaries that led to schism, they were quick to learn the lesson that was inadvertently taught them. After all, the schism of Aglipayism was well known in the Philippines, and once the Filipino converts realized that Oneness Pentecostalism was not immune, they joined in what might have seemed almost a national sport among Pentecostal churches. It was also seen that Hawaii was a significant way station on the road to Pentecostalism in the Philippines.

Chapters Four through Six presented the history of the movement, which was a history of schism. Chapter Four introduced the earliest pioneers of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines. It was seen that the conversion and ministry of the first Oneness Pentecostal in the Philippines, Urbano Aventura, closely resembled that of the first AG preacher there, Maximiano Somosierra, in that both were born within a few miles of each other near Iloilo, both were converted while working in Hawaii, and returned as the first known representatives of their respective churches. This chapter told the untold story of Diamond Noble, hitherto unrecognized as the first effective Filipino Oneness Pentecostal, having performed the first known baptisms and registered the first organization within the movement. This unique individual deserves a more intensive coverage than was afforded in this study, which had to be content with what was included because the focus was upon the movement as a whole. In fact, this research unearthed
rich veins of material that warrant further exploration and presentation about the lives of Filipinos who have contributed much to the history of the movement but remain relatively unrecognized. This research set out to discover “…the hidden treasures of these local histories…” as suggested by Allan Anderson.\textsuperscript{609} By following Anderson’s pattern of “reading between the lines” of existing sources, and “retrieving oral traditions…for the stories of those still living who remember the past…”, this study has attempted “…to redress the balance, where the contribution of indigenous workers, pastors and evangelists is emphasized.”\textsuperscript{610}

The history was continued in Chapter Five, focusing on the first non-Filipino missionary, Carlos Grant, and analyzing those methods that proved successful in the spread of the movement. Grant represents many former military men who served in the Philippines during war or peace, and returned as Pentecostal missionaries. What became the general attitude toward women in the ministry was established during this time with influence from American missionaries, but not in a way that greatly differed from the culture. The application of short-term training combined with the assigning of youth, mostly young women, to pioneer works in various locations was proven successful. Healing was an effective method of immediate evangelism whereby many were convinced of the validity of the message. The Filipino cultural tendency toward cooperation, rather than competition, bode well for successful working together under the direction of their missionary. Not only did the Filipinos generally work well with one another, but also Grant’s immediate success in the Visayas resulted from his fortunate connection with them. Grant’s undisputed and successful leadership of the movement,

\textsuperscript{609} Anderson and Tang, 124.  
\textsuperscript{610} Anderson and Tang, 131, 139.
and the easy way the Filipinos accepted his word as law, paved the way for the problems that came when other missionaries arrived.

Chapter Six continued and concluded the historical exploration, in which schism virtually exploded. The contributions of several significant missionaries and nationals were examined, along with how schism affected them, or was affected by them. It was seen that the most successful Oneness Pentecostal group in the Philippines was the totally autochthonous Jesus Miracle Crusade of Wilde Almeda. The current figures for the number of organizations, churches, ministers and members were offered, which showed a considerable two million plus members if those figures are even close to being precise. This research has shown that Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines is certainly a movement that justifies further study.

Schism received a significant investigation in Chapter Seven, in which the deep roots and more surface causes were discussed. The schisms that have shaped Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines promoted division and multiplication simultaneously, and they continue to do so. This research posited that schism was learned from the Americans and enhanced by the historical and cultural understandings of the Filipinos. It has been seen that the many types of schism were presented in the Biblical account, and that there is much to learn from the Biblical presentation. There are lessons to be learned that if properly applied, could be used to justify some schisms, and eliminate others. Barrett wrote in his preface “…that decisions of the utmost importance can be made in good faith yet in virtual ignorance of strikingly similar parallels elsewhere…” and also of “…the perils of ignorance.”611 Perhaps what has been written here can lend an

611 Barrett, xvii.
understanding to schism that allows for a more informed decision making process in regards to the same.

8.3 Finding the Filipino Voice

While this research does present original material on the main subject, the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, it also attempts to address the problem of history being written from above. One of the most serious issues facing “Pentecostal historiography” is that “…the vital role of thousands of indigenous workers in the early Pentecostal movement, particularly in Asia and Africa, was ignored, overlooked or minimized.”612 This has certainly proven true during the present research. Anderson goes on- “An obscure history of Pentecostalism has been taken for granted for so long that the multitudes of nameless ones responsible for its grassroots expansion have passed into history unremembered and their memory is now very difficult to retrieve.”613 How can the ‘history from above’ become the ‘history from below’? That is, how can traditional histories, written in this case by Western missionaries, cease speaking from the ethnocentricity of the missionary or the sending organization, and reflect the views of those they are sent to serve? As has been stated, this study purposed to “read between the lines” of available written sources, and to interview as many early laborers as possible in the movement.614 Going forward, if missionaries are mindful that the Kingdom of God does not necessarily reflect the culture and values of his or her home country, and if they are also concerned with importance of the historical perspective and not primarily with his or her own legacy, or that of the supporting organization, then their contribution to the

---

612 Anderson and Tang, 121.
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movement will be broader and last longer than otherwise. By giving ‘honor to whom honor is due’ and recognizing and recording the contributions of those among whom they labor, the missionary not only edifies the work, but also the worker. However, the act of record keeping, without the corresponding vision of proper missionary activity, is only an attempt to alleviate the pain without treating the wound. Missionaries have a Biblical mandate to treat the nationals as brothers and sisters, and respect them as equals in the family of God.

Even the term ‘servant leadership’ does not adequately describe what is needed on behalf of the missionary, because that only prolongs the idea of leadership from the Western point of view rather than leadership from among the culture. An entirely new paradigm would be beneficial, that views missionaries not at all as leaders, not even servant-leaders, but simply as servants, or at most as laborers together. Without this, Western missionaries to the majority world might only perpetuate the colonial model of missions, and sow the seeds of their own irrelevance. Because most missionaries are not familiar with the academic plea for histories from below, it would be beneficial if missionary societies and organizations could institute the gathering and recording of history as part of the mission, and communicate this policy to the missionaries. Works written on a popular level can also address this need.

If the local participants can be made aware of the importance of a history that is written from their perspective (from below) and preserved for future generations, they would take great pride in such a worthy project. They can be encouraged that their contribution to that history, and their thoughts and feelings, count ultimately more than that of the missionary, because they, and their children, will still be there after the
missionary is gone. Because their contributions, thoughts and feelings are important, these things might be recorded in such a manner as can be studied by present and future generations. That much of this will happen is inevitable because of the decline of the Western missionary and the rise of the indigenous missionary. As Christianity in general, and Pentecostalism in particular become more centered in the majority world, there will be fewer Western missionaries in the majority world, and more majority world missionaries in the West. Thankfully, this is already taking place. Rather than feel threatened by this paradigmatic shift, Western missionaries might view the change as a sign of their ultimate success. After all, the children may stand taller upon their parent’s shoulders.

If Western missionaries were better equipped to establish the movement at the first, it was only because of their financial resources, and the ‘perceived’ superiority of their doctrinal authority and organizational skills. While missionaries lent organizational skills, they were ultimately skills that were learned in the West, which did not take into consideration the Filipino mindset that was a blend of Asian and Spanish. It has been seen that the nationals’ perception of the missionary as essential is diminished when they realized growth and success for themselves. When that happened, as especially seen in the case of Wilde Almeda, Filipinos were more successful in the long-term growth of the movement. The greatest organizational successes were seen with Almeda, and Apollo Quiboloy, notwithstanding the latter’s substantial departure from his Oneness Pentecostal roots.

Future researchers of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, and elsewhere, will discover most available material to be beyond the normal sources of information. Few organizations publish figures for number of churches or membership, although that would be beneficial for the future study of the movement. The list found in Appendix A may be helpful in providing information for organizations in the Philippines, and although it is the most complete list to date, it falls short of being a complete listing of Oneness Pentecostal organizations in the Philippines. The difficulties of those who have previously researched Pentecostals of any persuasion in the Philippines are certainly understood and greatly appreciated. It is not an easy subject on which to compile accurate statistics.

The history presented in this study is not the final word on the subject of this elusive movement. It is far from a final word. But it is presented in the hope that it will be a reference point for serious and ongoing contemplation of a significant part of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movement in Asia. The story is dynamic, and will change with the addition of future studies. In Writing Religious History: The Historiography of Ethiopian Pentecostalism, Jörg Haustein writes, "With each new history of Ethiopian Pentecostalism, with each jubilee magazine, or with each additional informant, the narrative archive changes…”616 There is a growing self-awareness within this movement that will hopefully be pollinated by this study, and that promises to further what has been offered here. In the furthering, there will be continual transformation.617 What has been presented tentatively in this work will be confirmed, altered or disproved for the benefit of future researchers.

---

617 The author is already aware of research that has been instigated by the present study. Fred Napagao Jr. in Bacolod City has researched, designed and drafted a “Family Tree of the Apostolic Oneness Ministers of the Philippines” in 2015, after meeting the author and becoming aware this research.
of historical accuracy and analysis. If this analysis provokes research, even for the purpose of correcting what has been offered here, it will be viewed as a success by the author. There is so much more to be told. Every telling and retelling of the story; every additional report, description, and account will move it away from the reference point established here. Referring to the history of Ethiopian Pentecostalism, Haustein wrote, “In this way the history…will continuously be deferred, its “real story” transformed, permuted, and ultimately postponed.” By all means, and by any means, let it begin.

8.4 Confession

In a departure from the academic language of this research, I choose to conclude with a more personal tone. I was already convinced, as I began this work, that it must be a ‘history from below’ which set down the history of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines in a manner that acknowledged the importance and contributions of the Filipinos. While I recognized that the history had never been attempted, much less from a perspective which focused on the Filipinos, I had no idea of the magnitude of the contributions of either missionaries or Filipinos; especially the Filipinos.

In regards to the former, this work cannot adequately document the many contributions and sacrifices of foreign missionaries in the movement beginning in 1957, nor does it attempt to. I hasten to acknowledge the “work and labor of love” performed by missionaries, the extent of which can be known only to God, who “is not unrighteous to forget.” The movement would not be today what it is without their years of toil. The remains of Carlos Grant rest within the Bicutan church compound that he developed in

---
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his latter years. He is remembered as the father of schism by the UPCP, and as the spiritual father of many within that organization and many others. The Eugene Garretts left a proven and successful ministry of large healing campaigns to live and work in the Philippines where no one knew them. Arthur and Roberta Dillon only worked shortly in the country before having to return home due to her contracting the polio that cost her life. Gordon Mallory had to leave the country in fear after unjustly becoming the scapegoat for his organization’s participation in a property purchase that defrauded the government of taxes. John Willhoite admitted to hiding in his room for two months to avoid having to face the Filipino ministers who came to him expecting money when he had none for them. The vast majority of missionaries did the best they knew to do, lacking adequate understanding of Filipino customs and culture. They are heroes, most of them, and they all had feet of clay. Their “role,” as Anderson says, “was usually catalytic and not central.” 620 Most of them were guilty of a ‘failure of love’ as seen in Barrett’s research of schism in Africa. This does not negate every good deed. Their failure is all too human, and all too common. They paid lip service to the fact that this is God’s kingdom, and not one’s own. This profound truth is easier to accept in theory than in reality.

The true heroes and heroines of this history are those who have remained largely unrecognized, without which every seed sown by a missionary would go un-grown or un-harvested, and every dream unfulfilled. They are those like Diamond Noble, Teresita Azuelo, Luceno Blanca, Zebedea Sinen, Bien Bartolaba, Adelaida Gorillo, Mariano Libre, Anna Malipiton, Eddie Acuesta, Ruth Figueroa and a host of other men and women. All of these have been touched in one way or another with schism. Due to the

620 Anderson and Tang, 139.
Filipino culture, the “benevolent paternalism” of the missionaries, and the schismatic nature of Pentecostalism, there appears to be only one way that schism could be avoided. The second commandment, following the Shema, is to love one’s neighbor as oneself. For all parties to truly love, not only in word but also in deed, would prevent all painful schism. The only type of separation that could survive love is the agreement to divide for the purpose of evangelism and growth.

When recording findings, it is easy for writing to be seen as accusatory. I made an effort to present in an explanatory method and to avoid accusing. As I discovered the volume and intensity of schism among Oneness Pentecostals in the Philippines, both missionaries and nationals, I realized how far we have strayed from the example of Christ. By his teaching and his life, Jesus taught us true love and compassion for everyone from our Samaritan neighbor to those who would crucify us. By my research the past three years, I might have become something of an expert (whatever that is) on Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines, and schism within that movement. I can see where we went wrong, and have offered suggestions on the only viable way to prevent schism. But I am not immune. I find myself as part of the problem. A thorough examination of one part of Pentecostalism, in one country ends with an examination of my own heart. I cannot so much as lift up my head. I strike my “breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.” There is hope in an ever-merciful God, who is “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” And if repentance is

621 Anderson and Tang, 132.
624 2 Peter 3:9.
forthcoming, there will be a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which the love of God will be shed abroad in our hearts.\textsuperscript{625}
### Appendix A

**Filipino Oneness Pentecostal Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Name of Founder</th>
<th>Year of Founding</th>
<th>Current Leader</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Stated Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Acts of the Apostolic Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAY</td>
<td>Apostolic Assembly of Yahvah, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Apostolic Christian Church (NOW WITH ALJC)</td>
<td>Zaldy Wasquin</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACG</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of God</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Demetrio Torres</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJCII</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ International Phil. Inc.</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLG</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of the Living God</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>Apostolic Christian Movement</td>
<td>William Han Sr. /Raymundo Jalandoni</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Billy Han</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>Apostolic Faith Church</td>
<td>Apostolic Friends Fellowship (CLJC?)</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Billy Han</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>Apostolic Holiness Fellowship of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFIC</td>
<td>Apostolic Independent Missions (aka Church of the Lord Jesus Christ)</td>
<td>Donald Lance Sr./Steve Hancock</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Michael Couch</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Apostolic Jesus Name Church</td>
<td>Efren Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ronaldo Togle</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (1)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>Diamond Noble</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Diamond Noble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (2)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc. (Ammended)</td>
<td>Pedro Siao</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Pedro Siao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (3)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Naimy</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJCAF</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJCFW</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ of Faith Worldwide, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministries for Christ</td>
<td>Anonilon Pontillano</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Jonathan Cubelo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMF</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministers Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny Willhoite</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Phil White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPI</td>
<td>Association of Ministers in the Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td>Richardo T. Onda</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Richardo T. Onda</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>Apostolic Pentecostal Assembly</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPG</td>
<td>Apostolic Pentecostal Flock of God International</td>
<td>Leopoldo Agunaalado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPM</td>
<td>Apostolic Philippine Pentecostal Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Bible Apostolic Church</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBF</td>
<td>Bible Believer's Fellowship</td>
<td>Danilo Yulatic</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Danilo Yulatic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCCO</td>
<td>Balogo Church of Christ Oneness 33-AD, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACJC</td>
<td>Convention Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>James Carr Federico</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>James Carr Federico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Name of Founder</td>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Stated Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Christ Apostolic Ministries Phil. Christian Apostolic Ministry of Pentecost</td>
<td>Roy Dulnuan</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Roy Dulnuan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith</td>
<td>Emmanuel Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCF</td>
<td>Crossroads Christian Central Fellowship</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Christian Fellowship Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJCAF</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith</td>
<td>Emmanuel Dela Cruz</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLFM</td>
<td>Christ-Life Fellowship Ministry (Full Gospel)</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLJC</td>
<td>Church of the Lord Jesus Christ (AFF?)</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLJCAA</td>
<td>Church of the Lord Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith of Alegria Surigao Del Norte, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHTM</td>
<td>Christ Our Hope Tribal Ministry</td>
<td>Sister Paderange</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTJC</td>
<td>Church of One Lord One Faith One Baptism in the Truth in Jesus Christ Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWCG</td>
<td>Church of the Word of God Phil, Inc</td>
<td>Alberto G. Esplago</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Alberto G. Esplago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACJC</td>
<td>Endtime Revival Apostolic Pentecostal Church of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Rene Sotero</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Emmanuel Ministry, Caloocan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLT</td>
<td>Emmanuel New Life Tabernacle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERAPC</td>
<td>Endtime Revival Apostolic Pentecostal Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>Faith in Christ Jesus Church, Inc</td>
<td>Ben Tayao</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Peter Paul Paulino</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFJ</td>
<td>Friends of Father Jesus</td>
<td>Rodolfo Z. Vergara</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGRMC</td>
<td>Full Gospel Revival Mission Churches of the Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJJC</td>
<td>Flock of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>From AIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTJJC</td>
<td>Family Tabernacle of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Antonio Gallemit Sr.</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Antonio Gallemit Sr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM</td>
<td>Great Commission Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGOC</td>
<td>Glorious Gospel of Christ-Pasig Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAPM</td>
<td>God's Love Apostolic Pentecostal Ministries</td>
<td>Edmundo Celes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLJC</td>
<td>Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Rey Landingen</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Rey Landingen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMZINC</td>
<td>Global Ministerios Zion, Inc.</td>
<td>Joshua Beria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Joshua Beria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (1)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Pepito Aguilar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (2)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ Phils Apostolic Doctrine Pentecostal Oneness</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Efren Aguilar</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSLJP</td>
<td>Great Shepherd Lord Jesus Pentecostal Oneness, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMI</td>
<td>Harvest Apostolic Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td>Higdon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Larry Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMP</td>
<td>Hebron Apostolic Ministries Philippines</td>
<td>Ricardo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ricardo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Harvest Christian Mission</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI</td>
<td>Harmony Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACIP</td>
<td>International Apostolic Churches Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Name of Founder</td>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Stated Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAFMC</td>
<td>International Apostolic Faith of Jesus Christ Church Phil, Inc.</td>
<td>From AIM</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIC</td>
<td>International Church of Jesus Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOACJC</td>
<td>International Oneness Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Jesus Church, The</td>
<td>Lew Ambler</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Mike Ambler</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCFC</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Followers Church</td>
<td>Fernando Caudor Sr.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Fernando Caudor Sr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCHW</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Hope of the World Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>Zaldy Perez</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Zaldy Perez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCLTC</td>
<td>Jesus Christ the Lamb of Truth Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCM</td>
<td>Jesus Church Ministry, The</td>
<td>Brenda de los Santos</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Brenda de los Santos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCN</td>
<td>Jesus Christ for the Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCOKF</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Our King Forever Apostolic Ministry</td>
<td>Franc Mendoza III</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Franc Mendoza III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCPM</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Pentecostal Ministries Oneness Gospel of Christ Church, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTGBTG</td>
<td>Jesus Christ to God be the Glory International, Inc.</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECCUR</td>
<td>Jesus Church Upon the Rock</td>
<td>Socorro Ruelan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola Ruelan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFAM</td>
<td>Jesus Flock Apostolic Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td>Roberto Linco</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Roberto Linco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFM</td>
<td>Jesus Flock Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>Jesus Jehovah Shama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMC</td>
<td>Jesus Mansions Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMCIM</td>
<td>Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNAP</td>
<td>Jesus Name Apostolics of the Philippines</td>
<td>Fred Palabrica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNC</td>
<td>Jesus Name Church Apostolic Faith, Inc. (Different than AJNC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNTF</td>
<td>Jesus Name Tabernacle of Faith</td>
<td>Artemio B. Cana</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Artemio B. Cana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPAP</td>
<td>Jesus People Apostolic Pentecostal Oneness Phil</td>
<td>Benjamin N. Ramos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKC</td>
<td>Karamay ng Kabataan Center, Inc.</td>
<td>Fernando L. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMP</td>
<td>Kingdom Preparation Ministry Philippines</td>
<td>James Bishop Carr</td>
<td>1955-1983</td>
<td>Maximo Ebayan until death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>Lighthouse Apostolic Fellowship</td>
<td>Leonardo Magno</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Leonardo Magno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>Lighthouse Apostolic Ministry of Pentecost</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>1986-7</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJCC</td>
<td>Lord Jesus Christ Church, The</td>
<td>Jose C. Quiboloy Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJCF</td>
<td>Lord Jesus Christ Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Law of Liberty Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTK</td>
<td>Love and Truth</td>
<td>Eddie Cupples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWA</td>
<td>Living Way Apostolics</td>
<td>Efren Dela Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLJC</td>
<td>Members Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Mindanao Christian Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLMF</td>
<td>Mainggit Love Mission Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Name of Founder</td>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Stated Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLACi</td>
<td>Northern Light Apostolic Church International</td>
<td>Rey Sangueza</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rey Sangueza</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAGT</td>
<td>Oneness Apostolic Gospel Truth, Inc.</td>
<td>Rey Sangueza</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rey Sangueza</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIF</td>
<td>Oasis Pentecostal International Fellowship</td>
<td>Allan Rios</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Vic Notario</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACF</td>
<td>Philippines Apostolic Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>Ruel A. Latorre</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Ruel A. Latorre</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJC</td>
<td>Philippine Apostolics of Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>Geneva Bailey</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Lucy Mann</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMI</td>
<td>Philippine Apostolic Mission, Inc.</td>
<td>Ziegfred S. Lake</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ziegfred S. Lake</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>Pentecostal Assemblies of the World</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Childs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBAHC</td>
<td>Pentecostal Bible Apostolic Holiness Church, Inc.</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Childs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBWC</td>
<td>Pentecostal Bible Way Church</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Childs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>Philippine Ministerial Association</td>
<td>Eugene Garrett</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Omar Dalumpines</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCKGM</td>
<td>Reign of Christ’s Kingdom Global Ministry</td>
<td>Mitchell Loayon</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Mitchell Loayon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLJC</td>
<td>Revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Larry De Guzman</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Larry De Guzman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Rainbow Tabernacle of Praise Global Christian Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDLA</td>
<td>Sons and Daughters of the Lord Almighty Fellowship Church of God</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Spirit &amp; Truth Evangelistic Ministry</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGBGF</td>
<td>To God Be the Glory Fellowship</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJC</td>
<td>True Jesus Church (China)</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLGCM</td>
<td>Temple of the Living God Christian Ministries</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UACM</td>
<td>United Apostolic Christian Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td>Glen Aupe</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Glen Aupe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBEG</td>
<td>Union of Believers in the Oneness of God, Inc.</td>
<td>Romeo Conception</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Romeo Conception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCJC</td>
<td>United Church Jesus Christ (Oneness), Inc.</td>
<td>Romeo Conception</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Romeo Conception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPCP</td>
<td>United Pentecostal Church Philippines</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Alfredo Bodegas</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>297,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCC</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Church of Christ</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPFP</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny King</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Steven Buxton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 4,724 2,040,475

One-hundred twenty Oneness Pentecostal organizations are listed here. A few of them may be defunct. There are probably more organizations than are listed here, mostly smaller.

Of these 120, forty-five have an undetermined number of churches or members.

At least 33 have fewer than 10 churches, including 16 that have 4 or fewer churches.

Forty or more have 10 or more churches.
# Appendix B

## Organizations Over 1000 Stated Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Name of Founder</th>
<th>Year of Founding</th>
<th>Current Leader</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Stated Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JMCIM</td>
<td>Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPCP</td>
<td>United Pentecostal Church Philippines</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Alfredo Bodegas</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>297,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>Philippine Ministerial Association</td>
<td>Eugene Garrett</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Omar Dalumpines</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Jesus Church, The</td>
<td>Lew Ambler</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Mike Ambler</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Apostolic Independent Missions (aka Church of the Lord Jesus Christ)</td>
<td>Donald Lance Sr. / Steve Hancock</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Michael Couch</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (2)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ Phils Apostolic Doctrine Pentecostal Oneness</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Efren Aguilar</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTGBTG</td>
<td>Jesus Christ to God be the Glory International, Inc.</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministries for Christ</td>
<td>Anonilon Pontillano</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Jonathan Cubelo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCC</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Church of Christ</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPFP</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny King</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Steven Buxton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLMF</td>
<td>Mainggit Love Mission Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Holiness Fellowship of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNAP</td>
<td>Jesus Name Apostolics of the Philippines</td>
<td>Fred Palabrica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Palabrica</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLJC</td>
<td>Members Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (3)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Naimy</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJC</td>
<td>Philippine Apostolics of Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>Geneva Bailey</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Lucy Mann</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACICII</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ International Phil. Inc.</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJNC</td>
<td>Apostolic Jesus Name Church</td>
<td>Efren Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ronaldo Togle</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOACJC</td>
<td>International Oneness Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBWC</td>
<td>Pentecostal Bible Way Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Acts of the Apostolic Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLFM</td>
<td>Christ-Life Fellowship Ministry (Full Gospel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Name of Founder</td>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Stated Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCN</td>
<td>Jesus Christ for the Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBAHC</td>
<td>Pentecostal Bible Apostolic Holiness Church, Inc.</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Childs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACF</td>
<td>Philippines Apostolic Christian Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Demetrio Torres</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLGCM</td>
<td>Temple of the Living God Christian Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLJC</td>
<td>Church of the Lord Jesus Christ (AFF?)</td>
<td>Edgar Mendoza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar Mendoza</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERAPC</td>
<td>Endtime Revival Apostolic Pentecostal Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (1)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Pepito Aguilar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Harvest Christian Mission</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICF</td>
<td>Lord Jesus Christ Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Christian Fellowship Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJCAF</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMP</td>
<td>Hebron Apostolic Ministries Philippines</td>
<td>Ricaredo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ricaredo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMF</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministers Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny Willhoite</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Phil White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>Apostolic Pentecostal Assembly</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>Lighthouse Apostolic Ministry of Pentecost</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>1986-7</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UACM</td>
<td>United Apostolic Christian Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td>Glen Aupe</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rico Cuantioso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBOG</td>
<td>Union of Believers in the Oneness of God, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Jesus Church number of members was given in Talmadge L. French, Our God is One. Indianapolis, IN: Voice and Vision (1999), 283. In most other cases, French approximated 100 members per church/congregation, including children based on normal attendance. I have also estimated 100 members per church/congregation except where supplied with actual figures from the organization, in which case I use the organization figures.
## Appendix C

### Organizations - Date Founded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Name of Founder</th>
<th>Year of Founding</th>
<th>Current Leader</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Stated Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (1)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>Diamond Noble</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Alfredo Bodegas</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>297,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPCP</td>
<td>United Pentecostal Church Philippines</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Omar Dalumpines</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>Philippine Ministerial Association</td>
<td>Eugene Garrett</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Demetrio Torres</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Carlos Grant</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Demetrio Torres</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (2)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc. (Amended)</td>
<td>Pedro Siao</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Bible Apostolic Church</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJC</td>
<td>Philippine Apostolics of Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>Geneva Bailey</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Lucy Mann</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTJC</td>
<td>Family Tabernacle of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Antonio Gallemit Sr.</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Antonio Gallemit Sr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Jesus Church, The</td>
<td>Lew Ambler</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Mike Ambler</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMF</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministers Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny Willhoite</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Phil White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>Apostolic Faith Church</td>
<td>William Han Sr. /Raymundo Jalandoni</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Billy Han</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (1)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Pepito Aguilar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC (2)</td>
<td>Gospel of Christ Phil Apostolic Doctrine Pentecostal Oneness</td>
<td>Zebedia Aguilar Senin</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Efren Aguilar</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMCIM</td>
<td>Jesus Miracle Crusade International Ministry</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Wilde Estrada Almeda</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Apostolic Independent Missions (aka Church of the Lord Jesus Christ)</td>
<td>Donald Lance Sr./Steve Hancock</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Michael Couch</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJC</td>
<td>True Jesus Church (China)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCJC</td>
<td>Faith in Christ Jesus Church, Inc.</td>
<td>Ben Tayao</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Peter Paul Paulino</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIF</td>
<td>Oasis Pentecostal International Fellowship</td>
<td>Allan Rios</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Vic Notario</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCC</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Church of Christ</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>John Ayudtud</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>Apostolic Pentecostal Assembly</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Samson Cordova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAPM</td>
<td>God's Love Apostolic Pentecostal Ministries</td>
<td>EDMundo Celes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTGBTG</td>
<td>Jesus Christ to God be the Glory International, Inc.</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Louie Santos</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBAHC</td>
<td>Pentecostal Bible Apostolic Holiness Church, Inc.</td>
<td>James D. Childs</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>James Childs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>Lighthouse Apostolic Ministry of Pentecost</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Isaias Dela Cruz Jr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>Lighthouse Apostolic Fellowship</td>
<td>Leonardo Magno</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Leonardo Magno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCHW</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Hope of the World Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>Zaldy Perez</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Zaldy Perez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Spirit &amp; Truth Evangelistic Ministry</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Bing Ocampo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCFC</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Followers Church</td>
<td>Fernando Caudor Sr.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Fernando Caudor Sr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Name of Founder</td>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Stated Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJNC</td>
<td>Apostolic Jesus Name Church</td>
<td>Efren Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ronaldo Togle</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCOKF</td>
<td>Jesus Christ Our King Forever Apostolic Ministry</td>
<td>Franc Mendoza III</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Franc Mendoza III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACJC</td>
<td>Convention Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ, Inc.</td>
<td>James Carr Federico</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>James Carr Federico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLJC</td>
<td>Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Rey Landingen</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Rey Landingen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBF</td>
<td>Bible Believer's Fellowship</td>
<td>Danilo Yulatic</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Danilo Yulatic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMI</td>
<td>Philippine Apostolic Mission, Inc.</td>
<td>Ziegfred S. Lake</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ziegfred S. Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Apostolic Ministries for Christ</td>
<td>Anonilon Pontillano</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Jonathan Cubelo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJC</td>
<td>Revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Larry De Guzman</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Larry De Guzman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJC (3)</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ Philippines, Inc.</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Naimy</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMP</td>
<td>Hebron Apostolic Ministries Philippines</td>
<td>Ricaredo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ricaredo Dela Cruz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Christ Apostolic Ministries Phil.</td>
<td>Roy Dulnau</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Roy Dulnau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Apostolic Christian Church (NOW WITH ALJC)</td>
<td>Zaldy Wasquin</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJCAF</td>
<td>Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWCG</td>
<td>Church of the Word of God Phil. Inc.</td>
<td>Alberto G. Esplago</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Alberto G. Esplago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFAM</td>
<td>Jesus Flock Apostolic Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td>Roberto Linco</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Roberto Linco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCM</td>
<td>Jesus Church Ministry, The</td>
<td>Brenda de los Santos</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Brenda de los Santos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNTF</td>
<td>Jesus Name Tabernacle of Praise Global Christian Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td>Artemio B. Cana</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Artemio B. Cana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Rainbow Tabernacle of Praise Global Christian Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Roger Abo-abo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UACM</td>
<td>United Apostolic Christian Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td>Glen Aupe</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rico Cuantioso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOACJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Edgardo Camalon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMZ INC</td>
<td>Global Ministerios Zion, Inc.</td>
<td>Joshua Beria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Joshua Beria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLACi</td>
<td>Northern Light Apostolic Church International</td>
<td>Rey Sanguezza</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rey Sanguezza</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPFP</td>
<td>Worldwide Pentecostal Fellowship Philippines</td>
<td>Johnny King</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Steven Buxton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA CLJC</td>
<td>Members Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bernie Mendoza</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFJC</td>
<td>Apostolic Holiness Fellowship of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Eliezer Maxilom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCJC</td>
<td>United Church Jesus Christ (Oneness), Inc.</td>
<td>Romeo Concepcion</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Romeo Concepcion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCF</td>
<td>Crossroads Christian Central Fellowship</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Edsel Omandam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJII</td>
<td>Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ International Phil. Inc.</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Enrique A. Zaragoza</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCKGM</td>
<td>Reign of Christ’s Kingdom Global Ministry</td>
<td>Mitchell Loayon</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Mitchell Loayon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Survey of Religious Migration

Johnny King – Birmingham University ID#

Migrating to the Edge: The History of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines
Voluntary Questionnaire – (only for those 18 years of age or over) Please Print Clearly
You do not need to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable.

1. Date ______________

2. Name _________________________________________________________________

3. Date of Birth _________________

4. Contact Information (For Pastors or Organizational Leaders Only) ______________

5. Gender – Male / Female

6. Church/Organization Name ________________________________________________

7. Position Held in Organization _____________________________________________

8. Church/Organization Location ______________________________________________

9. Length of time in this church/organization ____________________________________

10. Former religion/s and organization/s _________________________________________

11. When did you receive baptism in the Spirit? ________________________________

12. Last spoke in tongues – within past week / within past month / within past year

13. Have you been Baptized in Jesus’ Name? Y/N ________________

14. When? ________________

15. Any previous Baptism? ____________________________________________________

16. Mother’s Religion/s ______________________________________________________

17. Father’s Religion/s _______________________________________________________


22. Date of first family members conversion to Oneness Pentecostalism ____________
23. What motivated you to become part of Oneness Pentecostalism? (Circle any applicable)

   a. I experienced a healing.
   b. I witnessed a healing.
   c. I attended a home bible study.
   d. I attended a church service.
   e. Other __________________________________________________________

24. Did you attend Bible School? Y/N   25. Which one? ________________________________

   If so, when ___________ and where ________________________________

26-27. Who was your first contact with Oneness Pentecostalism? ____________(M/F)______

28-29. Who was your first pastor? ________________________________ (M/F)______

30-31. Who was your pastor’s pastor? ________________________________ (M/F)______

32-34. Name of person who had greatest impact on your ministry and why? (For leaders only.)
________________________ (M/F)______________________

35. If you have historical information concerning the early days of your religious organization, would you please share that information with our researcher?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your help. Please return the completed form to the individual who gave it to you, or email to [REDACTED] If this survey is in the form of an interview by the researcher, other questions may be asked depending on the answers given and the willingness of the individual being interviewed to volunteer further information.

THIS INTERVIEW MAY BE ELECTRONICALLY RECORDED
Appendix E

Participant Information and Consent Form

‘Migrating to the Edge: The History of Oneness Pentecostalism in the Philippines’

Researcher: Johnny King
Research Supervision: Prof. Allan Anderson

A copy of this information leaflet and consent form should be retained by the participant.

The researcher should retain copies of each signed consent form.

Information for participants

The Oneness Pentecostal movement in the Philippine Islands, and among the Filipino diaspora, has a unique and rich history. This history deserves to be told. This research, conducted by the Department of Theology and Religion in the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, will examine the history of Oneness Pentecostalism within the Philippines and among the diaspora from its early beginnings to the present time. Historical information is being sought that will shed light upon the contributions of missionaries and national leaders, pastors and members of all aspects of Filipino Oneness Pentecostalism.

How can you help us?

Would you be able to spend some time with our researcher answering questions and sharing some of your memories, thoughts and insights? Would you be willing to fill out a survey form that asks questions about your conversion and your family’s conversion into Oneness Pentecostalism as well as other information that might give valuable insight into the growth of the movement?

If you are a current or former missionary, leader, pastor or member of a Oneness Pentecostal church or organization, you might have information that would contribute greatly to this research. You are under no obligation to participate in this research but we hope that you will feel comfortable in doing so.

Confidentiality and Fair Processing

The historical information that you share with us may be used in our research. Anything that you share of a personal nature will be treated as confidential. However, the information and documentation we produce based on your communication and research contribution will be stored and filed and may become part of a database or filing system.
Information and documentation will be retained by Johnny King privately and by the University of Birmingham. It will only be accessed by authorised personnel involved in the project and will only be used for the purpose of research and the production of academic knowledge.

*By participating in this research, you are consenting to your information and communication being stored and evaluated for the stated purposes.*

The information and documentation will be processed by the University of Birmingham in accordance with the provisions of the United Kingdom Data Protection Act 1998. What information we consider relevant for publication, in general, will be treated anonymously. However occasionally, we may want to identify a contribution within a particular person, church or ministry, but only where there is reason to believe that no problems could arise that would affect individuals or any part of your church/ministry. *No identifiable personal data will be published without explicit consent given.*

**Withdrawal from research**

Participation in this research is voluntary. *At any point the participant is free to withdraw without giving reasons.* If you wish to do so, all information and documentation on record, based on your research contribution, will be removed from the study and destroyed.

To formally withdraw your research contribution, please write within 4 weeks to Prof. Allan Anderson, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT.

Please also tell our researcher if you do not want to answer certain questions. It would help us if you gave us your reasons, but you do not need to do so.

**Audio/video recording**

We may want to record some of our interviews (video or audio). Please tell our researcher, if you are not comfortable with this.

**Compensation**

We are sorry that we do not have the means to compensate research participants financially for the time and effort they invest in the research.

*Please talk to our researcher if you need more information about this research or your participation.* Or send an email to [REDACTED]
Appendix F

Statement of Consent – Participants

(1) I confirm that I have read and understand this participant information. I have had the opportunity to ask questions if necessary and have had these answered satisfactorily.

(2) I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason. In such a case, I may also ask for information and documentation based on my research contribution to be removed from the study and destroyed.

(3) I understand that my personal data will be processed for the purposes detailed above, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

(4) Based upon the above, I agree to take part in this study.

(5) I approve/do not approve * of interviews being recorded (video/audio). (*Please delete as appropriate).

Name of participant_____________________________
Location____________________________________

Date____________________
Signature____________________________________

Name of researcher: Johnny King
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