

Why Paedobaptist Calvinist's Downplay and Reject the Union Truths.

A Baptist Opinion by Rev. Earl Jackson

©2011 All rights Reserved

When I speak of the "Union Truths", also called "Identification Truths", I am referring to a body of doctrines that is generally quite unfamiliar to the covenant theologians both, of today and of the past. These doctrines have little or no place in their theology, and they seem to be doctrines more closely linked with the more experiential oriented Arminian groups. But actually these are uniquely Baptist distinctive, and I will show you historically why this is so. Many of you have no idea what I'm even talking about when I refer to the "Union Truths", or Identification Truths", so I will begin with some loose defining and commentary regarding the importance of the doctrines, and then a brief analysis of why I think they are generally relegated to the Arminian camp, and also some feelings that I have on how this has crippled the Reformed movements of our day. Notice that I have subtitled this a Baptist opinion, and that is exactly what it is. I'm a Baptist, and I make no apology about having Baptist opinions, which non-Baptist's might find offensive. Oh well. Deal with it. That's why I am what I am, and why you are what you are. If my opinions bother you, or offend, you, I'm sorry, but guess what? If they come from the Bible, then I'll never change them, and you can go pound sand. I don't want to hear what you have to say, if you disagree with the Bible. If, you agree with the Bible, then guess what? You will love what I have to say, because it springs from that inspired source. But then, you may love what I say, but dislike the way I say it. That's OK too, because I am a human, and I am quite imperfect, and I often say the right things in a wrong way, you'll have to forgive me for that. I don't intend to hurt or harm anyone, and while I may hate a persons doctrine, his theology, his church, or the people he hangs around; and while I may say it with pointed words, I pray for them, that Love from Christ, and Love to Christ, would overtake them, change them, and me also. It's all about our faithfulness to Jesus and His word. So forgive me, if my opinions ruffle feathers, or sound caustic in your ears, they come, because people who disagree with Christ, disagree with my stomach and make me sick, even though I love them, at the same time.

First of all, let me venture some sort of definitions. Generally speaking the "Union Truths" are those doctrines having to do with our solidarity and union with Adam by nature; and our solidarity and union with Christ, the second Adam, by grace. Reformed theologians generally tend to confine their discussions regarding these things to the doctrines of "imputation" (both of sin and righteousness), "federal headship" (both of Adam and Christ) and a to loose application in regeneration and sanctification. There seems to be however, a vast body of doctrines and applications connected with the Union Truths, that is scarcely ever touched upon by the covenant theologians, particularly in the area

of sanctification. Most of the Arminian camps and dispensational theologians have embraced these concepts willingly and gladly, and have allowed them to permeate their thinking and theology to an entirely different level than the Paedobaptist covenant theologians.

Let me give you some loose examples of what I'm talking about, at least as I see it, and then you can analyze it for yourself. Most covenant theologians, and Calvinistic discussions, about the death of Christ (Atonement), center on the nature and extent of it, with treatment, as to the application of it, being limited to redemption in general. John Owens' classic work "The Death of Death in the Death of Christ" is one such prime example. In three, large, detailed volumes; Owen explores all the ins and outs of the cross, as it relates to it's nature as a satisfaction for our sins, and for whom it was engendered and why. These things are great, and are certainly important, but there is scarcely a word about the Union Truths like **Galatians 2: 20 "I am crucified with Christ"**. I consider that to be a grave, serious and obvious omission. I would have expected at least one chapter dealing with this important Union Truth that states that my solidarity with Christ was such that His cross-work was also my Cross-work. That when He died, I died, and subsequently when He arose I rose with him also. But there is nothing. Why is that? Do we not need to know that we are identified completely in His cross-work, and that it extends to our taking up His cross and following Him daily? It seems that the cross has an important, daily, practical application in the life of the believer, but Owen neglects it, as do most of the theologians in his camp. Their concept of the cross, is good as far as it goes, but it seems to conspicuously lack reference to the important experiential aspects of how that applies to our sanctification by grace, as well as our regeneration and justification. I think we need to understand this Bible doctrine, don't you?

Or how about Galatians 6:14? Why doesn't that occupy a Chapter? **"But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world"**. In exactly what sense is the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, my crucifixion to the world? And what are the implications of that, with regard to the notion of sanctification? It seems to me, that discussions about these things are abundant in the Arminian Camps, The Pentecostal Camps, The Brethren Camps, and The Baptist camps, (but I'm not saying all these groups are correct in their views here, but at least they talk about the subject). On the other hand these important doctrines are almost completely lacking in the Presbyterian, Anglican, Reformed Episcopalian, and Dutch Reformed camps, and these camps are made up almost exclusively of Paedobaptist Covenant Theologians, while the other camps are made up of Arminian, Pelagian, Dispensational and only some Calvinistic Theologians, but almost exclusively people who believe in Believers Baptism by immersion (the Baptist view of baptism).

My suggestion here, is that the differences between these groups, is more than just doctrinal interpretation. It is doctrinal application, and I see some roots of

this schism in the expression of one key doctrine...Baptism...as it relates to the respective theological systems. I know that you probably do not see any relationship yet, but hopefully when I am done explaining myself you will see it.

I have to tell you, at the outset that I am coming at this from a very Baptist perspective, but I have many dear friends who are both covenant theologians and Paedobaptistic. I have great respect for them, and I feel that I thoroughly understand their system, but I have to insist that they are Biblically wrong, and that they have carried their prejudice about the true biblical Baptismal formula to extremes, which has stilted their theology completely against the Union Truths, which are closely intertwined with the doctrine of baptism. This hurts them, their credibility, their theology, and unfortunately it is hurting many of the new found Calvinistic Baptist, who think that their brand of Calvinism is just the same as the Baptist brand. Well it is not. Do not be deceived there are many series dissimilarities between the Baptist's and the Paedobaptist Covenant theologians. And in fact the differences are vast, especially if you are a dispensational Calvinistic Baptist, or a New Covenant Theology, Calvinistic Baptist. In these cases, about the only similarity is the five points.

The differences between, us Baptists and those Presby's, Anglicans, and Dutch Reformed people, is very great indeed, and we should not allow their powerful, and great thinkers, to cloud our simple Baptist brains on this stuff. It is really easy to comprehend. It goes something like this, and I want you to go back quite a way back in time and think historically for a moment, so you can see the origins of the conflict. Around 1600 in England, there were no Pentecostals, no non-denominational groups, no Wesleyan Arminian groups, and basically the theological scene was controlled by the Anglican's (church of England) and to a lesser degree by the Presbyterians (Reformed). Puritanism was in it's hey day. Only State approved religions were acceptable. But, at that very time a strong heretical movement (at least heretical from the point of view of the ensconced theological powers that be)...the Baptist's... began to sprout up in England, with the establishment of a few dissenting congregations. They grew quickly because of their sensible and simple tenets and their piety and Christ-likeness. Their struggle for survival was intense, and included severe persecution, and even death. This was also soon carried to the American colonies, where the Baptist were forcefully driven out of Massachusetts Bay Colony, by the Colonial Congregationalist Puritans, who were also strongly Covenant Theology Paedobaptists. The number one issue in the conflict was not Calvinism. Many of the Baptist were staunch Calvinist's, like their Puritan counterparts. Both groups had strong adherents to the five points of Calvinism. The issue of contention was the Doctrine of Baptism, and as I will try to show you...the Union Truths, or Identification truths, which are uniquely connected to the Baptist's and their insistence on a Biblical Baptismal Theology, and a very strict Sola Scriptura, devoid of traditions and doctrines of men. The Baptist went far beyond the Presbyterians and the other Reformed traditions in their insistence upon the Bible alone as the sole rule of faith and practice. To the Baptist mind, if a

doctrine or practice was not firmly rooted in chapter and verse, it was nothing more than human invention and speculation. A verse that burned in the heart of every Baptist, when it came to the prevalent Puritan Paedobaptist religion which was firmly ensconced all around them was: **"Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition" (Matt. 5:6)**. To the Baptist mind this was completely unacceptable, and constituted a form of rebellion against God. His Word, and the light of truth, were to be our guides by the power of the Holy Spirit and nothing else. If you have not read John Quincy Adam's book; The Baptist's - The Only Thorough Religious Reformers, then you need to read it, so you can properly understand the importance of this thoroughgoing Sola Scriptura on the Baptist theology. Needless to say, the Baptist's insistence that the Puritan religious system of England, was nothing but human traditions, with little regard for Scripture, infuriated the powerful religious leaders of the time. The Baptist's were seriously persecuted, hundreds were murdered, and drowning was the favorite method used to kill these heretics who insisted on complete immersion for believers only as the only Biblical Baptismal formula. I'll show you in a minute how all this relates to the Union Truths, but for now, I want you to understand that the main issue was not Calvinism, it was Baptism, and Sola Scriptura. The Baptist's saw Paedobaptism as nothing more than left over traditionalism from Augustinian Catholicism. When the reformers left Rome, they did not leave far enough, according to the Baptist dissenters. They brought many of the Romish doctrines with them, and baptizing infants, baptizing by effusion (or sprinkling), and the non-Biblical ideas of Covenant Theology, were obvious elements of Rome's unscripturalism, which in the mind of the Baptist's needed to go. Don't misunderstand me here. Not all Baptist's rejected all of the principles of Covenant Theology, but most did. But all of the Baptist's, en toto, rejected Paedobaptism, and sprinkling as the mode of baptism. And here's the reason why. (Please pay attention closely, because these reasons they rejected Paedobaptism, are also the reasons they vigorously maintained the "Union Truths").

Rom 6:1- 11 What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness of his* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto

God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

You will immediately recognize this passage as one of the primary Baptismal passages of the New Testament. But to a Baptist it presents irrefutable proof of their doctrines of both Baptism, and Vital Union with Christ. I do not intend to exegete this passage, you can do that on your own. What I simply want to do is draw the pertinent Baptist conclusions which we Baptists insist that the passage teaches, and then show you how important they are to my thesis that the identification truths are generally neglected or outright rejected by most of the modern Covenant Theology theologians, which still tend to be Paedobaptistic. I'm aware that many current day Baptist theologians also embrace a slightly different, Baptist-ized version of Covenant theology, but that is of no consequence to my discussion. I simply want you to understand the basic underlying differences here.

First of all, Romans 6 teaches that Baptism is a "burial", and a "planting" together in the likeness of Christ's death. The Baptist view of the ordinances, is that there are two...Baptism and the Lords Supper. They are both symbolic, according to the Baptist interpretation, and they both symbolize the atoning work of Christ, and how it is applied to our lives. The bread and the wine show the death and blood of Christ, and symbolize how His death becomes appropriated for our life. Baptism, shows the atonement also, but specifically The Death, Burial and Resurrection. Baptism pictures all three things being applied in the believers life. The believer is buried under the water to show his burial with Christ, and he is raised out of the water to show His resurrection with Christ. The old man has died, and the new man has risen, because Christ has died, and Christ has risen. We do not live in sin any longer, because we have died, and the life that we now live, is a new life, a resurrection life. **"Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin"**. Even a casual reading of Romans 6 will yield these crystal clear truths, and will not only vilify the Baptist doctrine of the correct Baptismal formula and mode, but will also form the basis for the Baptist doctrine of the "Union Truths", that when Christ died, I died, and When Christ arose, I rose with him. Far from being insignificant doctrines, these are major doctrines, (at least to Baptists, who believe that all Scripture is inspired and profitable for doctrine (2Tim. 3:16)), and these doctrines vitally affect our entire view of sanctification and the Christian life. This is the root cause and the primary reason, that Presbyterians, and Anglican Puritans murdered and martyred the Baptists, in the 1600's and 1700's. But, I'm telling you, at least as far as I can see, this is the same reason that these Paedobaptist branches of the faith, dismiss or reject the Union Truths. Do not be deceived here, the Baptists have many distinctive doctrines which are not shared by the Presbyterians. And we are living in a strange time when compromising Baptists have allowed the many differences to be blurred to the point where Presbyterians are often invited to speak at Baptist conferences. There is even a disturbing trend in Baptist churches, to remove the name Baptist from their church name. People, shed their blood to maintain the

Baptist distinctives, and giving it all up to get closer to the Presbyterian's is an abomination, that needs to cease in our circles. Baptist's have always been separatist's doctrinally, because their doctrines are distinctively Bible based.

It is this notion of absolute and complete solidarity with Christ, that destroys any possibility of Paedobaptism. The reason that we are buried in Baptism, is because we recognize our union in Christ's death burial and resurrection. The union truths are an integral part of the fundamental Baptist understanding of Romans 6. Paedobaptist covenant theologians, cannot explain Romans 6 apart from turning it into a bunch of figures of speech. They rob "burial" and "planting" of their simple meaning, and of their baptismal significance, thus stripping the passage of any real importance at all. They do this deliberately, and with indifference to other portions of Scripture. There is no way that sprinkling, can ever be construed to be a burial, or as a metaphor about burial. When you plant something you put it out of sight underneath something else. Language has to be stretched out of all bounds to accomplish this impossible feat by sprinkling! By the same token, they rob the Union Truths of all their significance as well. To believe these things, would mean they would have to change their entire system, and they are not about to admit that they are wrong. They are too rooted in confessionalism and creedalism.

I have loads of respect for the great Presbyterian theologians, of today and of the past, and there have been a great many of them, who made many positive contributions to Christianity. But they all seem to be deficient in the matter of sanctification. To most of them, (and I realize that I am generalizing here. There are exceptions), but generally speaking... to most of them, sanctification is all about repenting, and praying, studying, church activities, obedience to the commandments, acts of worship and contrition, and perseverance in outward and inward holiness. Baptist's, right from their earliest days, have rejected all this, and insisted that sanctification, just like regeneration, and all other parts of salvation, is by Grace alone, through faith alone. Works are incidental and secondary. Relationship, and UNION is primary and fundamental. To the original Baptist's, and to most Baptist's today also, salvation is by Grace from start to finish, and this includes sanctification as well as justification and regeneration. The fruit of good works, springs from the root of grace. The branches have vital Union with the vine, and the end result is the true fruit of Christ-likeness. Christ-likeness, according to Baptist theology, is a product of UNION, and not the product of mortification, repentance, Sabbath-keeping, prayer or any other human activity. Now when you read the puritans and most Presbyterian authors, you find a puzzling lack of these Union Truths, and a constant insistence on do-goodism, and works. Why? I believe it is because their theology avoids the identification doctrines, because if they taught them, they would all become Baptists! The union Truths lead to the Baptism Truths. These are inexorably intertwined. At least that's the way it seems to me.

This also explains some basic differences in their theological methods.

Presbyterians, and Covenant theologians in general, tend to put a huge emphasis on Confessionalism, and intellectualism. The Baptists on the other hand, are generally perceived to be ignorant, or anti-intellectual. I think this comes from their method. Baptist's tend to go to the Bible first, when formulating a doctrine, and tend to spend lots of time extracting and collating every Biblical reference, and tend to formulate their doctrines based first and foremost on this. So, like myself, many Baptist scholars, pepper their writings with Biblical quotations, and references to chapters and verse, and provide little in the way of what would be accepted scholarly bibliography and footnotes. I cannot speak for others. I can only speak for myself, but I do this by choice. God called call me to be a preacher of His Word, not a reviewer of books and journals, not someone who parrots the quotes of Dr So and So, or someone who elevates the writings of mere men. I'm sorry, but to me that stuff is irrelevant and out of place, for a servant of God. What passes as scholarship, is simply quoting the opinions of others, who are supposed to be more qualified then you to speak. I reject that out of hand, and believe, that quoting Jesus and the Inspired writers, is my primary obligation. I'm supposed to be a mouthpiece of God, not a parrot of men. Sorry, but I think if you look historically at the two schools, you will find lot's of Baptist's who share my opinion.

Inevitable I'm going to get emails from people, accusing me of not substantiating my claims, and not documenting my assertions. It happens every time I write something controversial, or something someone does not like or agree with. I do read, and I do research the positions of scholars, experts, theologians and historians, I make every effort to keep myself well informed, and well read. I simply choose not to quote human sources very often. I find that if they are saying anything true, valid or important, I can get it in a better form, and from a better source in the Bible. I'm not interested in dishing out pre-digested truths. Birds vomit in the throats of their baby chicks, but God feeds His people by better means than this. Does that make me anti-intellectual? You may think so, but I don't concur with you at all. I happen to own and use a Library of 15,000 volumes, which I have accumulated over 35 or 40 years of book collecting and reading. I read widely on every subject. But I do not elevate the opinions of others above the Bible. I hope not, and I dare not. That's the way I think, and frankly, when I read the way some theologians, scholars and preachers handle the Word, of God, and the way they preach and write, it disgusts me. 5 or 10 minutes into their sermons and you've already heard 3 quotes from this book or that journal, this expert or that PHD. Forget that! Regurgi-burger truth. IT leaves me cold and dry. I'd rather listen to a ignorant old time preacher, who basis his remarks on God's opinion, and who elevates Christ. And make Christ into the center of everything that is truly important, just like He is in the reality of God. I'd take 50 hours of that kind of Christ-exalting preaching anytime, instead of 5 minutes of intellectual pomposity. Sorry. But that's part of the problem. The Presby's reject Union Truths, and Biblical Baptism because they're not already in their theology, their confessions, and their texts books. They can't quote men on this stuff, so they assume it is heresy. They drowned Baptist's

400 years ago because of the same unreformed, reformed doctrine, and theological creedal bias, which the incessantly cling to, and they would probably do it again today, if we were not so widely accepted and respectably tolerated now. They hate any doctrine that proves them wrong, and they are unwilling to reform beyond creeds, traditions and teachings of men. That's part of their tradition, and it's the one part they will never change. But that's exactly why I will never be a Presbyterian. Their stubborn insistence that they are right, even when they are wrong, would be enough for me to high tail it out of that camp. If I were a Presby, I'd get out of there so fast your head would spin, but that's just me, a radical, stupid, unintelligent Baptist. They cannot see their own errors, because they are locked in to them by their own mindset. Please don't misunderstand me. I said it a couple of times, but I need to re-emphasize it again. I have a lot of respect for the many positive contributions the Presbyterians and Covenant Theologians have made to the cause of Christ and the Christian Faith. But they are wrong about Baptism, and it colors their eyeballs on these other important identification doctrines as well.

Now, I want you to see where we are today. Hundreds of years have passed since the dissenting Baptist's insisted on Romans 6 and demanded a return to Scripturalism and the great Union Truths. Many groups broke off from them, over the following centuries. They sprang from these Baptist theological roots. I mentioned the Brethren groups (Plymouth Brethren), the Bible-Churches, the non-denominationalist's, the independents, the Pentecostals and others like Church of Christ, and Adventists. All these groups sprang out of, or flowed from, the Baptist roots at some point. And they all embraced the Baptist idea of immersion, and in almost all cases, they also maintained the emphasis on the Baptist theology of Union Truths, or Identification Truths. It's the Paedobaptist's, with their Augustinian Catholic heritage, who reject these doctrines out of hand, and who seem to care less about owning a correct doctrine of sanctification, especially if it is linked to a correct doctrine of Baptism. If it's tied to immersion, toss it out, we don't want anything to do with it! And we will refuse to think about it, except to come up with ways to negate it. That my friends is a sick attitude, and is an improper way to handle the Word of God.

Now I'm not so foolish to think that my measly efforts are going to reform any Presbyterians. They've been stuck in a theological rut for hundreds of years. My concern in this is simply to point out a long Baptist heritage of certain important and distinctive truths, and to call attention to the fact, that I'm very alarmed when Baptist's seem to be more Presbyterian than Baptist in their theology. I refuse to embrace something simply because Calvin embraced it. Calvin did a lot of good, theologically, and to promote the study of the Bible. But Calvin also set the evil stage for hundreds of years of murdering everyone who did not agree with him. I think he is very much to be faulted for his involvement with the burning of Servetus. And I think the Presbyterians murdered plenty of Baptist dissenters as well, over the succeeding centuries, following their founders hatred for anyone who did not agree with his theology. That's the way that it is,

and you can't rewrite history. I don't think any Christian has the right to murder another human being because they disagree with his theology. And I know that no Presbyterian living today, is proud of their black history of doctrinal hatred and evil acts. But the facts remain what they are.

I'm pointing this stuff out simply to warn my Baptist brothers who are chumming around Westminster Seminary, and other Paedobaptist institutions, as though the doctrines they find in those wells are pure and holy, formulated from scripture. They are not, and you need to be very careful. All who claim to be reformed, are not reformed to the same degree, and some do not want to be, and that's the case over there in Presby-land. I recently read in a Presbyterian denominational magazine, that more Baptist pastors, are leaving the Baptist faith to become Presbyterians, then ever before. How alarming is that? Well I believe that's because we bought into all their hogwash about confessionalism, creeds and expert theologians, and abandoned our simple Baptist faith in the Word of God alone, as the sufficiency for everything we believe and practice. I think we made a huge mistake as Baptist's in 1689 when we simply re-baptized their Westminster confession of faith, took out the parts about infant baptism, and adopted it into our own London Baptist Confession. We should have kept our own original, Baptist confession of 1644, rather than bring all their Covenant Theology garbage to our Bible believing congregations. That's where all the problems really began, at least as far as I see it. Then back in the 1970's when Calvinism began to revive in the ranks of slumbering Baptist churches, There was also a revival of that 1689 Baptist rewrite of the Westminster Confession. Many Reformed Baptist Churches began using it, and it's just a hop-skip-and-jump from a Baptist church to the Presbyterian church around the corner. When Baptists allowed the lines of demarcation to blur in 1689, they opened the doors for Baptist Pastors to migrate to Presbyterian pulpits in 2011. What ever happened to our Baptist distinctives? Any Baptist who starts sprinkling babies to bring them into God's kingdom, has abandoned the faith, betrayed the Lord, besmirched His Blood, and rejected the Bible, no matter what he says to the contrary. Baptist's have shed their lives for these truths, and it sickens me to hear the Presbyterians boast of more Baptist converts now, than ever before. That's disgusting. That's abhorrent to all my sensibilities. It makes me want to puke. Sorry, for the graphic language, but I'm sick of all this Baptist parlance with people who are stuck in the past, and lodged in a theological rut filled with errors. Baptist are a unique and ancient group of people, who seek nothing less than full restoration of genuine New Testament Christianity. We've been seeking it for 500 years or more, and we ought not stop now. The reformation we seek is Book of Acts Reformation, not Presbyterianism. That's one of our earmarks. It makes us the most thorough reformers, and it is an on-going process, not something set in stone or creeds of men.

I may share the 5 points with them, but that's about as far as it goes. They may preach an occasional good gospel message, but when they sprinkle babies into

the kingdom, they undo, all the other truths they advocate. I can get that kind of aberrant doctrine down at St Mary of the Assumption Church. It sickens and disgusts me, no matter what famous scholar, or theology professor, espouses it. I have met preachers with a third grade education, who had better theology, and more love to Christ, and more dedication to His Word, than these Doctor of Divinities, and PHD's who sprinkle babies into the kingdom, and reject the blessed Identification Truths that are the basis of our very existence. Beware, O brother. The grass may look green over at Westminster, but it is, plastic astro-turf! It is imitation through and through. Should you go there to graze, you will starve to death of malnutrition. Such Biblically contradictive theology, ought to clue you in to steer clear, and avoid it all costs.

For years I have heard Fundamentalist type Baptist preachers warning their people of the dangers and evils of "Calvinism". I know that they misrepresent the Calvinistic doctrines, and falsely teach that Calvinism kills evangelism. But not all their warnings should go unheeded. The modern day form a Presbyterian-saturated Calvinism is certainly destructive of Baptist identity, and erodes Baptist separation from subtle forms of ecumenism that seek to amalgamate truly different groups into one. Baptist churches are forsaking their Baptist name, and heritage. The term "Reformed" is gaining preference, when churches don't want to be associated with Fundamentalists. Some churches are just turning into Life-Point, Light-house, Fire-hose, or whatever non-descript emergent sounding name they can find. What the heck is a Life-point church? As for me, I want to know if I am going to a Baptist Church or not. Men bled and died to preserve their Baptist identity, and I'm not willing to flush it down the toilet, just to get a bigger or younger crowd on Sunday. At least when I see Baptist on the sign, I know they are not sprinkling babies into the kingdom of God!

The identification truths are avoided by the high minded professional theologians of the covenant theology, Paedobaptism camp. This is rooted in their hatred for the Bible truth of Believers baptism by immersion. They hate it, and they reject it. Not only that, they openly contradict it, and try to disassemble it. Any theology unwilling to bow to plain the precepts of Scripture, regardless of how much other truth they may have, is heretical theology. Jesus was an adult when He was baptized by John. Why was that? Why was He not sprinkled in the manger? There is not one case anywhere in all of Scripture where any infant was ever baptized! Why is that? How can we praise a group of so called reformers, who are unwilling to reform the most obvious of their own errors? Get me out of that church, or school, or denomination, that has no spirit of repentance. There is no reformation without repentance of obvious error. Dear friends, one mark of true Christianity, whether Baptist or any other brand, is that it is always changing and growing, and conforming to the living Word of God. Christianity is alive, and it's Book and God are also alive. So we change, we grow, we learn, we improve, we reform, and we are always striving to become more Christ-like. That means we refuse to get stuck in a rut, or cling foolishly to man made doctrines, inventions and contraptions. The Pharisees wanted their traditions,

and their living in the past dead doctrines. But Christ overturned, not only their money changing table. He overturned their whole system. Only those who are willing to change, are true followers of Christ. They are always repenting, but never dissenting from the truth. And never does this change involve tossing out one word, one jot, or one tittle of God's precious Word. So, my friends, pick your theological friends very carefully. And always, always, weigh everything carefully in the light of chapter and verse, and if it doesn't match up with what God says...reject it! Flee from it! Avoid it like the plague! because God knows what He is talking about. Listen only to Him. If you hear a voice contradicting Him, get out your ear-plugs, shake the dust off your feet, and RUN! Run the opposite way. Truth has no fellowship with darkness. RUN! RUN for your life, because you never know when they might start drowning Baptist's again. Watch out. We were hated before, and if we are not still hated, then it's because we have compromise away our Baptist heritage and distinctives! We have been come like them, so now they like us. Make no mistake. True Baptist's are nothing like them. We are different, and always have been. We are people of the Book, and are not people pleasers. We want only to please God, and to be like Him...no matter where that may lead, no matter what that might cost. We separate ourselves from the beast wherever she may be found. It's high-time we start doing this again, because too much is at stake. I'm urging any and all Baptist Pastors, to flee the harmful influences of Paedobaptistic Covenant Theology. It is a poisonous snake in our midst, and it is time to eradicate her.