

# *Why I am a Bible Believer*

By: David A. Sargent

I do not mind that I am a Baptist; but I am first a Bible Believing Christian, then Independent Baptist. I also believe that these things identify the belief structures of people and rightfully so. (John the Baptist was a Baptist because he baptized people; I am a Baptist because we believe water baptism does NOTHING for your salvation at all. It does not put you into Christ or into the Church or into anything but WATER! IT IS A TYPE only. It is NOT a sacrament.

If someone said they were Christian, and then proceeded to tell me that God was once a man and we can become Gods... You know what you are dealing with if you know and identify the groups and rightly distinguish between the Right and the Wrong. As a Bible believer, we should go to great lengths to study to rightly divide the word of truth and know what it is that we believe, or are supposed to believe and what we are NOT to believe or are not supposed to believe.

I know also that during Christian growth not all of the doctrinal things are solidified, known or understood. That is the point of growth in the KNOWLEDGE and GRACE of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, not everyone is at the same level of growth and or maturity in Christ. It therefore behooves us to have grace for others that have not come to where we are, and others that might be further along than ourselves.

Just to give the reader some history: I was not raised Baptist, I was raised Episcopalian; which is the Church of England in America. I am Baptist by CHOICE; because I do not believe in infant baptism; I do believe in believer's baptism, and the reason for this is because I do not believe baptism has any merit or saving grace. It is because of this that I also do not refer to baptism as a sacrament which it is not, but on the contrary it is an ordinance.

The Baptist distinctives are biblical one in which I have already given. The "Baptists" that would teach contrary to these things are NOT "Baptists"; they are just using that name to infiltrate for malicious purposes. Exactly what the Followers of Joseph Smith do by calling themselves "Christians" when they are NOT. There's nothing new under the sun!

To me being "Baptistic" is the same as being "Pauline" or being "Biblical". I see these things as the same. I know not all Baptists are "Baptistic" and have dealt with a few that are Followers of John Calvin who's name was actually Jean Chauvin. Whereas Calvin was against the Anabaptists of his day as they were also against him, to mix Baptistic doctrines with Calvin's doctrines would grate on each other as much as the Spirit does against the flesh. Calvin taught and practiced infant baptism and called it a sacrament. Then turns around and says it has no merit to salvation. That seems alright on the surface

however, there are two issues I have with this: IF you call a thing a sacrament, which implies grace in the object or application of this object; in this case baptism or the water. (From A Compend of Calvin's Institutes, 1939 edited by Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., PhD. Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chapter 24 titled: The Sacraments: Pages 185 through 214. On page 188 we read this: "Our two sacraments present us with a clearer exhibition of Christ, in proportion to the nearer view of him which men have enjoyed since he was really manifested by the Father in the manner in which he had been promised. For baptism testifies to us our purgation and ablution; the Eucharistic supper testifies our redemption. Water is a figure of ablution, and blood of satisfaction. ... In the water and the blood we have a testimony of purgation and redemption; and the Spirit, as the principal witness, confirms and secures our reception and belief of this testimony..." Further it says: "Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the society of the Church, in order that, being incorporated into Christ, we may be numbered among the children of God." This is a blatant lie. Baptism does NOT put anyone into the Church or into Christ! On the next page Calvin makes this remarkable statement: "...At whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life..." THAT IS THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION! Then on page 190 Calvin says: "...by baptism Christ has made us partakers of his death, in order that we may be engrafted into it..." This is why he baptized INFANTS! However water baptism does none of this. Water baptism puts you into WATER. It does nothing to the lost or the believer. It is for the believer to identify himself with Christ, but has no power to do anything. What was Calvin up to? I believe he was holding on to his Catholic roots. A lot of what he taught was against Rome, however, when it came to these things he was more Catholic than he wanted to believe he was. None of his pentagram points of pagan fatalism are true. They are all based on a misconception of the truth of salvation, propitiation, imputation and reconciliation. A total misconception of what makes up the human: body, soul and spirit. He could not comprehend what the human will really was. Calvin said on the same page: "...we are the children of God, because we have put on Christ in baptism. Thus we see that the accomplishment of baptism is in Christ; whom, on this account, we call the proper object of baptism." How does water baptism put on Christ? I think I understand what Calvin was trying so hard to say and could not because of his history and time in which he lived. To produce the pentagram points of pagan fatalism he had to have a root of doctrinal heresy that kept him from seeing the truth. He also believed in a Church State set up. Calvin's real name was Jean Chauvin; so it should be Chauvinism!

I have said all this about Calvin, because there are some Baptist that have considered Calvinism to be the truth. Calvinism is NOT Baptist, nor is it Biblical. Calvinism is just another harlot of Rome: as is Mormonism, Jehovah's Witnessism, Seventh Day Adventism, Campbellism, Christian Scientism, Pentecostalism, and any other Christian cult. Dealing with these groups as well as pagans, Wiccans, atheists, and other Non-Christian cults: they ALL have the same mother CULTIC way to "prove" their particular doctrinal slant. The cultic "way" to prove their particular doctrines is by using "Textual Criticism." I have spoken to many of these people that use this as either an alibi to NOT believe the Bible or to prove that THEIR religion is better; or to prove their particular doctrine. This "science" falsely so called, is "Textual Criticism" and was perpetrated by

Westcott and Hort with their Greek Text in 1881. These two men were CLOSET Catholics and worshiped Mary according to their personal correspondences. These things are public record now. All modern and new bible revisions are made from THIS type of pseudo-scholarship. It is a faithless disbelief in the preserved words of God. It deals with the HOLY BIBLE as it does with any ancient book, by linguistics, hermeneutics, syntax, and theories that older manuscripts are better because they are closer to the “originals.” Age is not a criterion of good or bad; the TEXT itself would be the criteria. The shape the text would also be criteria for the text being good or bad.

This pseudo-scholarship has been preserved in the Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece: The New Testament in Greek, where we read on page 44 of the Introduction, “It is well known how he (Nestle) compared the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weymouth...” Then on the next page, “The text shared by these two editions was adopted internationally by Bible Societies, and following an agreement between the Vatican and the United Bible Societies it has served as the basis for new translations and for revisions made under their supervision.” We see there is a LINK to the Vatican, and to ROME! Now let’s look at the preface of the Revised Standard Version: published by Thomas Nelson & Sons 1953, page iii, “The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek...” This is a LIE! There are NO originals anywhere! Further it states on page iv: “Yet the King James Version has grave defects.” And then on page vii we get this rotten excuse for tampering with God’s holy words: “We now possess many more ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, and are far better equipped to seek to recover the original wording of the Greek text.” WAIT! Did you see that? Did that line up with what they said before? How is it that they had the original Hebrew and Greek and then are seeking to recover the original wording? Now let’s look at the foreword of the New World Translation, published by the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, page 5, “In 1969 the committee released The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures, which presented under the Greek text revised by Westcott and Hort (1948 Reprint) a literal word-for-word translation into English.”

One last thing, in the preface of the New King James Version, published by Thomas Nelson Publishers (who holds the copyright for this work as the author) page vi: “Over five thousand Greek, eight thousand Latin, and many more manuscripts in other languages attest the integrity of the New Testament. There is only one basic New Testament used by Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Orthodox, by conservatives and liberals. Minor variations in hand copying have appeared through the centuries, before mechanical printing began in A.D. 1450.” This is just NOT true and the next quote will show this. On page vii, we read: “The manuscript preferences cited in many contemporary translations of the New Testament are due to recent reliance on a relatively few manuscripts discovered in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Dependence on these manuscripts, especially two, the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts is due to the greater age of these documents. However, in spite of their age, some scholars have reason to doubt their faithfulness to the autographs, since they often disagree with one another and show other signs of unreliability. The Greek text obtained by using these sources and related papyri is known as the Alexandrian text.” Then they say: “Important

textual variants are recorded in footnotes.” This IS the science of Textual Criticism, and is all through out the preface of the NKJV. On page vii and viii they make the very text they spoke against the Neutral Text! SO in the notes where you see NU-Text it is NOT the Neutral Text at all, but the text called the Alexandrian text. They say: “Thus a clearly defined presentation of the variants is provided for the benefit of interested readers representing all textual persuasions.” Then we get the “...footnotes are classified as follows: 1. NU-Text: These variations from the traditional text generally represent the Alexandrian or Egyptian type of text described previously in ‘The New Testament Text’. This text is published in the Twenty-Sixth Edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament...” The one I have is the 27<sup>th</sup> Edition. The advocates of the Alexandrian text type that use Textual Criticism believe their text base is the neutral text, named so that it is supposedly not on “sides” if any issue. There is a RIGHT and WRONG text base that is the bottom line. There are ONLY TWO SIDES!

The fact is that there is a Roman connection, a Vatican connection, and a connection to Alexandria, Egypt, and a connection to Westcott and Hort, the originators of Textual Criticism OF THE BIBLE, a science falsely so called by pseudo-scholars. All this is under the cloke and dagger of the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth: ROME.