

Infant Baptism

1. If I have been baptised as an infant, why is there any need for Believer's Baptism?

Because Infant Baptism is no baptism.

It is a custom which pagans had carried into the Roman Catholic Church 17 centuries ago. Constantine the Great (Emperor of Rome) then declared Christianity to be the State Religion. Every Roman citizen had to become a Christian. Paganism was outlawed, pagan temples were shut down, and the pagans were absorbed into the Roman Church. And these brought along their pagan views and customs, which soon infiltrated the State Church – the birth of the Roman Catholic Church.

At the Reformation of the 1500's, Protestants (followers of Martin Luther) took over this custom from the Roman Catholic Church without changing it, and later developed doctrines to justify it. These doctrines are among those which are today known as "Covenant Theology".

Thus, you have never been baptised. You have been subjected to a pagan ritual without your consent.

2. But surely my Church leaders would know if it were a pagan ritual. They would never allow that!

Depending on your Church affiliation, that's not the only pagan custom that your Church leaders might be ignorant of. Are you aware that most other "Church calendar events", such as Christmas, Easter, Lent, Valentine's Day and Halloween are also pagan customs which had been fed into the Church?

This might shock you! And you're not the only one. I was shocked too, when I found out the first time, and checked the facts! It took me a long time to work through this emotionally.

Pastors and dominees simply echo from pulpits what they learn in Bible School or Seminary. I have never seen a graduate leaving a Reformed Seminary convinced of Baptist doctrines; and conversely, I've never seen a graduate leaving a Baptist Bible School convinced of Reformed doctrines.

Whatever a pastor or dominee is convinced of after his studies is not a function of TRUTH. Rather, it is a function of INDOCTRINATION. Both sides use the same Bible to justify their respective viewpoints.

Whatever pastors and dominees believe, is not a function of TRUTH. It is simply a function of WHICH INSTITUTION they opt to attend for their studies – even long before they believe the stuff on which they would later be prepared to bet their heads on.

3. But can't the two camps just live together? Can't those who want to baptise babies just have Infant Baptism, and those who want to baptise believers just have Believer's Baptism?

No, they cannot.

Simply because the two viewpoints are irreconcilable. And there cannot be two baptisms. The Bible speaks of only one:

*There is one body and one Spirit – just as you were called to one hope when you were called – one Lord, one faith, **one baptism.***

(Eph. 4:4 – 5)

4. So who is right? Both camps justify their viewpoints from the same Bible!

Believer's Baptism is the Biblical one.

To explain this, we will have to choose between two strategies:

1. The doctrinal avenue.
2. The symbolical avenue.

1. The doctrinal avenue:

This is the avenue which gets utilised in Bible Schools and Seminaries.

It is also the avenue which has been debated back and forth a zillion times before, and has not convinced either of the camps. And after several centuries of debate, I believe we have exhausted those doctrinal arguments. It seems like the doctrinal avenue simply does not possess the capacity to convince, let alone convict.

We will not waste our efforts here.

2. The symbolical avenue:

Experience has taught me personally that this avenue, of all avenues, by far displays the Biblical outcome the clearest.

We will explore this one:

In order to comprehend the strategy of gaining understanding of the baptism issue, please consider the following:

The entire **Infant Baptism** doctrine rests wholly on one doctrinal pillar:

That baptism is a seal of the Abrahamic Covenant.

For the sake of brevity, we will not attempt here to explain WHY this is so. Suffice to say that any person who would be included in the Abrahamic Covenant (the covenant which God made with Abraham – Gen. 15; 17) would be saved. This is Covenant Theology.

Therefore: If we could prove that baptism is NOT the seal of ANY covenant, it would mean that the whole Infant Baptism doctrine would implode on itself.

Ready?

Here goes:

Let us consider the major covenants of Scripture:

1. God's Marriage Covenant. Gen. 2:24.
2. God's covenant with Noah. Gen. 8:20 – 21; 9:12 – 16.
3. God's covenant(s) with Abraham (the "old" covenant). Gen.15; 17.
4. Holy Communion (the "new" covenant). Jer. 31:33; Mat. 26:26 – 28.

ALL these covenants were sealed by BLOOD and FLESH:

1. In the Marriage Covenant, husband and wife become ONE FLESH. In the consummation of the marriage covenant, the wife would bleed as her husband's flesh penetrated her body.
2. At God's covenant with Noah, Noah sacrificed some clean animals. Flesh and blood.

3. At God's covenant with Abram, he had to divide an animal in two. Flesh and blood. At God's covenant with Abraham, he had to be circumcised. Flesh and blood.
4. During Holy Communion, we celebrate the content of the new covenant of God with His people with bread (symbol of flesh) and wine (symbol of blood).

We therefore see that when God cuts a covenant, He does so with BLOOD and FLESH as the seal of that covenant.

(The only exception is the so-called SALT covenant – which is something entirely different. We won't go into that in the scope of this article).

The important aspect to note here, is:

THERE IS NOT ONE BIBLICAL INSTANCE WHERE GOD CUTS A COVENANT AND SEALS IT WITH WATER!

Hence, Scripture makes it abundantly clear:

GOD DOES NOT CONSIDER BAPTISM TO BE THE SEAL OF ANY COVENANT!

The baptismal water seal is the giveaway!

And this is the very point at which Infant Baptism doctrine implodes onto itself. It simply falls apart. Disintegrates.

Baptism is not the SEAL of any covenant. Rather, its function could be viewed as the same as that of Noah's flood, or the Red Sea. More on this later.

The only Biblical baptism is Believer's Baptism.

It gets administered unto BELIEVERS – whichever age they might be, but certainly not babies. Babies cannot believe during babyhood.

Believer's Baptism is baptism by immersion, not by sprinkling. This is not a mere technical issue. There's a good reason why.

5. So is Covenant Theology all wrong?

No.

The Bible is full of covenants. God is a covenantal God. But baptism plays no part in it.

6. So, if Baptism is no covenant, then what IS it?

Baptism is a sign of (Col. 2:12):

1. Death with Christ (Col. 2:20). Immersion in the water grave symbolises death and burial. Rom. 6:3 – 4; Mark 10:38.
2. Resurrection with Christ (Col. 3:1). Rising from immersion waters symbolises new life (birth) or resurrection. John 3:5.

This is the central reason why it should only be administered to believers, and not to babies.

7. So why then does the New Testament compare Baptism to Noah's flood and the Red Sea? (1 Pet. 3:20 – 21; 1 Cor. 10:2).

Because Noah's flood wiped away the sin of the pre-deluvian world. It was God's final judgment of sin.

Because the Red Sea wiped away the slave masters (Egyptians) in hot pursuit of the Israelites. It was God's final judgment of the house of slavery.

Similarly, baptism symbolises the wiping away of the individual's old, sinful life. It symbolises God's final judgment of the individual's sin, of his house of slavery.

8. So where does Covenant Theology take the wrong turn?

Covenant Theology confuses Baptism with Holy Communion.

The sign of the New Covenant (Jer. 31:33) is Holy Communion (Mat. 26:26 – 28). Flesh and Blood.

The content of the New Covenant is that God will write His law on our innermost flesh, or on the fleshy tables of our heart. (2 Cor. 3:3) This is sealed by Holy Communion (Flesh and Blood).

Covenant Theology says that circumcision (the seal of the Old Covenant) was replaced by baptism (and hence makes baptism the seal of the New Covenant – in stead of Holy Communion). Hence, strangely, Covenant Theology has TWO seals of the New Covenant in stead of ONE: Baptism and Holy Communion.

9. So, if baptism didn't replace circumcision, then why don't we circumcise male babies any more?

Circumcision was never replaced by anything. Circumcision is alive and well!

The only thing concerning circumcision that changed from the Old to the New Covenant, was that circumcision at the foreskin was replaced by circumcision of the innermost flesh (sometimes called the heart). Deut. 10:16; 30:6; Jer. 4:4; Rom. 2:29.

10. How can someone's HEART be circumcised?

God calls the process whereby He writes His law on someone's innermost flesh "circumcision of the heart". Col. 2:11; 2 Cor. 3:3.

In the scientific world, indications are that this "writing" of God's law on the fleshy tables of a believer's heart might well involve a re-coding of his "junk" DNA – the non-genetic part of the DNA helix. Which might well give rise to a radical change in behaviour.

11. WHEN does this "writing" take place?

Scripture is unambiguously clear on this (Col. 2:11 – 12):

In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands,

in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

*Buried with him **in baptism,***

wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God,

who hath raised him from the dead.

This is THE ONLY instance where the New Covenant and Baptism meet one another directly.

Circumcision was never replaced by anything. It is alive and well. Circumcision of the heart, until this day, occurs AT BAPTISM.

AT BAPTISM God, by His Holy Spirit, according to an individual's faith, writes his law on our innermost flesh – most probably on our DNA. Which causes a radical change in behaviour – a behaviour according to God's law!

Praise the Lord!

12. So if a person has never been baptised by believer's baptism – what would be the consequences?

Metaphorically:

He might have left the days of Noah, but the giants might not be dead.

He might have left Egypt, but Pharaoh might still be after him.

He might have accepted Jesus, but might fight ever-losing battles against sin.

He might have survived the giants, but might never be born into the post-deluvian world.

He might have left Egypt, but might never have taken possession of Canaan.

He might have left his old life, but was never reborn into a new life.

13. What should such a person do?

1. Get yourself baptised by immersion as a believer!
2. Renounce your Infant Baptism in the Name of Jesus!

14. Why should I renounce my Infant Baptism?

This is VERY important!

Whereas the water ritual of Infant Baptism does not represent a Biblical covenant, it does represent an occultic covenant.

Whereas NO Biblical covenant is ever sealed by water, occultists make water covenants most often!

A covenant forges THE STRONGEST imaginable spiritual link between any two parties. It could be equated to a spiritual contract.

Hence:

If you have been Infant Baptised, and have taken Communion as well, it would mean that you have made a spiritual contract not only with Jesus Christ, but also with some or other demonic entity. Which demonic entity this would be, would depend on the denomination that baptised you. Research shows, though, that in most cases this entity is the Queen of Heaven, also known as the Whore of Babylon or the Woman riding the Beast (see my DVD series on The Queen of Heaven).

You need to get rid of this spiritual contract as soon as possible! Or carry on suffering the consequences.

15. How can I get out of a spiritual contract that was made on my behalf by my parents?

Don't blame your parents. Forgive them. They meant well, although in ignorance.

There are a number of ways to get out of a legal contract:

1. Both parties might want to get out of the contract, agree and tear up both copies of its contents, and forget about it.
2. The party who wants to get out, might plead with the other to release him of his obligations.
3. The party who wants to get out, might have a rich friend who could buy him out of the contract.
4. The party who wants to get out, might die.

Options 1 and 2 aren't viable in this case. No demonic entity would willfully give up his rights to a human soul.

Option 3 is viable. We have a rich friend in Jesus. And He has paid for all our mistakes. We can ask Him to buy us out of our contract!

Option 4 is also viable. If the baby who had the contract dies with Jesus Christ, and is buried with Him in baptism, he is released from his obligations!

16. How do I do that?

After you've had yourselves baptised by immersion, pray the following:

Lord Jesus, I repent of the ignorance of my parents who had me baptised by sprinkling of water when I was a baby. I now realise that this was a grave sin before You, and that my Infant Baptism had forged a spiritual covenant and contract between me and a demonic entity. Please forgive me.

Lord Jesus, I accept your forgiveness, because Scripture tells us that if we repent of our sins, You will forgive us. (1 John 1:9)

Therefore, I now proclaim that I have died with Christ in the waters of baptism. Thus, I declare my covenant and spiritual contract with any demonic entity null and void, and renounce it in its entirety. I give back to this entity everything that I have ever received from him, and declare that in all eternity, I never want anything from him again.

I hereby declare a spiritual divorce between myself and this entity – for all time and eternity, in the Name of Jesus.

Lord Jesus, I pray that you will seal this prayer and declaration with your Blood.

Amen.

17. What do I do if I had my children baptised as babies? Can I pray this on their behalf?

If they are still spiritual minors (12 or younger), and you are their spiritual guardian, you may well pray this on their behalf. Also repent of your sin of ignorance of having them baptised as babies.

If they are older than 12, they are responsible before God for their own spiritual affairs. They have to make the decision themselves, and pray their own prayer.

18. Where did pagans get the original idea of baptising babies?

This goes back in time quite far – back to the fourth generation after Noah's flood!

Research shows the following:

Noah's great-grandson Nimrod was a godless man. He built the city of Babylon and devised a system of religion which led his followers away from God. This religious

system became known as “The Mysteries”, and is still practiced today by pagans.

After Nimrod’s time, the Mysteries developed more and more as time went on. In this religious system, one of the ways by which people would try to get rid of their sin, was by purification by fire.

They would make a high-flaming fire, and jump through the flames repeatedly, believing that each “pass through the fire” would burn away their sins.

And of course, as time went on, they realised that the sooner in his life a person would “get rid of his sins” in this way, the better.

So they started to do this with babies. As soon as a baby’s physical body could endure the procedure, they would wrap it tightly in cloth – so as to resemble a rugby ball. Then two grown-ups would position themselves on both sides of a high-flaming fire, and throw the baby through the flames repeatedly, each time catching it on the other side of the fire.

This is what “passing children through the fire for Molech” refers to. (2 Kings 16:3; 23:10; 2 Chron. 33:6; Ezek. 16:21)

At some stages in history, this practice was outlawed by God-fearing authorities – which caused the practitioners of the Mysteries to switch from fire (as an agent of purification) to water (which is also a well-known agent of purification). And voilà! we have baptism of babies – by sprinkling of water.

(See *The Two Babylons* by Rev. Alexander Hislop)