



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF PILGRIMS HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH

Vol. XIV, No. 11

November 1, 1998

Page

AN EXAMINATION OF *THE CHEMISTRY OF THE BLOOD*

By J. C. Settlemaier

INTRODUCTION

In 1943 M. R. De Haan, M.D., a well-known radio preacher and the founder of the Radio Bible Class, published a book entitled *The Chemistry of the Blood*. In this book, De Haan takes the position that *sin is in the blood and is transmitted through the blood*. He goes on to argue that the father alone is the contributor of the blood of an embryo and the mother alone is the contributor of the body of an embryo. It is, he contends, the only way Christ could be born without sin, as he got his body from his mother, and his blood from God the Father. Otherwise, Christ would have had the blood of Adam, and thus would have been a sinner!

De Haan's position became a mark of orthodoxy among a considerable number of Baptists, even among sovereign grace landmark Baptists. There is a wide spectrum of Baptists today who hold to De Haan's theory. When a preacher makes the statement that the blood comes only from the father or that sin is in the blood, he will be sure to get many hearty "Amens." This theory was accepted without question among the Arminian Baptist churches (the American Baptist Association) with which my folks were associated when I was a child. No one in those churches, so far as I know, ever questioned the idea that sin was in the blood! I first heard this theory at the knees of my father, who listened to M. R. De Haan on the radio and who read his book on this subject. When I first read *The Chemistry of the Blood*, I knew nothing of biology and very little about the Scriptures. Of course, the book is very convincing when one considers the quotes De Haan makes from medical text books,

and that he was himself a surgeon.

Let me emphasize at the outset that I have nothing against M. R. De Haan. His name was held quite high by my father and others with whom I was associated in my early years. I believe I learned from him as I listened to him on the radio and read several of his books. He held to the veracity of Scripture, the deity of Christ and other great fundamentals. I do not question him or his motives. My only concern with his teaching in *The Chemistry of the Blood* is, "What saith the Scriptures?"

I thought it improper to write upon this subject without contacting Radio Bible Class Ministries (RBCM) to ask them their present position on this subject. I received a nice letter from Kurt E. De Haan, the Managing Editor of RBCM and a grandson of M. R. De Haan. He informed me that RBCM would not now "give unqualified support to the book as originally published." They have, in fact, revised the book as to this idea of sin being in the blood, and that blood comes only from the father.

IS SIN IN THE BLOOD

This is De Haan's theory. Is it true? Do the Scriptures teach this doctrine? I believe it can be clearly demonstrated that no such doctrine is taught in the Bible. This is false doctrine pure and simple. If this theory is false, then the whole thing goes down.

My contention is that this theory, that sin is in the blood, is neither taught nor implied in the Scriptures. Because of this one error, many others are introduced and, consequently, this original error is compounded. Some of the more glaring mistakes De Haan made I will now list, with

THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS #000476) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127. Periodical postage paid at Memphis, TN 38101.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

The editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address is: 2065 Tompkins Lane, Millington, TN 38053-5107.

Church Phone at Home: (901) 876-5015

Church Phone: (901) 357-0215.

E-mail address: RWcamp@cris.com

Visit our Home Page on the Internet

<http://www.concentric.net/~Rwcamp/>

Note: An answering machine is on both numbers. They will answer on the fourth ring. We do not monitor our calls before answering.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN MEMPHIS we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 10:00 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 7:00 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

the pages where the reader may find the references. Only the quotes are actually De Haan's words.

1. The blood of a child comes from his father alone, and "the male sperm is the source of the blood"; "...Every drop of blood in an infant's body is the contribution of the male parent," p. 32, 35,42.
2. The body of an embryo comes from his mother alone, p. 36. She contributes no blood at all to the embryo, p. 33, 42.

3. The blood of Adam came directly from God, p. 36; the blood was put into his body when God breathed into him the breath of life; De Haan calls it "a separate gift of God," p. 14; p. 41.
4. The only cause of corruption [of a dead body] is sinful blood, p. 27.
5. The blood of Adam was changed in some way when he sinned and thus became sinful blood, p. 14. "Sin is a disease of the blood," p. 25. "Sinful and polluted blood," p. 14, " . . . Adam's blood, which was completely impregnated with sin."
6. Sin is transmitted only through the blood, p. 13, 24; sinful heredity is transmitted through the blood, p. 31; cf. p. 36.
7. Sin is in the blood and not in the flesh. Flesh can only be called sinful flesh because it is nourished and fed and sustained by sinful blood, p. 14, 24. On p. 15 the author says "He [Christ] had not a drop of Adam's sin in His veins."
8. Physical death is the result of death in the blood, p.13.
9. The Holy Spirit contributed the blood of Jesus, Mary, His body. This blood was divine blood, p. 36; on p. 42 he says "The virgin-born Son of God, with a human body, but sinless supernatural blood, inseminated by the Holy Ghost." "His blood was of the Holy Ghost."
10. Christ did not partake of the same flesh and blood as His people did. "ONLY Jesus is called the Seed of the woman, because He was born of a woman and was without one drop of human blood in His veins"; p. 25. On p. 36 the writer says: "The children [referring to Heb. 2] take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception." p. 42.

It is my position that every one of these ten propositions is false or contains false elements.

DE HAAN'S THEORY DISPROVED

If I did not know the first thing about biology, I would argue that De Haan's theory of the father contributing the blood, and the mother the body of a child is flatly false. I have seen many children who are so much like their fathers they could pass

for twins. I am one such child. I am the same size as my father was. I weigh about the same as he did. My left eye droops exactly as his did. The older I get the more I look like my dad. On the other hand, my mother was a very small woman and never weighed much more than a hundred pounds and there is very little resemblance between my mother and me as far as appearance is concerned. Every reader knows this is true in countless cases. These facts alone disprove De Haan's position, if we had no other evidence than observation.

DE HAAN'S THEORY DISPROVED BY BIOLOGY

But, secondly, De Haan's theory, that the blood of a child comes only from the father, and the body comes only from the mother, goes contrary to commonly known and easily ascertained facts of biology concerning the genetics of reproduction. I believe his idea is a scientific blunder that exceeds anything I ever read written in modern times! De Haan's theory would require us to throw out the factual foundation laid by Mendel on the genetics of reproduction!

The idea that the father alone is the source of a child's blood is completely false. My wife has O+ blood and mine is A+. My son has O+ blood. This is genetically predictable when one considers the blood is derived from both parents but it is impossible with De Haan's theory.

It is a fact that is clearly and easily demonstrated that the things male and female children share, are contributed by both parents. The parents together contribute the blood, the mental capacity, the resistance or susceptibility to disease, the appearance, the color of hair, eyes, skin, and every other inheritable trait common to both male and female. The traits that are not common to both male and female are sexual. "The 46 chromosomes of human somatic cells actually consist of two 23-chromosome sets (22 autosomes and 1 sex chromosome per set), with one set derived from the individual's father and one from the individual's mother." The male chromosome (XY) does not contribute the blood to the child, for only male children receive this chromosome. Therefore every non-sexual organ, every muscle, every bone, every gland, every nerve, and all the other parts, and extracellular materials, including the blood, are derived from both parents.

If the blood comes only from the father, then where do female clones get their blood? "Cloning is the production of a group of genetically identical cells or organisms, but all descended from a single individual." The cloning of a viable human is not yet done to my knowledge, but they have just this past year (1997) cloned sheep in Scotland and if the Lord does not intervene, I believe they will clone humans. As these cloned sheep were yews, one can only wonder where their blood came from, according to De Haan's theory.

DE HAAN'S QUOTES ARE MISAPPLIED

But someone will object: "De Haan quotes medical textbooks to support his theory." And this puzzled me. While I knew there had been great strides in genetics in the last fifty years, (my copy of De Haan's book has the date of 1943, and it is the fifth edition) I was quite certain that the basics of genetics had not changed all that much. Therefore I tried to obtain each of the three medical text books from which De Haan quoted. Through the interlibrary loan I was able to obtain two of the books quoted, however I could not obtain the exact editions quoted. The two text books obtained contained no hint of De Haan's theory that the blood comes only from the father and the body only from the mother.

The quotes he gives in his book are irrelevant to the purpose for which he quotes them. He quotes from *William's Practice of Obstetrics*, third ed., p. 133, as follows: "The foetal blood in the vessels of the chorionic villae AT NO TIME GAINS ACCESS TO THE MATERNAL BLOOD in the intervillous spaces, BEING SEPARATED FROM ONE ANOTHER by the double layer of chorionic epithelium."

And again he quotes from the *Nurse's Handbook of Obstetrics* by Zabriskie, R.N., fifth edition, p 75:

"When the circulation of the blood begins in the embryo, it remains separate and distinct from that of the mother. All food and waste material which are interchanged between the embryo and the mother must pass through the blood vessel walls from one circulation to the other."

And from the same book he quotes p. 82: The foetus receives its nourishment and oxygen from the mother's blood into its own through the medium of the placenta. The foetal heart pumps blood through the arteries of the umbilical cord into

the placental vessels, which looping in and out of the uterine tissue and lying in close contact with the uterine vessels, permit a diffusion, through their walls, of waste products from child to mother and of nourishment and oxygen from mother to child. As has been said, this interchange is effected by the process of osmosis, and there is no direct mingling of the two blood currents. In other words, no maternal blood actually flows to the fetus, nor is there any direct foetal blood flow to the mother." *Ibid.*, p. 34.

The problem with these quotes is that they say not one word about the point to be proved! The point he is attempting to prove is that the source of an embryo's blood is from its father alone. What he quotes only teaches what no one denies—that the blood of an embryo does not ordinarily mingle with that of its mother. In fact the blood of the mother and that of the embryo may be two entirely different and incompatible types. But this has not one thing to do with the *source* of that infant's blood.

De Haan does not produce a single quote, from either Scripture or Biology, which supports his proposition that the blood of a baby comes from the father alone and its body comes from its mother alone and if he knew of such authority surely he would have produced it.

De Haan would have us believe that sin was lurking in the blood of Mary, separated from Christ only by the villae of the placenta. And if one drop of her blood passed through the placenta into the body of the Lord Jesus He would have been a sinner! "Jesus could have a human body, but one drop of Adam's blood would have made him a sinner like you and me." While it is not normal for a mother to send her blood to her fetus, it does happen. Can anyone believe our Lord came so close to being a depraved sinner? This is a theory totally foreign to the teaching of Scripture.

Similar faulty thinking developed the immaculate conception of Mary and a host of other fanciful, bazar, and false teachings. We have higher ground for the foundation of Christ's impeccability.

DE HAAN CLAIMS THE BLOOD OF ADAM CAME DIRECTLY FROM GOD

As I reread this message in De Haan's book, I was surprised to see no appeal to Scripture to prove his propositions. Indeed he did allude to some passages, but not once does he say, "This is

the text which proves my proposition." And you don't have to wonder about it, when a writer is seeking to prove a proposition scriptural without Scripture, you can be sure he has none!

De Haan writes "The breath of God put something in man that made him ALIVE. That something was blood. It must have been. It could be nothing else . . ."

Now this is how errors get started! It could have been a thousand other things, so far as we know, for with God all things are possible. But we are not left in doubt about this. The Scripture says: "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Ge 2:7). Notice the text does not say that God put *something* into man, but God "**breathed** into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul!" Adam was perfectly created. He was all there. He had a brain, he had a heart, he had lungs and he had blood. He had every essential except life. And for De Haan to say Adam lacked blood is not exegesis but imagination! If there had been a Scripture that taught this doctrine, it would have been given instead of a mere assertion.

DE HAAN CLAIMS THE ONLY CAUSE OF CORRUPTION IS SINFUL BLOOD

This is stated on p. 27. Surely no one would make such a statement without some Bible evidence! Yet the reader will look in vain for any. Indeed the author does quote Ps 16:10: "[For] Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither with thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." But there is not a word in this text which states *the cause* of corruption. He goes on to say: "Lazarus being dead only one day more was said by his sister to be STINKING with corruption, but this One saw no corruption because the only cause of corruption, SINFUL BLOOD, was absent from His flesh."

What is wrong with this position?

The first thing wrong with De Haan's statement is, he gives no Scripture for it. It is merely an assertion! If sinful blood is the only cause for a dead body's corruption, then one wonders why dead animals stink! Do they have sinful blood?

This reminds me that Augustine claimed that peacock meat would not rot! He said he tried it himself and found that it was indeed true. And some people will believe such claims simply because they wish to believe them. It has nothing

to do with evidence for there is none and I beg to be excused.

De Haan also claims that something happened to Adam's blood when he sinned. "Since life is in the blood, when man died [spiritually], something happened to the blood. Sin affected the blood of man, not his body, except indirectly, because it is supplied by the blood. For this very reason sin is not in the flesh but in the blood."

Now where is this found in the Scripture? He gives no Scripture to prove it. He expects the reader to accept his word on this. I maintain that Adam's blood (and Eve's too) was exactly the same the day before they sinned as it was the day after, as far as sin is concerned. Whatever difference there may have been was the effect not the cause. Their blood was the same type, same color, the same as to sin and there was no corruption in the red fluid that did not result from the effects of their depraved hearts. Just as we say "He has wicked hands," "he has a vile mouth" or "his brains are perverted." Yet no one, I suppose, really believes that the hands, the tongues, or the brains of such individuals, are actually sinful. These are but the instruments of sin. And when someone receives a heart transplant from a wicked man, surely no one would think that the organ could impart character to the recipient. And neither will blood impart character to an individual, either good or evil.

SIN IS A MATTER OF THE HEART

Sin has ever been a matter of the heart: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man." Notice our Lord does not look at the blood as the place where sin resides, but at the heart! The blood is no more corrupt than the body, but the heart—the spiritual part of man—is another matter. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?" But where is the text that says the blood is desperately wicked? When God looked down on the antediluvians did He see that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that **his blood was completely evil**? Surely God knew the source of sin in man, surely God saw the real problem in man, and surely God did not think it in one part of man while it was really in another part!

Therefore, if God said sin was in the heart, then it was not in the blood but in the spiritual nature of man.

There can be a moral and spiritual disorder in the soul without a perversion of the substance or essence of the soul or the body. This is the real nature of a depraved soul. It is a matter of the heart and it has nothing to do with the body and it has nothing to do with the blood. B. H. Carroll said: "The members of the body are merely instrumental, and Paul says **that all sin is apart from the body**. The body cannot sin. The body is used as an instrument of sin, but the sin comes from the inner man; it comes out of the heart of the man." Total depravity is a spiritual and moral defect, not a physical thing.

IF A MAN LOSES HIS BLOOD WOULD HE BECOME SINLESS

Does a man become less sinful as he bleeds? Maybe the old blood letting had spiritual advantages that it lacked for medicinal purposes. If sin were in the blood as De Haan teaches, then the loss of blood would be a positive thing. And if man could substitute all his blood with something else the consequence would be a sinless man! Just such a substitute has been devised and used successfully. Fluosol, a fluorocarbon emulsion, was developed by Dr. Leland C. Clark in 1966. "Finally, consider the case of a patient who had fallen into a deep coma caused by infectious hepatitis. The diseased liver poured toxins into the blood, and the toxins poisoned the liver cells, thus creating a vicious cycle of liver destruction. Dr. Gerald Klebanhoff of Lackland Air Force Base Medical Center used artificial blood to break this cycle. He drained the patient's blood entirely and replaced it with artificial blood. This removed the toxins and allowed the beleaguered liver to begin to recover, while life was sustained by the blood substitute. After a short time, the artificial blood was drained and replaced with whole blood. The comatose patient awoke in the recovery room a few hours after the procedure, attesting to the success of the total blood replacement." According to De Haan's theory this man would have been sinless during this procedure as he had no sinful blood in his body!

SCRIPTURE DOES NOT TEACH THAT SIN IS IN THE BLOOD

The one great objection to these ideas, that "sin is

in the blood" or that "Adam's blood . . . was completely impregnated with sin," is, they cannot be found in the Bible! Look where you will. Read prophet, read apostle, read the inspired historian or listen to the words of the Lord Himself, but you cannot find these theories in the Bible!

Sin is a matter of the heart, and is found in the so-called psychological core of man. It is the inner personality of a human being that is corrupted with sin. Sin is in the spiritual recesses of man and not in his capillaries. There is no physical part of man that compels him to sin. Man sins because his nature is sinful. When man sins it is not because there is some poison in his blood, in his flesh, or in his brain. There is nothing in the substance of a man that makes him sinful. It is his spiritual nature that is corrupted. The Scripture calls this depraved nature by such terms as, an evil heart, a carnal mind, the law of sin, the old man, the flesh, and filthiness of flesh and spirit.

This position is further supported by the terms that the Scriptures use to speak of the regenerate: They are said to have a spiritual mind, to be the new man, to be a new creature and to have a new heart. But where is the Scripture that speaks of bad blood, good blood or new blood? De Haan himself gives no Scripture to prove his proposition and I do not believe any can be given.

T. P. Simmons says: "The basis of depravity and spiritual inability lies in the heart. It is deceitful and incurably wicked (Jer. 17:9). Out of the heart are the issues of life (Prov. 4:23). No one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean one (Job 14:4). Hence neither holiness nor faith can proceed from the natural heart. Good things proceed from a good heart and evil things proceed from an evil heart (Mt 7: 17,18; Lk 6:45). Notice here that Simmons does not teach that evil things proceed from bad blood.

SIN IS NOT TRANSMITTED BY THE BLOOD

De Haan says, "So potent was this poison [of the tree of knowledge of good and evil] that six thousand years after, all who are related to Adam by human birth still succumb to that poison of sin which is transmitted through the blood." The author quotes Acts 17:26 which simply says all men have a common origin. We are all related. This text teaches that we all came from the same source. Whether we are Jews, Greeks, Scythians, barbarians, bond, free, or whatever we all have

the same ancestry. "The main idea, beyond question, is that God had created the entire human race from a common stock . . ." There is not one word in this text about the transmission of sin by any means, much less by the medium of blood.

Nor, because the lineage of man, in Scripture, is traced through the male generally, are we to think this means sin is transmitted through the blood of the male. For as we have already seen the blood comes from both parents. It takes one illogical (not to mention unscriptural) leap after another for De Haan to come up with this fallacious position. The blood of the race came equally from Adam and Eve not from Adam alone. Eve is the mother of all living, (Gen.3:20). Both Adam and Eve have the common name of Adam, "Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created," (Ge 5:2). Where is the Scripture which teaches that sin is transmitted through the blood?

Now it is a secret that God has not seen fit to reveal how depravity is transmitted from the parents to the children. We do know that when a child is conceived in the normal way he is depraved. We know that Christ had the same flesh and blood that we have yet He was not depraved. This means that neither sin nor depravity is transmitted via blood.

CHRIST TOOK OUR NATURE

The Word of God says that as the children of promise took part of flesh and blood the Lord Jesus Christ took part of the same. "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14).

De Haan denies this. He says ". . . But Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception." He tries to substantiate his position by referring to the margin of his Bible and from the Greek of Hebrews 2:14.

He quotes his Bible margin thusly: "In the margin of my Bible, I read that the word translated 'took part' implies 'taking part in something outside one's self.'" I assume De Haan was using a Scofield Bible which has this note on He. 2:14: "The word trans. *took part* is not the same as that

trans. *partakers*, but implies taking part in something outside one's self."

De Haan then gives the meaning of *koinoneo* as "to share fully," and for the meaning of *metecho* "to take part but not all. The children take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part . . ." He tries to draw a distinction between *koinoneo* and *metecho* yet they are clearly synonyms as Spicq states: "The nuance of intimate sharing, of assimilation, already suggested by the use of the verb *metecho* for eating or instruction, is revealed by its interchangeability with *koinoneo*: 'so, since children have flesh and blood in common (*kekoinoneken*), he also shares (*meteschen*) in these same things.'"

Let the reader mark well De Haan gives no source for this definition of *metecho*.

Why not?

This word means: "to be or become partaker; to partake . . .";—Thayer's. "Share, have a share, participate w. gen. of the thing in or of something . . .":—A& G. "To partake of, enjoy a share of, share in, take part in . . ."—Liddell & Scott's. "To be partaker of, to share in..."—Berry's Lexicon. "...To share or participate . . ."—DNNT. "*Metechlein* always means 'to have a share in':—TDNT, Vol. II, p. 830. I might give other references, but these will suffice to prove his definition is not supported by the lexicons.

In Heb. 2:14, De Haan meets a passage which flatly opposes his doctrine. This text teaches that Christ *likewise* took part of the same flesh and blood as we did. T. P. Simmons, in reference to this passage, said: "Christ's body and human nature were in all respects like our own, except that there was no taint of sin in Him. He was the flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood." His participation in our flesh and blood was absolutely essential because only a near kinsman could redeem. Therefore, Christ was related to his people. He became their Kinsman Redeemer. This Scripture declares this truth in express terms: Christ participated in, He shared in, He took part of, the same flesh and blood we did and there is no exegetical reason to exclude the blood any more than there is to exclude the flesh. If you exclude either flesh or blood, there can be no relationship and no Redeemer. De Haan's theory says Christ did not take part of our blood! And while this is without doubt unintentional, it is yet an

attack on the humanity of our Redeemer. The text says He took part of both our flesh and our blood.

THE BLOOD OF GOD

One of the texts which is often produced to prove that Christ received His blood not from Mary but directly from God is Acts 20:28. "**Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.**" Strangely, De Haan does not quote this verse which, on the surface, seems to teach his theory.

There is no question that this clause, **He hath purchased with His own blood** means the church was purchased with the blood of God. The antecedent of the pronoun is not *God the Father* in vs. 27 but *God* in the clause *church of God*.

This text does not support the idea that the blood of Christ came directly from God the Father, but it teaches the deity of the person of Christ! It is Christ's blood of which Paul here speaks because God the Father has no blood, no body parts and no similitude of any kind, being a pure Spirit. All the references to God having body parts are anthropomorphic. God's right hand is His mighty power. His feet is a term that signifies that He moves, and His eye that He sees. Yet there is no body, no bone, no blood in God.

When the elders of Israel saw *God* they saw a Christophany for *God* is invisible. When Christ's body was prepared, we are to understand that his body and all its organs, His physical appearance, His blood, and every other part of his physical nature came from His mother, but without sin. De Haan says: "The children take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception."

But this is false!

He was the seed of the woman. His conception was supernatural for both his body and his blood! His divine nature came from Heaven. In great humility He disrobed himself of His Deity and was made in the womb of his mother and by this means the pre-existent One came into union with real human nature, both flesh and blood. This union of the divine with sinless human nature is what gave His blood that powerful efficacy so that He could redeem us. It was not the other way around as De Haan and so many others believe. If

both His body and blood were not human, then how could His sacrifice be effective to redeem fallen men who were human?

But why then does the text say "the blood of God"?

Because anything true of His Divine nature is true, and can be said, of the whole person. Just as we say of a man who is strong and healthy, but depressed in mind, John is very low. Now we speak of his mind only, but it is true of his person. On the other hand we say of one at the point of death, he is very well, because he is full of faith and anticipating glory, while his body is wasting away. Thus, we say of the person of Christ, that His blood, his head, his hands are Divine. Not because the organs of His body are Divine, but because He is a divine person. This is the way the Scripture speaks of the two natures, referring what is true only of the human or the Divine to His person.

Thus whatever is true of Christ as a man can be said of Christ as a person. We read of Him being weary. Was deity tired? We read of Him being hungry. Was deity hungry? We read of him being acquainted with grief, shedding tears, being angry, weary and being ignorant of certain things. Who would claim that these things pertain to God? But they were true of the person of Christ because they were true of His human nature. He said while on earth that He was in Heaven, that He was before Abraham, which things were not meant of His human nature that had its beginning when He was conceived in the virgin Mary. But these things were true of His person. This is, I believe, the correct interpretation of Acts 20:28.

This is the teaching of Scripture in other passages pertaining to the Incarnation. "In Romans 1:2-5, the Apostle says that the gospel concerns the Son of God, who is our Lord Jesus Christ, who, as to his human nature, *kata sarka*, is the Son of David, but as to his divine nature, *kata pneuma*, is the Son of God. Here also the two natures and one person of the Redeemer are clearly asserted."

The blood of Christ was divine in the same way his hands and feet were Divine—because He was a divine person. His body and his blood came from the same source. He was as human as we are, on the one hand, and as much God as His Father was on the other. Yet these two natures were not mingled. His blood was the blood of God

because His person was divine, not because His blood came from Heaven.

CONCLUSION

We have looked at The Chemistry of the Blood carefully. We have examined its claims and found them to be fallacious and absolutely opposed to the truth of God. We have presented good solid evidence, from many quarters, which conclusively proves these theories are unsubstantiated, unscientific and, most importantly, unscriptural.

Because there is no biblical support for the idea that sin is in the blood, nor for the errors that orbit around it, there should be a public rejection of all of these errors in the churches. It is not enough to merely stop teaching these doctrines, where they have been taught. We must not only proclaim the Word of God, but we must also disclaim these errors as we proclaim the truth. Where these thorns are embedded in the sheep, we must first extract them. Then, and only then, can the healing begin.

We must learn to reject such theories, as these put forth by De Haan, because they do not have a "Thus saith the Lord." They do give definitions of words but they are not right definitions. They do quote authorities but they misapply the quotes. They do refer to doctrines but not according to the analogy of faith. They do quote Scripture but the Scriptures quoted do not support the propositions. Therefore such false teaching, even though it may have the hash marks of centuries on its sleeves, and on its shoulder the laureates of a thousand campaigns, and on its chest medals from many a battle, such teaching, I repeat, must be rejected for the imposter it is. We must prove all things by the Word of God. Cunningly devised fables may sound convincing, they may use scriptural terms, they may come in orthodox garb and they may be paraded as the truth of God, but they are false none-the-less because they are not founded upon the proper exegesis of Holy Scripture.

Remember, these kind of errors, and this one concerning the blood in particular, run in the minds of a thousand men who never read De Haan's book, who never spent five minutes time to see if the Scripture does indeed teach his propositions, who will never check out the novel meanings assigned to words without the support or usage of authorities. They heard some one declare these theories and they took them on

human faith. Investigation and research were excluded.

Once such an error is introduced into the minds of preachers and congregations, it is almost never totally eradicated. Thus, we must learn to challenge, at the very door, every doctrine that cannot give a "Thus saith the Lord." Let the fight begin then and there. It is better to fight at the door than in the pulpit and in the pews!

WILL THERE BE A BAPTIST POPE?

Part V

A CLOUD OF WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE OF LOCAL CHURCH AUTONOMY AND INDEPENDENCY

By Wayne Camp

INTRODUCTION TO PART V

In the October installment of this study on the autonomy and independency of each and every local church of our Lord Jesus Christ, I used the church in Antioch as an example of church independency. I wanted to print the article by Bro. Settlemoir in full in one issue. Therefore, my space is limited this month. In view of that, I simply want to extend the message on Antioch to include some other uninspired witnesses who affirmed that Antioch was a full-fledged, organized church of the Lord Jesus Christ when she sent forth Paul and Barnabas to the work to which God had called them and when they conferred with Jerusalem concerning some matters which included circumcision.

Our witnesses last time affirmed clearly and scripturally that Antioch was independent and autonomous in her actions in these matters. Now, let us hear from some other witnesses on this particular. Was Antioch still under the authority of Jerusalem or was she a fully functional independent church when the events recorded in Acts chapters 13-15 took place? I maintain she was independent. The two witnesses I quoted last time maintained she was. Now, let me call some

other witnesses who specifically discuss these matters and affirm the independence and autonomy of Antioch at the time.

T. P. SIMMONS

I have quoted Bro. Simmons before in this study. But, let us hear from him again on the actions of Antioch in sending forth their missionaries. He wrote, "THE SETTING APART OF BARNABAS AND SAUL. In this we see the independence of New Testament churches. The church at Antioch, although it was much younger than the church at Jerusalem acted in this matter independent of the church at Jerusalem and without so much as consulting, the church at Jerusalem. Cf. Acts 13:1-3. Neither did the church consult the apostles."¹

According to Bro. Simmons, the church at Antioch did not consult the apostles nor Jerusalem on this matter. They did not need to for they were an independent, self-governing body. They had the authority and command of the Holy Spirit who told them to do this.

EMERY BANCROFT

Eld. Emery H. Bancroft wrote on the matter related in Acts 15. He said, "If anything is plain in the Scriptures certainly this is. The fifteenth

chapter of Acts, which has sometimes been adduced to show that the church at Jerusalem exercised a controlling influence over others, if properly understood, has just the opposite bearing. Some men had gone down from Jerusalem to Antioch and taught that the Gentile Christians, in order to be saved, must become Jews, and keep the whole law by submitting to the rite of circumcision, and be received as proselytes into the Jewish nation. On this question, with marked forbearance to both parties, but without departing one iota from the gospel principle of faith in Christ as essential to salvation, the church at Jerusalem sent a courteous and loving letter by the hand of special messengers to say that in their opinion it was not necessary for Gentiles to become Jews first in order to become Christians, but, in order to refrain from wounding the sensibilities of the Jewish brethren, it was right that Gentile converts should avoid certain offensive practices. Here, there is no hint of lordship on the part of the Jerusalem church over the church at Antioch, neither does there appear anywhere else in the New Testament any trace whatever of superiority, or lordship of one church, or set of churches over another."²

In the thinking of Bancroft, there was no doubt that the church in Antioch was absolutely independent in her dealings with Jerusalem on the matters considered in Acts 15. She was answerable to none but the Lord in her church government.

CURTIS PUGH

"On the matter of sending out Paul and Barnabas, Bro. Pugh has written, "So it is with Christ. He has delegated His authority to His church. She is not only the 'pillar and ground of the truth,' but also to her was committed the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper as well as the authority to send forth teaching servants in the work of the Lord as the Holy Ghost calls and leads. While a man CAN (is able to) preach, immerse, and administer bread and wine, he MAY NOT (does not have permission to do so) unless the Holy Ghost sends him forth out of and by a New Testament church. This is the teaching and pattern of the New Testament!

This "church authority" delegated by Christ to His churches is seen in action in the New Testament. Consider the sending out of Paul

(Saul) and Barnabas in Acts 13:1-4.

"Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus."

"Note these several things:

- (1) The men to be sent out were active teaching members "in the church that was at Antioch" which was a real, functioning "local" church.
- (2) "The Holy Ghost said," speaks of the Divine call to service. Without the working of the Holy Ghost in both the individual called AND in his church there can be no Scriptural sending-out of men to do the work of "church planting".
- (3) After more fasting and prayer the spiritual leaders in the church of which they were members "laid their hands on them" (that is, ordained them to the work).
- (4) In this way they were "sent forth by the Holy Ghost." Both the sovereign working of the Spirit AND the obedience of the members of a New Testament church are required for an individual to be "sent forth by the Holy Ghost."

It is obvious that this witness also held that the church at Antioch was a real, functioning, organized, local, independent and autonomous body when she sent forth these missionaries. That is the only kind of church that has the authority to send out missionaries.

CONCLUSION TO PART V

This has been shorter than the previous articles on this subject. But, we have heard three other witnesses to the independency and autonomy of the local church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Three witnesses to the independency and autonomy of the local church at Antioch have spoken clearly. Antioch acted as an organized body that was sovereign in her relationship to other churches. She consulted with no one when she sent forth these missionaries, Paul and Barnabas. She consulted with no one when she received the offering for the poor in Jerusalem. She consulted

no one about sending some representatives to Jerusalem seeking some advice from that independent, autonomous sister church. Our cloud of witnesses continues to increase.

Bouquets and Brickbats

MISSISSIPPI: I really enjoyed the article in the Oct. 1 issue concerning the autonomy of the local church. Thank you for your work and ministry on this issue.

TEXAS: I wanted to tell you that the October issue of the paper was really good. Your series of articles on the independency and autonomy of each local church of the Lord Jesus Christ is really good. I hope you will not let any one discourage you from continuing to write such articles, since they are very much needed. Keep up the good work you are doing.

ILLINOIS: May GOD bless you for your stand for the truth even if some of the brethren seem to want to roast you. It's better to stand for the truth than for tradition. Do you think that some of them are falling into Catholic ways, in that they believe that GOD only speaks to them and not to the congregation and that they make all the decisions and the church is just supposed to rubber stamp what ever they say with out any questions?

WWW: I would encourage you to go to a series before you speak out. Lots of people, especially religious people, we are the worst, tend to believe what others tell us.

Pray to God for wisdom and then go all three days. I'm a woman, so I wouldn't go myself. Wisdom should never hurt you.

[Editor's Note: I never cease to be amazed at the audacity and self-righteousness of Promise Keepers and their followers who write to me. This lady is suggesting that I should attend a PKs three-day meeting before I speak out against them. Yet, she has never been to a meeting, supports them, and rebukes me for not going and for speaking out against them.

Moreover, she suggests that I am not a person with wisdom inferring that she is. She writes, "Wisdom should not hurt you." Amen! But, her statement infers I am unwise and have never asked God for wisdom.

I have read seven books written and published by PKs or with their cooperation. In addition, I have read at least a thousand pages of other material, both pro and con, on the movement. I have visited their own official WebSite and studied what they have there. I have visited other WebSites that belong to various PKs organizations. Every time I visit one, I come away more convinced than ever that this is an organization that fits the description given by Paul. **2 Corinthians 11:13-15 For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. 14 And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. 15 Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.** Their official tract on the way of salvation posted on their own official WebSite is enough to convince me that they are heretics. When you read articles and books in which they set forth their belief on salvation and the church, no sound Christian could support them. Those who do, do so ignorantly, or are simply afraid to oppose them.

WWW: I have spent most of last night and this am reading your info on Promise Keepers as I already agreed before, and pray continuously for my son to see the difference and realize just as you stated in "Is This Hatred" the scripture used will once again after prayer help me to try to reach him about this matter. Do you have a regular pub. that you put out like Sword of the Lord and others, Berean Call. If so please E-Mail me back that I might obtain subscriptions of same, or is it just this web page, which is really great work. God will be pleased.

PENNSYLVANIA: I am the pastor of Calvary Bible Church (a little independent Bible Church in South Central Pa.) One of the people who attends our services very faithfully sent me an

email to tell me of your site. Keep up the good work! I agree with you. Babylon has certainly manifested itself in our day with just enough truth mixed with a great amount of error that it can confuse and fool many folk. Your warnings and your insights are right on target.

You raise an issue which is much on my own heart. Before God called me to the pastorate I was a research Chemist. Because of that opportunities have come to me repeatedly to do debates with college professors and other leaders of the Evolutionary mind set. How utterly foolish their theory is and how much in conflict with the precious Word which God has given to us. To assume as Dobson does that the first 11 chapters are not factual is to among other things eliminate the reality of the Fall and thereby destroy the full understanding and appreciation of the atonement that Christ made for His elect. Along with that of course he has a bucket with no bottom in it concerning origins and realities which depend on that which is stated clearly in those first 11 chapters.

It is a sad day when we see so many people

falling for the touchy-feely, weak-minded approach to truth. They become strangers to truth. Of course they will blame you for hatred. What other defense can they make? It has been the ploy of the Devil and his crowd for a very long time and whether some of the men you mentioned are truly children of God and misguided or truly children of Satan and therefore sons of perdition they are one way or the other endorsing Satan's plan and program.

Keep up the good work.

WWW: Long live the Holy Roman Catholic Church!

I have seen your page at <http://www.concentric.net/~Rcamp/hatred.htm> and I need to point out the following errors in your doctrine:

1. You've got a problem with the Catholic Church and even dare to call it the whore of Babylon. This is enough to ensure your eternal damnation. Jesus said: "On this rock I shall build my Church and the gates of Hell won't break it". Any sane person must admit this is the Catholic Church, certainly not the Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church (which can't be older than 1517 when Luther first published his heresies and would mean that there was no Church of Christ for more than 15 centuries).

2. You consider good works are not needed for salvation. This is another utter error. So, if I have faith, I shouldn't bother to do any good works. I could break the ten commandments, I could kill innocent people, I could do terrible things and I would still have my soul saved just because I believe Christ died on the cross for me. I wouldn't need to enforce God's Word; when the Bible says "do this" and "do that", why would I waste my time when I'm saved anyway? That would mean I could safely ignore God's wishes. It is therefore obvious that BOTH faith and good works are needed for salvation.

These show you're one of the false prophets you're talking about and that Jesus has nothing to do with you. It is high time that you admit your errors and do penance in order to gain salvation. I would suggest that you sell everything you've got and donate the proceeds to the Catholic Church and then become a monk for the rest of your life. However, I fear that you won't even consider to take these steps and that you'll persist in your errors. May God have mercy on your soul!

**Postmaster: Please send address changes to:
The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator
3084 Woodrow St
Memphis, TN 38127
(USPS #000476)**

**Periodical
Postage Paid
Memphis, TN
38101**