



# The Burning Bush - Online article archive

## Bible Protestantism and Romanism do not hold the same views on abortion!

“Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is,” Ephesians 5:17.

I am of an age at which slipping into the shadows and withdrawing from all public life has its attractions.

But it is not always possible to do that which you may strongly desire to do. This is especially so when a need arises and a voice is required to answer falsehood and deception and there is none!

Such an occasion arose yesterday. According to the “Belfast Telegraph”, Mr Ian Paisley Jr, MP, has written an article for the “Catholic Herald” in which, according to the “Belfast Telegraph”, he states that he holds views on abortion ‘identical’ to those of ‘pro-life’ Roman Catholics.

### Ian Paisley Jr: What I admire about Catholics

Ian Paisley Jr July 10, 2020 at 2:55 pm



Headline in the ‘Catholic Herald’ of July 10th 2020.

Mr Paisley is of course free to hold such views but what concerns me is that many Christians who, upon reading reports of his views, may be inclined to believe that, because of his name, what he believes is biblical, especially when he claims in the article that he is “an evangelical Protestant”.

If this report is true, (and it is for I have seen the article online) then what he believes on abortion is not biblical or true.

What would also concern me is that such identifying with the views of Rome on abortion tends to hide the terrible and shameful hypocrisy of Rome on the death of infants. It is not so long ago that it was reported that the bodies of up to 800 infants had been found in the grounds of the Tuam Roman Catholic Convent-run care home for unmarried mothers. The exact circumstances in which the little ones perished is yet unknown! But one newspaper ran the headline: ‘Order of nuns that dumped up to 800 babies into a septic tank’. What evil, heartless and satanic depravity this discloses!

This is not the first case of its kind and it serves to highlight the duplicity of Popery on the death of children and should have us exercise care when expressing admiration for its anti-abortion campaign!

### Admiration

Mr Paisley did state his admiration for the zeal of the Roman Catholics in opposing abortion. That creates no problem for me. I would that there was an equal display of zeal on the part of all true Christians toward abortion as is shown by some Roman Catholics. Too many Christians are silent when they should be speaking out.

But acknowledging the zeal of some is not the same as having ‘identical views’ on this issue of great importance!

### Differences

In the 1940s in the Republic of Ireland, the dreadful problem of a high infant mortality rate was one of the reasons for the introduction of a ‘Ministry of Health’. However, in 1948 the Fianna Fáil government had been ousted and it was replaced by a coalition. The new government was left with the task of implementing the health scheme. In 1948, Dr Noel Browne, a socialist, became Minister of Health in the coalition government.



## The Burning Bush - Online article archive

Browne was an admirer of the National Health Service in the United Kingdom. When Dr Brown submitted the plan for a health service in 1950, it was particularly opposed by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, John Charles McQuaid, a noted hardline Papist. He summoned Dr Browne to his 'palace' and declared the reasons for the opposition to what was proposed in the new healthcare bill.

One of the main reasons for McQuaid's opposition was "Doctors trained in institutions in which we have no confidence may be appointed as medical officers ... and may give gynaecological care not in accordance with Catholic principles." Rome held great control over the hospitals in the Irish Republic at that time. Archbishop McQuaid was the chairman of some boards of directors of Dublin hospitals. He exercised considerable influence concerning medical appointments and control over the religious orders whose members made up much of the administrative and management staff in hospitals.

Dr Browne was forced to resign his office in April 1951. He stated in his resignation speech in the Dublin parliament: "I had been led to believe that my insistence on the exclusion of a means test had the full support of my colleagues in the Government. I now know that it had not. Furthermore, the Hierarchy has informed the Government that they must regard the mother and child scheme proposed by me as opposed to Catholic social teaching. This decision I, as a Catholic, immediately accepted without hesitation."

So, the social and moral teaching of the Roman Catholic Church was opposed to the new health bill in company with the medical lobby.

Central in the controversy surrounding Rome's opposition to what was called "The Mother and Child scheme", was the issue of the importance in Rome's eyes of 'infant baptism'. If a child dies unbaptised then, according to Rome, it goes to 'Limbo'!

The state of the dead unbaptised infant is one of the reasons for Rome's opposition to abortion. Dr Browne's plan threatened to take the care of the mother and infant out of the hands of the 'Church' and therein lay the perceived threat to Rome's power!

### Baptism

Now, I am opposed to abortion. I have spoken, written and protested against it on many occasions. I believe that the modern use of abortion by those wishing to avoid the 'nuisance' of the birth of a child for social, financial, mental or any of the notions that society has embraced of late as being legitimate reasons for the slaughter of the unborn, entails murder.

But I do not believe Rome's view on the absolute necessity of the baptism of an infant in order that it may obtain heaven. Baptism does not save the soul nor is it in any way necessary to salvation. The Lord Jesus assured the 'dying thief' that he was going to heaven yet he was not baptised!

To claim that one holds an identical view on abortion as Romanists is to embrace and endorse Rome's view of baptism. That would be very wrong!

### 1960s

I recall, in the late 1960s, a nurse phoning me when my wife was in hospital expecting our second child. Apparently some difficulties had arisen and the nurse took it on herself to phone me and tell me that if I did not come immediately to the hospital and be ready to baptise our baby then they would seek another minister/priest to come and baptise the child.

Believe me I gave that poor blinded Romanist nurse something to think about in a brief phone conversation and within minutes was in the hospital where I again berated them for their most improper seeking to impose the views of Popery upon my family.

It turned out that the same nurse had demanded from my wife that she give a name for the child, yet unborn, in case of an emergency. My wife explained that we did not believe that the child needed to be baptised



## The Burning Bush - Online article archive

or given a name but this had not satisfied the Romanist nurse, who then took it upon herself to contact me.

The incident serves to show just how poor Romanists place their faith in baptism as a means of preparing a child for heaven.

### David

I am of a mind that the child that dies in the womb or at birth or indeed, any child that dies before the age of understanding, will go to heaven by virtue of the shed blood of Christ alone. David was confident that he would see in heaven the little child that Bathsheba bore but which died under God's judgment (2 Samuel 12:14). David explained to his servants why he was able to bear up under the loss of the child when they broke the news of the death of the child to him. "Then said his servants unto him, What thing is this that thou hast done? thou didst fast and weep for the child, while it was alive; but when the child was dead, thou didst rise and eat bread. And he said, While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept: for I said, Who can tell whether GOD will be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me," 2 Samuel 12:21-23. I believe that all Christians who suffer the loss of an infant may share in the comfort of David.

No, baptism is not needed for the salvation of the infant or the adult. It is the cleansing blood of Christ alone which atones for our sins. Therefore I do not share with the Roman Catholic all that they believe regarding abortion.

Mr Paisley did no service to the cause of God by making what may have been a rash statement rather than a true declaration of what he believes.

Rev Ivan Foster (Rtd)

16th July 2020.