



# The Burning Bush—Online article archive

## What Dr Paisley once said about Rev Armstrong & the Limavady protest



The following excerpts from "The Revivalist", a monthly magazine edited by Dr Paisley, indicate clearly that if he apologised to Rev. David Armstrong, Dr Paisley has repudiated the stand that he and the Free Presbyterian Church took against apostasy since the inception of our church in 1951.

Every day seems to bring some new revelation that must surely convince the dullest of minds that the new political philosophy embraced by Dr Paisley stems from a heart that has forsaken the old paths of obedience to God's Word.

If this report is true, we must publicly resist and reject these new views while we continue to earnestly pray that the man, who for so long and so courageously led the battle against ecumenical apostasy, is recovered and restored to the position of grace and power that he once occupied.

Ivan Foster, 16th December 2007.

The following are links to the original "Revivalist" articles on Dr Paisley's website.

<http://www.ianpaisley.org/revivalist/1984/Rev84mar.htm>

<http://www.ianpaisley.org/revivalist/1985/Rev85feb.htm>

<http://www.ianpaisley.org/revivalist/1985/Rev85may.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

### COMPROMISE AT CHRISTMAS

By Rev. Wesley McDowell

(Minister, Limavady Free Presbyterian Church)

*"Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather, REPROVE THEM"* - Ephesians 5: 11

**On Christmas Day last, another chapter was written in the compromising ministry of Limavady Prebyterian Church, Rev. David Armstrong.**

The local press proclaimed "History was made in Limavady" because, as the title of the front page article boldly stated - **"CHURCH LEADERS CROSS THE ROAD AND THE DIVIDE!"**

Local priest, Kevin Mullan was invited by Mr. Armstrong into First Limavady Presbyterian Church to speak to the congregation and extend to them seasonal greetings. He did so and *members of the congregation applauded*. Mr. Armstrong then went to the mass house after his own service was over, and did likewise. He received a standing ovation from the mass of mass lovers (Woe unto the man when popery applauds).



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

---

Rev. Wesley McDowell, minister of our Limavady Church, was quick to expose this ecumenical exercise and sought to advertise in, and express opposition through, the local press. *He was refused the facility of doing so, the editor himself being a Presbyterian Elder.*

This shows that ecumenism is a great danger to civil and religious liberty. It seeks to stifle and ignore any opposing view - i.e. the truth. Mr McDowell insisted that he be given the right to advertise, threatening the editor with a protest and a complaint to the Press Council. He succeeded in getting an alternative ad inserted, but was refused the facility of commenting on this issue. The subject was announced for Sunday evening, 15th January. It was entitled: "DAVID IS DELUDED, OR COMMENTS ON THE COMPROMISE OF A LOCAL CLERGYMAN"

Mr. McDowell pointed out that this Christmas caper was another step in the decline of a compromiser who went to mass at the opening of the "adulterous shrine" in Limavady. He also quoted Armstrong's own words: "It has been mainly due to the Ministry of the Rev. David Watson of York that I have had to re-examine my attitudes." *Watson is the leader of the Charismatic Movement in Britain.*

Armstrong also claims that the Pope is a Christian. It was pointed out by Mr. McDowell how un-Presbyterian and un-Biblical Armstrong's attitudes and activities are. During the course of the sermon based on I Sam. 21:10-22:2, the preacher said: "We have run up against a stone wall, as it were, for the local press has refused to publish our criticisms, but the Lord will open a door and we will get the truth out." Little did he realise then what would happen.

That Republican rag, "The Sunday World", carried a scurrilous attack on the Limavady minister and implied that his opposition to Armstrong had forced 1st Limavady session, by 5 votes to 4, to ask their minister to leave the Church. Newspapers all over the country and even on the mainland carried the story and for some days Mr. McDowell had the opportunity of exposing the ecumenism of Armstrong. As usual, the press sought to misrepresent Rev. McDowell, but those who read between the lines knew what was happening.

Mr. McDowell states: "It is very obvious that Church House put the screws on the Limavady session. A B.B.C. newscaster told me that he could get nothing from anybody in 1st Limavady and had to give up in the end, the only information coming from the Presbyterian press officer in Belfast, Rev. Cobain. The reputedly unanimous vote in favour of Armstrong was a cover up, for I know for a fact that there is disquiet in the Church over the ecumenical activities of its minister - this having been expressed to me on one occasion from inside that Church. I told that person that the only honest and God honouring thing left for him to do was to, 'Come out from among them'.

"Subsequent events have proved this to be the only action that God's people can take. 'Come out of her my people,'" Rev. 18:4. Church House has stifled the voice of opposition to ecumenicity and has refused to let members of the 1st Limavady session publicly express opposition to the compromise of Armstrong. It must be remembered that the Presbyterian Church allows its ministers to publicly take part in ecumenical services, but any pub-



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

lic opposition to the likes of Armstrong is forbidden.

"The rule of Popery in this issue must not be overlooked. Over the past few years R.C. Bishop Edward Daly, from Londonderry, has sent devious priests to Limavady. In a local R.C. publication Armstrong is seen in a photograph with Daly and Donnelly (a local priest). They have got this gullible Presbyterian in their grasp and yet, in this whole Christmas caper, which they initiated, they refused to make any public comment. They stood on the sidelines and reaped the benefits. Indeed a local Presbyterian minister told me that he, 'felt that the R.C. priest, Mullan, set Armstrong up'.

"The 'unanimous' vote for Armstrong is tantamount to saying: 'Carry on - invite the colleagues and admirers of the Sinn Fein Cardinal O'Fee into the Church. Applaud those whose colleagues applauded the hunger strikers and those who fired the volleys over their graves'. The Word of God says: 'Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them'."

\*\*\*\*\*

### THANK YOU MR. CARDINAL

For several years a small band of people have faithfully protested against the visits of Cardinal O'Fiaich to St. Anne's Cathedral. Their protest at times has been viewed with distaste and contempt by many people, but now the full purpose of such action has been fully justified. The Cardinal's open support for the activities of Provisional Sinn Fein has long been simmering under the surface of hypocritical pronouncements about violence. At last Mr. O'Fiaich has displayed an honest heart, revealing his true position and identifying his personal aspirations as that paralleled with Sinn Fein's desires. In light of such revelations it is now time for the Protestant clergy to stop deceiving and confusing their people, by withdrawing their support from the ecumenical movement, which has only given a spirit of credibility to men like the Cardinal, who by his double tongued statements is clearly a wolf in sheep's clothing. The Scriptures teach, *From such withdraw thyself.*

The people of this Province have suffered much in the wake of I.R.A. terrorism. Many bear the indescribable anguish of the bomber's bomb and the assassin's bullets. In the midst of such suffering they understandably turn to their faith. But when they see the very foundations of that faith being given away it weakens their confidence in the only instruction that can provide comfort, consolation and above all salvation.

As protestors against this Ecumenical Service we earnestly appeal to all men everywhere to repent for there can be no reconciliation between men until first of all there is reconciliation with God. Let us reject those who support the activities of Sinn Fein and at the same time thank the Cardinal for making his position so clear, and fulfilling the Scriptures, *As a man thinketh in his heart so is he.*

***"The Revivalist", the monthly magazine of the Free Presbyterian Church edited by Dr Ian Paisley - March 1984***



# The Burning Bush—Online article archive

\*\*\*\*\*

## Protestant and Catholic Encounters!

Every year, at this time, there is a proliferation of services at which Protestants and Roman Catholics meet together for worship. Ostensibly the purpose is to sing carols and celebrate the wonderful birth of the Lord Jesus Christ.

On the face of it, it seems quite a harmless exercise, even a worthwhile one. But is it right? By that I mean, is it acceptable in the sight of God; the One who is professed to be worshipped?

Furthermore, can Protestants safely meet in worship with Roman Catholics without doing injury to their faith and undermining their Protestant heritage? Surely, they cannot. The very word 'Protestant', was coined at a time when the unscriptural errors Of Romanism were being highlighted. The Protestants were those who raised their voices against those errors. To join in worship now with that same unchanged, erroneous system is, surely, a denial of the very word 'Protestant'. This must be true regardless of the reason for worship.

It seems quite clear that this special season of Christmas is being used, rather abused, by Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen to break down the natural and historical barrier that exists between the two churches. Thus, the senses of the Protestant people are being dulled and their resistance to the errors of Romanism weakened.

It's not the fault of the people that this situation exists; it's the fault of those untrustworthy clerics, but it's the people who will eventually suffer.

Now to answer the question of whether Protestants and Roman Catholics should worship together a number of things must be taken into consideration.

First - what do we mean by and what is involved in the term 'worship'?

Worship is defined in the Oxford dictionary as "reverence paid to a divine being". The worship of God is one of the oldest and most important elements in man's make up. It has to be said, then, that if worship itself is so important, true worship is vital and essential.

There is no point, surely, in worship unless it is conducted aright. Let's illustrate the point like this.

We all realise the necessity of breathing to stay alive. Furthermore, we realise and appreciate the importance of breathing pure air. The number of 'clean air' acts which are in existence procure and guarantee for us this benefit of pure air. Agents and agencies have also been appointed to act as watchdogs to ensure that the clean air acts are complied with and to guard against impurities getting into the air we breathe.

I put it that, in the spiritual realm, just as much trouble should be taken to ensure purity of worship. Let's remember, we are not worshipping a man, a church or a religious system; but the God of eternity, the creator of the universe.

Now for worship to be pure it must have a proper basis and that basis must be common to all participants. We can only meet for worship on common ground. In this respect worship is no different to any other aspect of our lives.

For example, a proper marriage cannot be effected unless the two people who are party to it agree on and comply with the basis for such a marriage: love, trust, fidelity and respect.

Similar arguments could be advanced with respect to every other avenue of our lives; business and commerce, the law, education, sport and recreation and a host of others. In all these a set of basic rules applies and if we go outside them, problems arise.



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

---

The worship of God is no different - common ground is essential and must be found. Even the ecumenists recognise this. For years they have been working together to achieve agreement on certain fundamentals of worship: for example, the eucharist.

But where do we go to find this common basis and what rules do we employ in this search for purity of worship?

Is it enough to say "We are all worshipping the same God perhaps in slightly different ways - but still, the same God?"

Obviously, it is not enough. This was the position taken by the first man ever to offer improper worship to God - Cain. Cain professed to be worshipping God but brought an offering which was unacceptable. God refused his worship and judged Cain's action as sin.

Well then, is it enough that we be sincere? Surely if we mean well that makes whatever we do all right.

Again, the answer must be sincerity is not enough! It's not the first time a man has drunk poison from a bottle which he sincerely believed to contain lemonade. His sincerity, however, did nothing to alter the deadliness of the poison or the danger to his life.

Then again, is it enough that we be all agreed? "There's safety in numbers", some would say. "Everybody's going this way. Does that not make it a fairly safe bet?"

Once more the answer must be "No"! The fact that all are agreed about a certain policy or course of action does nothing to make that position the right one. The little Norwegian lemmings are all agreed. They are all going the same way, yet they just as surely plunge to their death.

But some would ask, "Is it not good for us all to get together to sing carols and worship God? Everybody seems so happy. The unity and fellowship is really wonderful. This course we are on has all the appearances of being the right one; it's so peaceful and calm"

Again it must be pointed out that what seems to be all right is, quite often, far from it.

The passengers were having a wonderful time aboard the Titanic on that fateful night in April 1912. The sea was flat calm. The destination - New York - was assured; for were they not sailing the safest and most modern ship in all the world. Peace and serenity reigned supreme. Everything appeared perfect. Yet they perished just the same. What appeared to be the most wonderful voyage ever turned out to be one of the most infamous catastrophes!

From all this it is quite clear that we are not to be guided by considerations of unity, sincerity, convenience or appearance. There is only one reliable guide in this matter; that is the Word of God the Bible.

Now God, in His Word, gives us clear, explicit instruction on the matter of worship. He says, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24) Underscore the word "truth". In the Bible "truth" may be defined as "revealed reality". In other words God is saying; those who worship him must do so as He has revealed they should in His Word!

Inevitably, this brings us to a consideration of the fundamentals of the faith. Fundamentals are, simply, foundational truths over which there can be no degree of interpretation. Just as we must agree that the Bible is the Word of God, so we must agree that certain things taught in that Word are foundational, or fundamental to faith in Christ.

Creeeds, catechisms and confessions are all attempts by men to put down, in simpler form, what they believe the Bible teaches on particular matters of faith.

Now it so happens that the creeds and confessions of the Protestant (sometimes called re-



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

---

formed) churches agree on these fundamental matters. It also so happens that they all disagree with the Roman Catholic church.

Consider, for example, the central act of worship in the Roman Catholic Church - the Mass. The Roman Catholic Council of Trent, which met periodically between 1545 and 1563, and which confirmed the doctrines of the Roman church as distinct from those of the Reformed church, made this declaration concerning the Mass: "The sacrifice in the Mass is identical with the sacrifice of the cross, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is a priest and victim both. The only difference lies in the manner of offering, which was bloody upon the cross and bloodless on our altars."

How different that is from the plain teaching of the Bible which states that "Christ was *once offered* to bear the sins of many", and that "he has offered *one* sacrifice for sins *forever*" (Hebrews 9:28; 10: 12).

Clearly, there is absolutely no need for any further sacrifice of the Saviour; the sacrifice of Calvary was enough. How dare, then, the Roman church suggest and teach otherwise?

Furthermore, in the Mass, the Roman church teaches that the host, upon the words of consecration spoken by the priest, becomes the literal, actual body and blood of Christ. This is the Roman doctrine of "Transubstantiation" or literally - "a change of substance".

Again, how different this is to the simple teaching of the Bible on the matter. Nowhere is there any indication that the bread becomes anything other than bread; or the wine anything other than wine. They, in fact, do not change! When Protestants receive the bread and wine in communion they receive them only as the emblems of Christ's body and blood, nothing else, nothing more.

There is, therefore, a distinct difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant teaching on this matter; a difference which is fundamental and cannot be ignored or glossed over. Anyone who practices or takes part in the Mass as taught by the Roman Catholic church is in grave error and in disobedience to the plain teaching of scripture, It is, therefore, impossible for any true Protestant to meet in worship with such a person.

In conclusion and to summarise; Protestants and Roman Catholics can, and should, be good neighbours. They can work side by side in the factory or at the workbench. They can conduct affairs of business or commerce and involve themselves in sport and recreation, for in all these things, and many others, there is common good.

However, in the matter of joint worship they can never meet in a manner which is acceptable to God, for between Romanism and Protestantism there is no common ground.

*Rev. James McClelland*

---

### CHRISTMAS PROTEST IN LIMAVADY

On Christmas Day, three of our Ministers led a protest in Limavady. Revs. Wesley McDowell, George Whyte and James McClelland with about forty Free Presbyterians from Garvagh, Londonderry, Coleraine and Limavady protested outside First Limavady Presbyterian Church. Suitable placards were carried and the leaflet, "Why Were Our Reformers Burned", was distributed. As Rev. David Armstrong, Minister of First Limavady, entered his church, Rev. McDowell challenged him to a public debate on the issue of ecumenism. Armstrong ignored the challenge and ran into his church. The protestors continued to remain outside the church. The RC service in the chapel ended at 11.15 a.m. and they witnessed our pro-



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

---

test, some pouring scorn upon us, others laughed. At 11.20 a.m. the local priest, Kevin Mullan crossed from the chapel to First Limavady. Rev. McDowell presented him with the above mentioned leaflet and stated the reason why the protest was taking place. At this point also, the priest was confronted with a young converted RC. He was told that this young man was being hounded by a priest and persecuted by his family because he had been saved and was attending the church of his choice.

It was pointed out to the priest that if his church was in control, the very protesters before him, in all probability, would not be afforded the legitimate right they were now exercising. The priest was welcomed with open arms into the Presbyterian Church.

Meanwhile, three Free Presbyterians had entered First Limavady Church earlier to observe the proceedings. At the end of the Service, when the priest was called to the front to speak, our brethren stood up, one of which, Mr. Paul Olphert, Londonderry, read a few verses, of Scripture (11 John 9-11) and then accused Rev. Armstrong of treason before God. Upon this, a number of men made for our brethren. Mr. Olphert was dragged by the hair out of the pew and down the aisle, and kicked between the legs. A medical examination later confirmed this. Our brother had a severe bruise about one foot long on the inside of his upper right leg.

The two other Free Presbyterians were similarly treated, being punched and kicked when the service ended and people gathered at the door of the church, Revs. McDowell and McClelland went to complain to Armstrong about the treatment doled out to our brethren. He ran like a scared rabbit into his church, and his members began to push us back. Rev. McClelland was struck on the face and subjected to abusive and foul language. It must be noted that in all this, not one Free Presbyterian retaliated, and as Rev. McDowell informed the police at 8.30 a.m. that morning that the protest would be peaceful - so it turned out to be, ON OUR PART.

A complaint was lodged with the police that day, and whilst doing so, Rev. McDowell was subjected to cheek and abuse by one of the officers in the station.

A subsequent talk with an officer indicated that in all probability the R.U.C. would try to get something on the protesters. The officer tried to dissuade Rev. McDowell from taking any action, suggesting that charges might be brought re disruption of a religious service and obstruction of a clergyman. It was pointed out that if it had been Free Presbyterians who had used violence, the last drop of blood would be wrung out of them. Subsequently Armstrong, in the Newsletter, adamantly denied that there had been any violence in his church. This man is prepared to lie to save his public face, but God knows the truth, and in the final analysis, that is what matters.

It must be noted that this affair is not merely about Christmas Greetings. During Christmas week, Armstrong was welcomed by R.C. Bishop in Londonderry, Edward Daly to St. Eugene's Cathedral, and the Presbyterian clergyman preached there. The same night after a torchlight procession through Londonderry, Kevin Mullan spoke in St. Columb's Cathedral. This was organised by a group of French origin - Taze - whose declared aim is to obtain unity around the chair of St. Peter.

Armstrong was also at Midnight Mass on Christmas Eve in Limavady. It has also been made known that Armstrong and Mullan will be going to a St. Patrick's Day Parade in U.S.A. The theme of that parade is to be reconciliation.



# The Burning Bush—Online article archive

The situation in the Limavady Presbyterian Church is but a reflection of the situation in the Presbyterian Church as a whole. There are those in First Limavady who disagree with Armstrong's exploits, but he rides roughshod over them and even more disturbing, over the express Biblical teaching on the matter of ecumenism. A compromise has been reached in the Irish Presbyterian Church whereby such sinful activities as those taking place in Limavady, are tolerated. As in the case in Limavady, those who oppose ecumenism will soon be outnumbered and any resistance to the blasphemous and idolatrous dogmas of Rome will be weakened. The only Scriptural action to take is to, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate", 11 Cor. 6:17.

***"The Revivalist", the monthly magazine of the Free Presbyterian Church edited by Dr Ian Paisley - February 1985.***

\*\*\*\*\*

**An excerpt from sermon entitled : "Apostate Priests - Burned to Death with the Fire of God!"**

**A Sermon preached by**

**Dr. Paisley at the Easter Convention in the Martyrs Memorial Church, Monday, 8th April, 1985.**

**A reference to the protest by Rev. Wesley McDowell is highlighted.**

Two contrasting verses, verse 24 of Leviticus chapter 9, and verse 2 of Leviticus chapter 10, "*And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces*". What a scene is that! The sacrifice on the brasen altar, but no fire kindled under the sacrifice. Then suddenly the glory of the Triune Jehovah God appeared - that Blessed Shekinah - that indefinable splendour of the visible Majesty of God's appearance - and from the Mercy Seat there comes a fire that goes out in its fulness through the Holy Place and past the laver and kindles the sacrifice upon the altar.

I will come back to this wonderful scene. From the Mercy Seat there comes a Holy, Sacred, Majestic Fire of God, and it consumed on the altar the sacrifice already laid there. What a shout of wonder, of worship, of praise, of ecstasy and joy goes up from over a million hearts! They fall on their faces and they worship. But in a few moments afterwards that fire comes forth again, this time, not in blessing but in judgment. This time, not in atonement but in punishment. There are two bodies burned by that fire, the bodies of two priests, the sons of Aaron the high priest of the tribes of Israel.

## **NADAB AND ABIHU**

I want to preach about Nadab and Abihu. Could I say by way of preface that sin always blots the fairest copybook that God gives into the hands of man.



## The Burning Bush—Online article archive

---

These men were drunk. Their timing was wrong. The day to offer incense was the great day of atonement. They were in the wrong place, for it was to be offered on the altar of incense and on the mercy seat. They were in the outer court where no incense was ever to be burned. They had the wrong fire, they did not get it off God's altar, it was strange fire that they were offering, not a fire of the Lord's kindling.

I want to say to you, we have strange fire in our Churches today, and they say it is successful. My Bible has nothing to say about success. My Bible has everything to say about faithfulness. This Bible majors on faithfulness; it does not major on successfulness. The rich fool was successful, but he is in Hell. Old Lazarus was not successful, but he is in Heaven. I would rather be with Lazarus, he was faithful.

I want to say to you, that I don't care what is successful. If it is contrary to this Book it is error, it is deception, it is of the Devil. Let me say it clearly!

"Why do you not speak in tongues?" I will tell you why. Because the Bible says it is a sign for the unbeliever and not for the believer. I am not looking for an unbeliever's sign. They say to me, "Why do you not join the Charismatic Itch?" I don't like being itchy! What is more, when I see the gang on the ballroom floor I would not want anything to do with them. A man that denies the Deity of Christ and he says he is an evangelical, an evangelist would be a better name for him. They embrace one another, and talk about lovely fellowship, "Oh, is it not wonderful?" "Down there in Rostrevor with Cecil Kerr, is it not lovely?" **Wee David Armstrong from Limavady I see has gone to the Church of England, to a Charismatic Church. Thank God for a Free Presbyterian minister in Limavady that told the Limavady people the truth about Armstrong! God bless Wesley McDowell! We will not hold it against him because he is called Wesley!**

Let me say this, you can't have strange fire friend. We must build God's work in God's way, and you will have terrible opposition, and it will be slow going. Nehemiah did not build the wall in a hurry. You know why? Because he had to go into the clearing of the rubbish first, and that took a long time.

I have been clearing rubbish out of the Churches for years. Thank God for that woman that was cleared out on Saturday night, brother. She can dance in the old apostate Church, she will not be dancing in our property, Hallelujah for that! I want to tell you that we have to take a strong stand for God's own fire.

***"The Revivalist", the monthly magazine of the Free Presbyterian Church edited by Dr Ian Paisley - May 1985.***