

WILL UNBAPTISED BABIES BE BARRED FROM HEAVEN?

Some say, "Jesus never said that the kingdom of Heaven belonged to the unbaptised children he blessed but to people who were childlike before God. In John 3:5 where he rules out salvation without baptism in water he was thinking of adult baptism if he was thinking of baptism at all and infant baptism was unknown in those days so by implication babies are barred from Heaven forever." Perhaps that is the right understanding of Christian doctrine.

The Catholic book, *Why Does God?* says that since baptism is called the new birth it is as essential for entry into Heaven as natural birth is for entry into this world and that since a baby is not able to desire baptism it cannot get the soul saving effects of a baptism of desire – like somebody who prepares for baptism but dies suddenly before the ceremony can who God gives some of the effects of baptism without the ceremony in order to make it possible for him to get into Heaven - and strictly the only way a baby can be saved is by literal personal water baptism when alive (page 161).

The Church says unbaptised babies go to a place called Limbo meaning border as the result of a process of elimination. It would be cruel to send them to Hell we are told. But you cannot say that because the Catholic God has deprived them of blessings because of Adam and he is fair so if he can do that he can send them to Hell for they deserve it. And the Church says they can't go to Heaven because they haven't the maturity to choose Heaven. Incidentally, this is a lie for they also teach that baptised babies get into Heaven and God gave the unbaptised the power to choose. He can find a way for the unbaptised babies who go to Limbo to mature so that they can choose.

Pius VI in 1794 officially forbade disbelief in Limbo which he understood as being Hell without the fire (page 86, *Reason and Belief*)

Some say that Limbo is a Paradise but others say it is a place of punishment.

Let us test the concept of a paradise Limbo.

The babies will be fairly happy there without God the supreme source of happiness because they don't know what they are missing. They can't be perfectly happy for the Church says you need full and tangible union with God for that. But shouldn't God let them grow up in that world like they do here so that they can choose him? The Church says that he doesn't have to because he doesn't owe them any favours – they are too young to deserve them (question 711, *Radio Replies*, Vol 1). This is how she safeguarded the justice of God.

But she didn't succeed. Only cruel clergy could think she did. You can't deserve the power to choose or disdain the Lord. But a really good God would let you have the chance when he believes in giving us the power of free will. He could give the unbaptised babies the power and the intelligence to use it after death.

When God has made us for himself as religion says we cannot be happy if he holds us, especially babies, away from him. To exclude anyone from God is a severe and hurtful punishment and they will despise the blessings they have as poor substitutes. Pining for God is supposed to be an intrinsic part of human personality. Vatican 2 said that all people have the one ultimate goal which is God (see the document *Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, 28th October, 1965).

If God is loving he lets baptised babies into Heaven. To love is to seek union in fellowship with someone. God does not love the unbaptised babies when he won't admit them into his presence. A good God can't have favourites so he can't be more generous to some people than others. When he forgives forgotten crimes he should forgive the original sin of a child which is more worthy for it is not the child's fault. The child does not deserve to be in original sin no matter what the Church says.

And it is obviously malicious to assert that God ought to punish babies in Limbo for a sin they never committed. Those who say original sin is the absence of God in you so it is not punishment but just a barrier that makes you unable to connect to God are in a sense worse. God is punishing in that case but refusing to say he does. And so are we.

The notion of Limbo is anathema to anyone with sense. I have heard even Catholics say that it proves how low the Church would stoop to blackmail parents to give her their children. I would say that is more true of the Church in the past but is partly true today.

Some Catholics hope that Limbo will be closed down by God some day so that the prisoners can float up to Heaven. Not a very brilliant presumption considering that God could have done this from the start. Limbo presents us with a capricious God. God could just as easily abandon them forever.

The Bible does not say that unbaptised babies will be saved or at least at peace. Though it forbids making dogmas that are not implicitly or explicitly spelled out on its pages it follows that we have to say that Limbo exists to be on the safe side. It is implying that Limbo exists. Could it be said that when it says God is love that it implies the opposite? No for it does say we suffer by divine decree for Adam's sin by being prone to sin and death so God is not so keen on making us holy. God laid punishments on Adam and Eve in Genesis that have been passed on to us implying God has rejected us with them and up until modern times it was babies and children that had the worst deal.

Nobody can believe that a mass murderer can go to confession and end up in Heaven from which harmless babies are eternally debarred just because their parents didn't get the priest to cast a spell on them. It is the height of religious sectarianism. They need to ask themselves some serious questions about what is in them that makes them willing to believe such a thing.

Jesus died for all sin including Adam's, the sin that babies carry that is known as original sin. Because he paid divine justice for the sins we committed it follows that he paid for the original sin that taints babies. Babies then should be conceived without original sin. So God goes out of his way to hurt them when they are born with it for he is the one that can prevent original sin. To be born without the grace of God is to be born degraded. It is a degradation that begins at conception. It must be a punishment. The Church says that degradation is worse than pain for the Church commands you to die rather than give up your love for God. This tells us that God could certainly sentence them to eternal pain when he degrades them for that is a lesser evil than degrading them. Now if Jesus had not atoned on the cross what would become of babies who die? Probably the same as what happens to unbaptised babies now. It would surely be better for God to give Adam and Eve ten billion years of life to have babies that all die so that all are fine in Limbo than to have things the way they are and many people having grown up to go to Hell. Better for all babies to die than for one to be eternally damned. The fact that we grow up must mean that babies are better off growing up even though some of them go to Hell. That would only be true if all babies dying would sentence them all to eternal damnation. So God lets them grow up so that some of them will escape.

If you believe that people are better off dead than suffering intensively when they are not getting better, you will hold that the Bible teaching that babies deserve death because of Adam's sin is not as bad as the teaching of some Christians that they should go to Hell forever. If you agree with the view that life is so important than even such suffering wouldn't justify ending the life then it would be blasphemy for you to say then in that case that an all-good God would not send babies to Hell when he kills them. Killing them would be worse if life is so important.

The real origin of Limbo was in hearts that were going to make sure nobody would dare defy the Church and not have their child enrolled as a member.

It is belittling God to teach that he keeps babies in original sin until the priest empties a jug on them. He does not love them when he is not anxious to make them his children as quickly as possible. Rome says he owes the children nothing so he can arbitrarily heal one of original sin and keep another in it if he wants to. So his forgiveness is just generosity. But it is an insult to be generous to one and not another for no reason. Generosity is a virtue so a truly perfect God cannot be mean like Rome's God. Rome has hidden her secret doctrine that God hates babies until they are baptised for too long. One could be forgiven for thinking the Church is the one that hates babies.

It is not a very nice person who would praise a God who will not regard innocent babies as his friends and children until an eccentric in strange robes splashes them with holy water. The Catholic Church defends her this God claiming that the babies do not deserve salvation. But the babies haven't done anything. The Church agrees and then informs us that it is because they haven't that God has the right to look upon them with wrath. But he could look on them with love. When he has a choice he should pick the best. He would pick love if he were love.

The Church says that if you would be baptised but can't be God will understand and you will be made as good as baptised the very moment you die but under very strict conditions.

As long as you delay making your child a friend of God you are willing the child's separation from God and that must be a sin. And it must be child-abuse. Rome says it is worse to abuse the soul than to abuse the body. No wonder some feel that if they have abused a child's soul they might as well abuse them sexually for they have done worse.

One out of three zygotes die unknown to the mother. Limbo is the home of at least this one third of the human race. How unkindly God is!

Today, the consensus is that it is best for babies to have them baptised and it should be done at all costs though we can't be sure why it is. This is still a terrifying doctrine for anybody who is in danger of miscarrying. Why don't Catholics baptise babies in the womb with syringes as a rule?

At the end of the day, though baptised believers in infant baptism claim that they do not consider themselves any better or worse than an unbaptised baby they do. If you have God in your heart you are better than the person who has not. The doctrine of baptism they have is the stuff from which racism is made.

Religious fanaticism is when a religion fails to live and believe in such a way that no harm is done if the religion turns out to be untrue. This is fanaticism. It is no better than the spirit that leads the Catholic Church to inflict the fear of a priest not coming in time on a dying person.

Most so-called Christians have no problem contravening the rules of the Church on marriage so it is hard to see how they put so much emphasis on getting babies baptised.

The Catholic Church teaches that a person can be saved by gaining some of the effects of baptism through a baptism of desire or baptism of blood. If a man desires baptism and dies before managing to get baptised he will go to Heaven. This is the baptism of desire. If a man gives his life for the faith though he is not baptised he is considered to get what is called the baptism of blood and he will go to Heaven. The Church stresses that these are not sacraments and are not equal to baptism but another way to get rid of the sin that baptism takes away. The Church says these fit the rule given by Christ that only water shall save for the waters of baptism still save these people in the sense that it is in deference to baptism that these saving effects are allowed to take place. The doctrine of baptism of blood and baptism of desire is wholly unscriptural. God would not like you to say that a sinner can be saved by getting rid of sin these ways when an innocent and helpless baby cannot be saved without literal baptism in water. And Jesus could baptise the people who desire baptism and who have the baptism of blood with water on entry into Heaven. That he does not do so is a testament to the doctrine of the blood baptism and the desire baptism being false. They are supposed to be allowed by God for water baptism is the only way to salvation but if Jesus does not baptise the recipients of the desire or blood baptism then water baptism cannot be the only way. If water baptism were the only way then the blessings of blood or desire baptism would arise not from blessings given without a view to water baptism but from blessings given in advance of water baptism in the same way you might get your wages before you earn them in view of the fact that you will earn them.

The Church teaches that baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation but that in extreme cases people get the grace of baptism in the baptism of blood and baptism of desire which are not technically baptisms. They distinguish between the grace of baptism and the form of the sacrament. In other words, desire for the sacrament gives you its effects when you are dying unbaptised.

The scenario when somebody runs to a baby with water to baptise it but it dies first leaving it too late does not fit the rules for baptism of desire. The baby didn't desire the baptism but somebody else did but baptism of desire requires that the candidate of baptism desire the baptism. The baby is in original sin and so doesn't like God and so nobody can assume that the baby has a desire to be with God. Some liberal clergy think that if a baby dies before its baptism because it was intended for it to be baptised the baby will be saved and given the powers of baptism without the water. The baby then is saved by baptism indirectly. But this can be said of any baby. Imagine a baby dies without baptism at the North Pole and there are no Christians within ten thousand miles what then? The Christians would baptise the baby if they could so the baby then will be treated by God as baptised though it is not for it is nobody's fault the baby wasn't baptised. This kindly and compassionate idea however is destroyed by the fact that they think Jesus said water baptism is necessary for salvation. If nobody was baptising anybody. Babies would still be saved so how could it be true to say that water baptism saves? It denies the urgency and importance of water baptism.

A big objection to the view that any baby baptised or not will be saved by the effects that baptism brings if it dies is that it makes the baby's death more important than the state of original sin, the state of being separate from God.

What is worse for the baby in the Christian view? Dying or having original sin? It is having original sin for that is the state of being born estranged from God and not liking him – it might not understand that it doesn't like God but that makes no difference. If God saves a baby just because it dies then why doesn't he save it just because he wants it to like him and to forgive its original sin? Furthermore, death, even in babies, is a punishment for original sin according to the apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Romans in the book God wrote, the Bible. A God then who saves a child because of death and not because the child is in a state of sin without baptism which is a worse state is perfectly capable of rejecting a child that died in original sin. And indeed he should for death is not the worst state and is in fact what the child deserves.

Being created in a state of incompatibility with God or in enmity with God is worse than choosing to reject God in a sense. There is something more degrading in being born bad than in becoming bad. So the doctrine of original sin is a grave insult to the baby.

The Church says that original sin is the state of being hostile to God from the first moment of your existence and this hostility is inherited from Adam who rebelled against God. So then the baby that is baptised doesn't want to be baptised or

healed of this sin for it doesn't like God. Baptism is clearly opposed to the choice of the baby, the choice it would make if it could, and religious freedom. What about older people who get baptised? God's grace can work on their minds and hearts to make them want deliverance from their antagonism towards God in baptism. This cannot happen with a baby. It would make more sense if the Church held that babies should not be baptised and that if they die they will grow up and have to make the same choice between Heaven and Hell as the rest of us.

The Church tells people to live in prayerful hope that unbaptised babies may go into Heaven after all. But it is careful to say that this does not suggest the baby will get to Heaven. It is silly to mistake the hope of an unbaptised baby's salvation as amounting to saying there is no Limbo.

A CASE FOR SAYING LIMBO FORBIDS INFANT BAPTISM!

The notion of original sin and needing to get rid of it is what the practice of infant baptism is based on. It is supposedly a remedy.

All agree that the baby will grow up to reject God at least some of the time. So the relationship with God has to be fixed by repentance and forgiveness.

A person who lives up to their conscience well in life but who is not baptised will go to Limbo. That person will still go to Hell if she or he dies unrepentant and unforgiven. But what about the sins? The idea is that without priests to forgive them or clear knowledge of God, God will still be able to get forgiveness to them.

Being unbaptised means sin is not as big of an issue as it is for the baptised.

For the unbaptised, it is more understandable for they are not protected by baptism.

The unbaptised is not trying to reject God who is put into the soul by baptism, by sin. So it will be rare for such a person to commit a mortal sin assuming the Catholic doctrine that some sins are mortal and lead you to Hell is true.

So in a world where most baptised sin seriously and fall away their sin will lead them to Hell more than a corresponding sin by an unbaptised would do, it is better NOT to baptise your baby so that she or he will have happiness in Limbo than to increase the risk of eternal damnation.

Plus if a baby is estranged from God surely it needs to give consent to going to Heaven, Hell or Paradise in Limbo?

FINALLY

A religion that sullies the wonder of having babies with its doctrine is a scandal. A religion that sullies the death of an unbaptised baby by suggesting it will spend eternity without God even if this eternity will be happy is an abomination. A religion that sullies the birth of a child by saying baptism is the safe course and ensures it will go to Heaven if it dies is a disgrace and outrage. People need to start having the right feelings about these things. Baptism is core to Catholicism as a Church and as a system of belief for it is the sacrament of faith and it is entry into the Church structure. That is why such an evil practice such as baptism overrules any good the Church does. If the core is evil the goodness of the system is good in the way cheese in a trap is good to the mouse. Another evil practice is how many Catholics hurt by the doctrine of baptism blame it on bishops and priests and ignore the information they have which says they are only preaching what Jesus preached on the subject.