

Dear Pastor Colin,

Thanks for all you are doing to defend life. It is an inestimable blessing that Andrew is able to worship with and be supported by your fellowship. I well understand your concerns about the complexities involved in pressing other churches to be a witness against abortion. But if we don't, who will? Here are a few thoughts about disunity in the Body, from a biblical perspective:

In Jeremiah 7:1-7, God commanded his prophet to "Stand in the gate of the Lord's house..." (verse 2) for the purpose of confronting worshippers over the sin of "oppressing the fatherless" and "shedding innocent blood" (verse 6). God's people were committing and permitting child sacrifice and He sent a messenger to confront them about this abdominal atrocity. No child is more "fatherless" than aborted babies. Their blood is innocent and it is being shed in every church. God also commands us to warn His people of the catastrophic consequences of this latter-day idolatry.

Abortion isn't just mass murder. I know you agree that it is child sacrifice. For New Age pagan author Brenda Peterson, the connection between abortion and child sacrifice is indisputable. She was declaring abortion to be the sacrifice of a living human baby to a pagan deity as early as 1993, in a cover story in the September/October issue of *New Age Journal*. Referring to "pagan, Earth-centered goddess religions ..." she describes a "matriarchal time" during which "... the power to give and deny birth belonged to the goddess and to women." She goes on to quote pagan author Ginette Paris in her book *Pagan Meditations*. Peterson says Paris "... describes abortion as an essentially religious act, a sacred sacrifice to Artemis." "One aborts an impossible love," she writes, "not a hatred." The article says that in a later book, *The Sacrament of Abortion*, "Paris explains further that if we saw abortion as a sacred ritual, it would restore to the act a sense of the sanctity of life.... For those sisters who have chosen the 'sacrament' of abortion, we will make sacred the sacrifice." She means "sacred" in a satanic sense but because most Christians have never seen the full horror of abortion, they don't respond to it as either genocide or child sacrifice. If our clergy are not going to start an awakening as to the depth of this evil, to whom should we turn?

Are you arguing that God would rather babies be killed in neighboring churches than that you violate man-made principles of boundary etiquette among pastors? If you shouldn't speak truth in love to other fellowships, whose responsibility is it to correct their error?

Pastor Rick Warren recently warned evangelical pastors that "it's our job to protect our congregations from Satan's greatest weapon – disunity." Ill-advised disunity can certainly be a danger but the idea that it is Satan's "greatest weapon" strains credulity. We can all name influential churches which teach and practice doctrinal error which Satan is using to cause far more destruction than could ever be wrought by disunity. These are exactly the kinds of apostate churches Paul spent his entire ministry trying to reform. He was struggling to establish the very definition of Christianity – a struggle which continues to this day and won't be fully resolved until

Christ's return. He used a combination of threats and promises which created divisions and forced people to take sides. It is important to bear in mind that, despite his having planted these churches, he was neither a member nor a leader in their fellowships and his authority to even express these accusations was in dispute. Paul was even forced to defend his contention that he was a true apostle (Galatians 1:11, 2, Corinthians 11:12).

In 2 Cor. 7:8, Paul says of his decision to confront the church at Corinth, "Even if I caused you sorrow by my letter, I do not regret it." In the next verse he says "... now I am happy ... because your sorrow led you to repentance." He threatens "some people who think that we live by the standards of the world" in 2 Cor. 10:2, with the warning that he hopes he doesn't have to be "bold" with them when he returns to their church. In 2 Cor. 11:12-13 he threatens to "cut the ground out from under" those he terms "false apostles" and "deceitful workmen." Verse 15 quotes him predicting darkly that "Their end will be what their actions deserve." In 2 Cor. 13:2, he is equally divisive with a warning that "on my return I will not spare those who have sinned ...." He was just as contentious in Philemon 1:8, when he reminded wavering Christians that "because of the authority Christ has given me, I could order you to do what you should do ...."

Instead of ignoring the heterodoxy of the church in Galatia, he expressed "astonishment" that so many were so quickly "deserting" their Savior and in verse 9, he "condemned" those who were teaching false doctrine. In Ephesians 4:17, he criticized those who were "living as the gentiles do" and lest they mistakenly take his stern correction as an optional suggestion, he added that he "insisted on it in the Lord ...." In Philippians 3:2, he put the church on notice of the dangers of men who were doing evil (which commentators suggest involved the teaching of false doctrine) and he called them "dogs." In Galatians 1:9 he called for the "eternal condemnation" of men such as these. In Galatians 2:4, he refers to "false brothers who infiltrated our ranks to spy ...." In verse 11 he says "When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong." These were "negative words" which probably hurt others."

Instead of accepting error in the interest of harmony, he also cautioned the church in Colossians 2:4, that they should not be "deceived by fine sounding arguments ..." and to impress upon them the gravity of their situation, he warns them in verse 6 that "the wrath of God is coming." He was involved in a power struggle in Thessalonians 1:2, with men who had sent the church counterfeit letters contradicting Paul's teachings. In chapter 2, verse 3, he commands the church to keep away from anyone who "does not live according to the teaching you received from us." In 1 Timothy 1:3, he can't get to a church which has come under the influence of several of Paul's critics so he sent Timothy whom he directs to "command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer...." In 1 Timothy 4:1-2, he denounces teachers of false doctrine as "hypocritical liars." In 2 Timothy 4:14, he personalizes his battle with a doctrinal rival by naming his name and in 2 Timothy 2:17, he goes further and names the names of several who were challenging his theology.

Acts 15:41, says Paul's purpose in all this "troublemaking" was "strengthening the churches." This disunity didn't weaken the churches, it "strengthened" them! It may be tempting to distinguish Paul's authority from our own in an effort to dismiss his example as irrelevant to our own rights and responsibilities. But that won't work. Paul himself exhorts us to "pattern after me, follow my example, as I imitate and follow Christ, the Messiah." And what was Christ's example as regards unity?

Christ Himself warned us in Luke 12:50-53, that we should not "...think I came to bring peace on earth." Then He explains "No I tell you, but division." Did he only come to divide believers from unbelievers? Paul repeatedly divides the church but sees no contradiction in saying his ministry "imitates" Christ's. In John 6:60-66, Jesus emphasized a divisive teaching he knew would "offend" many of his followers and drive them away. He knew true believers would stay and he used this hard truth purge his ranks of those who were not sincere in their faith.

Paul was even more divisive with unbelievers. As an evangelist, he incited riots almost everywhere he preached. Paul was such a "troublemaker" in the Book of Acts that many of his listeners conspired to kill him in Damascus (Acts 9:23), attempted to kill him in Jerusalem (Acts 9:29), ran him out of Antioch (Acts 13:50), threatened his life in Iconium (Acts 14:5), stoned him and left him for dead in Lystra (Acts 14:19), attacked and beat him in Macedonia Acts (16:22), stormed his residence in Thessalonica (Acts 17:5), drove him from Berea (Acts 17:13), dragged him before the authorities in Corinth (Acts 18:12) and attempted to silence him with mob violence in Ephesus (Acts 19:29). Paul also incited two riots in which he was almost killed in Jerusalem, the city in which the Book of Acts ends with a description of plot to assassinate him (Acts 21:30-31, Acts 23:10, 6-7, Acts 23:10, Acts 23:12).

If we can't involve the church in this fight we lose. Without a serious, internal church dialogue on abortion, we will not involve the church. That dialogue is likely to create arguments and division. Church leaders generally hate disunity more than they hate abortion. It is likely, therefore, that there will be no dialogue which is not forced from the outside, making the long avoided issue of abortion unavoidable.

The abortion industry has been shrewd enough to not bother the church. The pro-life movement has been foolish enough to not bother the church. Nothing changes till the church is bothered. With God's help, we are about to bother the church on abortion as it has never been bothered before.

We must use huge abortion photos, displayed from the sidewalks outside churches, to achieve that purpose.

Many genuinely pro-life pastors are reluctant to confront neighboring fellowships from the sidewalks because they don't want to appear to the secular culture to be "Christian crazies." The Apostle Paul, however, seemed so outrageously counter-cultural that he was forced to defend his mental health in Acts 26:25: "I am not insane most excellent Festus." Jesus too was also shocked the sensibilities of secular and sectarian leaders

that He was also accused of being deranged. In John 10:20, critics cast doubt on His sanity: "Many of them said 'He is demon-possessed and raving mad. 'Why listen to Him?'" In Mark 3:21 Jesus' own relatives accused Him of being crazy: "When his family heard about this, they went to take charge of him, for they said, 'He is out of his mind.'"

We know first-hand that these tactics invite persecution. Our CBR group recently spent three days displaying large abortion photo signs outside the Harvest Christian Crusade at Angel Stadium in Anaheim, CA. We were not there to conduct a protest but to express a cry for help. We admire Harvest Church, the event's sponsor, and our presence at their huge evangelistic outreach was generally accepted by the forty to fifty thousand people who attended the event each day. But Harvest Crusade pastors and staff harshly opposed our presence the entire time we were there. One pastor immediately insisted that we stop distributing our pamphlets and warned that our large abortion photo signs would embarrass and discredit the entire church.

The real embarrassment, however, isn't Christians lawfully, politely displaying abortion photos on public property outside Christian gatherings. The real embarrassment is that nearly every church would rather surrender than fight the demonic terror of legal abortion. The real embarrassment is that the Harvest staff fought us harder than they have ever fought abortion. When we explained that we were on public property and had a Biblical responsibility and a constitutional right to be there, they pressured security personnel to threaten us with arrest if we refused to move away from the crowds and withdraw to a distant parking lot. This happened repeatedly. When we tactfully declined to depart, security radioed the police. We informed the police that we would sue the City of Anaheim if we were forced to move. We then appealed to the police supervisor, who finally agreed that we were breaking no laws and could stay where we were.

In a fit of anger, a Harvest staff member later pushed one of our signs out into the street and shoved one of our most gentle volunteers physically away from the crowds. He didn't seem to realize that it was he who was embarrassing the church because he also threatened others of us physically.

Another Harvest pastor complained that our large abortion photo signs would drive unbelievers away from salvation. I reminded him that in Mark 10:17-30 Jesus intentionally drove a rich, young ruler away from salvation by confronting him with the one sin He *knew* would keep him out of the Kingdom. If Jesus was right to insist that this unbeliever deal with the greed which was blocking his path to salvation, are we wrong to urge unbelievers to deal with abortions which may be blocking theirs? Mark 10 teaches that sinners who aren't fully ready to repent aren't fully ready to be saved. Jesus taught that offers of salvation must be preceded by conviction of sin. Should we trick abortion sympathizers into false professions of faith by hiding the fact that Jesus hates baby-killing? Are they advocating fraud as a strategy for evangelism? Do Harvest pastors think their crusade is the only time and place at which seekers will ever be able to hear the Gospel? America is awash in ministries offering

seekers a chance to learn the Truth which can save their souls, but our signs could be a seeker's only chance to learn the truth which can save her baby's life.

When the Guttmacher Institute was still reporting the abortion rate among "born again" Christians, one study found that nearly one in five American abortions were performed on women claiming to be "born again." That same study asserted that professing Catholics were as likely to abort as women in the population at large. Hosea 4:6 warns "... My people are destroyed from lack of knowledge. Because you have rejected knowledge, I also reject you as my priests; because you have ignored the law of your God, I also will ignore your children."

Harvest staff also chided us for tormenting post-abortive women. But we were actually offering post-abortive women a toll-free phone number through which they could arrange confidential post-abortion counseling without charge. Almost half of all abortions are performed on women who have already had one or more previous abortions. Post-abortive women are the women most likely to abort and therefore the women we most need to confront in love. Hiding the full truth from them is an act of cruelty, not an act of compassion. In fact, one post-abortive woman who recently saw our shocking photos told us, "If I had seen this, then I would have never had an abortion." She also said that "Looking at ... [these pictures] has in some way helped me to grieve my loss."

The Harvest staff then criticized us for upsetting children. We had brought parental warning signs to display at the entrances to the Anaheim Stadium parking lot but we never had enough volunteers to use them. It turned out, however, that the vast majority of those attending the crusade were adults. Most of the children who did attend were either too young to notice the signs or old enough to have abortions themselves. In three days I did not see a single child who was visibly distressed. Tragically, in this country, even a pregnant nine-year-old girl can be taken for an abortion by a school nurse who easily finds a pro-abortion judge who will authorize the "procedure" without parental permission or even provide parental notice. CBR thinks students who are old enough to have abortions are also old enough to see abortions. Christians are more open to the truth about abortion than are unbelievers and had our photos not been there, we would have lost our best chance to save many savable preborn children.

The *Orlando Sentinel*, June 12, 2005, in an article headlined "Last Crusade," quoted Pastor Graham's attempt to dodge responsibility on abortion but in so doing, he revealed a shockingly naïveté concerning the willingness of the church to shepherd the flock on this issue: "... I have to leave that [abortion and similar issues] to the younger people' he said." And where does he believe these "younger people" can be found? Pastor Graham says "... after they [converts] come to Christ, they hopefully come to a church where they will learn more about their responsibility to society." But in what church will they have any real chance to learn about abortion? Certainly not in your neighboring churches in Worthing or Brighton or anywhere else England.

ChristianityToday.com, "Jesus and Justice," June 24, 2005, reports that despite Rev. Billy Graham's 1952 decision to never hold another segregated crusade meeting, "[theologian] ... Reinhold Niebuhr ... criticized him for not moving quickly enough" in opposition to racism. In *Time* magazine's "The TIME 100" article, June 14, 1999, Rev. Graham said his "... one regret is that he didn't join the battle for civil rights more forcefully." He said "... I think I made a mistake when I didn't go to Selma' with many clergy who joined the Alabama civil rights march led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. 'I would like to have done more.'"

You are already doing more to stop the killing in your own fellowship and community than any pastor we know. But unless believers from many other churches stand with us, we will never be able to mobilize the resources required to fund and staff truly transformational projects. The ideal way to way to recruit that involvement is with the cooperation of your fellow pastors. But when they reject offers to collaborate, it is vital that we make those same offers directly to believers who worship at their churches. We would rather recruit from the pulpit if we can but we will recruit from the sidewalk if we must.

When we stand on the sidewalk with abortion photos outside a church whose leaders have spurned our overtures, lives are saved. Doesn't that justify, in God's eyes, any resulting consternation? Why is it righteous for us to display these photos where professors are hiding the horror of abortion but erroneous for us to display them where pastors are hiding the horror of abortion?

We are losing this fight because the people who kill babies think big and the people who save babies think small. I implore you to think beyond your own fellowship. Christian women tell us tearfully all the time that had they seen our photos before they killed their babies, they wouldn't have done it. Were I a pastor, I wouldn't want to have to admit to such a woman that I didn't show her the truth because I didn't want to offend her pastor.

A great relationship between pastors of neighboring churches is cold comfort to a dead baby if that relationship fails to produce meaningful collaboration in opposition to abortion. Of course you should send letters and make calls to local pastors in an effort to establish collaborative relationships. Pastors who are serious about fighting will want that sort of relationship and they will never see our signs on their sidewalks. Pastors who aren't serious about fighting abortion don't want that sort of relationship and they have no right to insist that we help them hide the horror of abortion from the believers they have abandoned on this issue. They don't deserve and shouldn't expect months to decide. They have already had decades. Abortion has been legal in England since 1967. Show them a picture. Ask them if that is child sacrifice. Ask them what they plan to do about it. They need to act with us or it is incumbent upon us to respectfully but decisively act on their behalf. While Christian pastors dither and temporize and equivocate, NHS doctors are killing and killing and killing.

Many pastors would say relationships are key to success in pursuing social reform. But that perspective is not consistent with the history of social reform. Of course we prefer

good relationships, but we will seldom have them and if the lack of those relationships is allowed to paralyze us, this battle is over before it begins.

Please bring your church into an outreach to every other Bible-believing church in the UK. If you won't do that, please don't hinder Andrew's efforts to recruit church members to participate as individuals. If you won't do that, please at least remain neutral and don't condemn the project.

Lord bless,

Gregg Cunningham