

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

October 2010

Dear Pro-life supporter,

On August 2, 2010, we received a message from a thirty-two-year-old woman from Kalamazoo, MI. She had just seen our abortion photos and wrote to say: "I used to work at a Planned Parenthood that [performed] abortions. And every day, I had to watch these babies be murdered and then was forced to find the 'pieces' to make sure everything was cleaned out. It made me sick and since then my ideas on abortion have greatly changed!" *Seeing* the horror of abortion changed her mind about abortion and she quit the clinic soon after starting. Thank you so much for helping us change the minds of the countless others to whom we have shown the same horror which changed this woman's mind. Now we need your help showing those images to Christians at churches without whose involvement the pro-life movement has no hope of prevailing. Believers also need to be sickened because they can't be mobilized until they are outraged.

"Passing by on the other side" has been a successful avoidance strategy for many churches because most haven't been forced to pay any obvious price for ignoring the most horrific mass murder in human history. That is about to change. We intend to make indifference to abortion far more costly than pro-life involvement. We must boost the expense of apathy because the cost of involvement can be high indeed.

*The New York Times*, May 16, 2005, made that point in a story headlined "Political Split Leaves a Church Sadder and Grayer." The article reports that "The Rev. Chan Chandler, the young minister who led the congregation ... is gone, having resigned under fire last week and taken his mostly younger followers with him." It turns out that the fire he was under derived from telling the congregation that voting for a pro-abortion political candidate was a sin concerning which guilty members should either "... repent or resign."

That rebuke may sound extreme -- even to pro-life activists -- but didn't God also break fellowship with Old Testament Israelites who thought child sacrifice should be lawful? In Jeremiah 15:1, He says of those who practiced and/or supported baby-killing, "Then the Lord said to me, 'Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people. Send them out of My sight ....'"

Many of today's pagan feminists argue that, from a theological perspective, abortion IS child sacrifice -- of the very sort against which God rails throughout the Books of Isaiah and Jeremiah. See *The Sacrament of Abortion*, Ginette Paris, Spring Publications (1992) which the Amazon.com "Product Description" characterizes as a book which "... has been widely used in abortion clinics ...."

Would Pastor Chandler's challenge have been "over the top" if delivered to church members who voted for candidates supporting slavery in 1850? The preacher who temporarily replaced Pastor Chandler was quoted as saying, "It's time to quit taking sides...." But in so saying, the replacement pastor was "taking the side" of the priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side of the beating victim. We are losing the abortion battle precisely because Christian apathy amounts to "taking sides" in favor of the baby-killers. Pastor Chandler's replacement then added that "The only side that's worth anything is the side of Jesus." But how does indifference to injustice place us on "the side of Jesus"? The article adds that "Members say ... [the fired pastor's] sermons against abortion ... seemed ... to cross a line between morality and politics." Christians should obviously never attempt to codify their religious practices by legislating mandatory

baptism or communion, etc. But where do the Bible or the Constitution prohibit Christians from working to enact laws which reflect Christian values?

This ousted pastor is a genuine Good Samaritan in this story but one of his more confused critics condemned him with the assertion "... that one person cannot judge another." We should, however, be discerning in deciding with whom we should worship. Paul taught that we are to have nothing to do with people who continue to teach false doctrine. Teaching that baby-killing is consistent with the will of God is sin because it is false doctrine. In Matthew 18:17, Jesus commands that when a brother who becomes a sinner "... refuses to listen even to the church, treat him even as you would a pagan or tax collector." Commentators explain that such "treatment" refers to those "whose company ... [Christians] shunned." Scholars say the word describes the church's "power to exclude" – which is precisely what Pastor Chandler threatened in response to unrepentant support for laws permitting baby-killing.

This same critic also falsely claimed that "People try to separate sin, and you can't separate sin." He added that "They're the same, abortion and treating your neighbor like dirt." What? Killing your baby is the same as offending the guy next door? An equation this bizarre is only possible among "believers" who know little about the Bible and nothing about abortion. Of course God hates all sin. But it is profoundly un-Biblical (though a common theological error) to suggest that God hates all sin *equally*. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary, New Testament*, InterVarsity Press (1993) says "Jesus thus regards blasphemy against the Spirit – permanently rejecting his identity (Matthew 12:18) as attested by the Spirit's works (12:28) – as *the worst of sins* [emphasis added]." "Worst" connotes a grading of sin. "Grading" is especially evident as regards the sin of killing children. God said in Jeremiah 19:5, "They have built pagan shrines to Baal, and there they burn their sons as sacrifices to Baal. I have never commanded such a horrible deed; it never even crossed My mind ...." The term "such a horrible deed" is incontrovertible evidence that God does "separate" one sin from another, based on that transgression's relative degree of evil. So must we. It shouldn't be a felony to insult a neighbor but it should be for doctors to kill babies.

This critic's wife also condemned the fired pastor, perhaps understandably, because she admitted that she had voted for a pro-abortion candidate upon discovering that his pro-life opponent supported the war in Iraq and the death penalty. Reasonable believers might differ on issues related to national security and penal policy but never has God licensed baby-killing as a legal right. Child sacrifice invariably provokes God's fiercest wrath and most terrible punishment. Shouldn't we take child slaughter as seriously as God does?

No. At least not according to the pastor featured in another tragic "abortion splits the church" story, this one appearing in *The New York Times*, July 30, 2006. Headlined "Disowning Conservative Politics, Evangelical Pastor Rattles Flock," the article described a massive church split forced by Minnesota Pastor Gregory Boyd's *refusal* to preach on abortion. The article should actually have been headlined "Embracing Liberal Politics, Apostate Pastor Betrays Flock." This Reverend shocked many members of his congregation by announcing that "... the church should ... give up moralizing on sexual issues." He declined to say whether Planned Parenthood should reciprocate by "giving up" their blood-thirsty slaughter of preborn children.

He did, however, try hard to make his treachery sound profound. But he couldn't quite pull it off. He groped for inspiring spiritual corollaries but could manage only lame *non sequiturs*. Pastor Boyd declared, for instance, that "When the church wins the culture wars, it inevitably loses." Loses what, its complicity in genocide? Former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass wrote a withering essay on this very point in 1852, titled "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?" His condemnation of the church's refusal to fight what Rev. Boyd condescendingly calls "the culture wars" (TeachingAmericanHistory.org) charged that "The American church is guilty, when viewed in connection with what it is doing to uphold slavery; but it is superlatively guilty when viewed in connection with its ability to abolish slavery." The same could be said of the power to abolish abortion, which God has given the hard-hearted Pastor Boyd and every other pastor.

Pastor Boyd then opined that when the church "... conquers the world, it becomes the world." This quip is another head-scratcher. What could be more worldly than Pastor Boyd's transparent attempt to curry favor with the pro-abortion *New York Times*? He might do well to heed the warning in James 4:4, that "Anyone who chooses to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God." On April 16, 1963, Martin Luther King, in his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," called out pastors just as uncaring as Rev. Boyd, whose churches stood idly by while African Americans were beaten to their knees for trying to register to vote. "What kind of people worship here?" he asked. "Who is their God? Where were their voices ...?" Where is Pastor Boyd's voice while the sewers of Minneapolis run red with the blood of Minnesota's children? Wasn't the church's refusal to take sides on civil rights legislation essentially a decision to take the side of the racists who were oppressing the black people this legislation was introduced to protect? In the cause of social justice, a refusal to defend the oppressed is not neutrality. It is the facilitation of oppression, whether the victim is black or preborn or both.

Pastor Boyd also intimates that he cringes when clergy express overtly patriotic gratitude for the military men and women whom God has given us to protect the miracle which is America. But I can find no scriptural indication that Jesus shares his embarrassment. He tells the *Times*, "When you put your trust in the sword, you lose the cross." That is a classic red herring. Taking up the sword doesn't require that we trust it in any spiritual sense. During my thirty-one-year military career I was stationed with countless Christian servicemen and women and I cannot recall a single believer who "put their trust in the sword" instead of the Lord. Pastor Boyd is an appeasing pacifist whose reluctance to defend our children reflects an even darker reluctance to protect our country. He is embarrassed by the militant Jesus, who in Luke 22:36 commanded His disciples "... if you don't have a sword ... buy one." When they replied in verse 38 that "... we have two swords," He said, "That is enough." And in Matthew 26:51, one of the disciples used one of those swords to prevent Jesus' arrest. This disciple had no reservations about carrying a sword in the presence of our Lord. Jesus told him to put it away. He didn't tell him to never carry it again.

Thankfully, in response to all this nonsense, 1000 members of Pastor Boyd's 5000-member congregation had the good sense to leave. Please join me in praying for the souls of the 4000 who stayed. As a consequence of this split, only \$4 million of his \$7 million building fund goal was met and seven of his fifty staff members had to be laid off. Adding to the fallout, "... 20 volunteers who had been the backbone of the church's Sunday school" also quit. But Rev. Boyd remained defiant. "Mr. Boyd now says of the upheaval: 'I don't regret any aspect of it at all. It was a defining moment for us.'" Abortion *is* a "defining moment" for the church but shamefully so. Then he said, "We let go of something we were never called to be." The priest and the Levite in the Parable of the Good Samaritan would have argued that they weren't called to rescue beating victims. Pastor Boyd concluded, "We just didn't know the price we were going to pay for doing it." That price he didn't know will include terrible bloodshed that could have been avoided.

On August 20, 2010, we received a message from a thirty-nine-year-old woman from Cleveland, OH. She had just seen our abortion photos and wrote to say, "I am a mother that was lied to. My baby is gone and I have the rest of my life to mourn the loss of my child and my 'choice.'" This is the invisible price which will be paid for Pastor Boyd's politically correct conceit.

The *Times* article says "He refuses to share his party affiliation ..." but it comes as no surprise that he parrots a thoroughly left-wing narrative in saying good riddance to pro-lifers he demeans culturally and stereotypes racially: "In the end, those who left tended to be white, middle-class suburbanites, church staff members said. In their place, the church has added more members who live in the surrounding community — African-Americans, Hispanics and Hmong immigrants from Laos." Then more defiance: "This suits Mr. Boyd. His vision for his church is an ethnically and economically diverse congregation that exemplifies Jesus' teachings by its members' actions." But which of "Jesus' teachings" is "exemplified" by turning your back on imperiled children? Perhaps it can be found in Matthew 25:45, in which Jesus warns "... I tell you the truth, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me." No matter how

fashionable, pandering to *The New York Times* with racial quota posturing is probably too self-serving to qualify as something done “for the least of these.”

In his book *Founding Brothers*, Random House (2000), Joseph Ellis reminds us that it was Christians (Quakers) who, as an explicit expression of their faith, first forced Congress to debate the abolition of the slave trade in 1790. Congressmen from slaveholding states were furious. They were insistent that the word “slavery” literally never be uttered in public debate. They themselves often referred to slaves only cryptically, as “this species of property.” This reluctance to allow the word “slavery” to even be spoken betrayed the insecurity which inevitably afflicts defenders of indefensible evil. Their only hope is to avoid any debate whatsoever. When finally cornered, they retreat behind abstract, procedural arguments in favor of the right to engage in evil, instead of attempting to justify that evil as a concrete, substantive reality.

Early slave traders were kindred spirits with today’s pro-aborts. They were far more likely to offer “who should decide” kinds of arguments (“States’ Rights”) instead of rationalizing specifically what it was they wished to decide. That strategy worked best when the ugly details of slavery could be kept vague. This is why Southern congressmen in 1790 demanded the gallery be cleared of visitors and the press be banned from the chamber before the abolition resolutions be read. But it hardly mattered. The Quakers lost. And because most of the rest of America’s churches were led by Pharisees as hard-hearted as Pastor Boyd, they would continue to lose until President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamations in 1862 and 1863 and the Thirteenth Amendment was enacted in 1865.

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.’”

Like slave traders, advocates of abortion also go to extremes to stifle debates on abortion, to which they refer only as “choice.” When forced to defend their position, they demand the “right to choose” and attempt to silence any consideration of what is being chosen. The few times I have ever been able to find pro-aborts who would debate abortion, they almost invariably conditioned their participation on my assurance that I would use no abortion pictures. This is why we invented the Genocide Awareness Project. Our huge, outdoor photo displays were the best way to get the pictures out of the auditoriums we used during poorly-attended debates and onto the sidewalks of the most heavily trafficked areas on campus. There we could force the debate which professors try to stifle and we can make the pictures the central issue. To this day, pro-aborts try to cover up the photos on almost every campus we visit. We threaten lawsuits to solve the problem and thanks to your faithful support, those threats are not hollow. Pro-lifers debate whether pictures work but the pro-aborts don’t. I can’t thank you enough! Please redouble your efforts and we will too.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregg Cunningham', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Gregg Cunningham  
Executive Director