

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

June 2014

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

During our recent Genocide Awareness Project (GAP) visit to the University of California, Riverside, a Christian student named Shavonda told us that after praying about our aborted baby photo signs, God told her she was wrong to be “pro-choice.” Why didn’t her pastor tell her that? See her testimony at [abortionNO.org](http://www.abortionNO.org) (and on YouTube at <http://youtu.be/fQdZf9g4rB4>).

Abbie Crist, a top-tier attorney and an invaluable member of our Board of Directors here at the Center For Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR), shares our frustration over the irresolution many pastors exhibit regarding abortion. She worships at Lake Avenue Congregational Church in the Pasadena, CA, area and she recently wrote an abortion-related article for one of her church’s publications. The essay was to be used in connection with a crisis pregnancy event, but the church’s leadership decided the article was too controversial because Abbie explicitly expressed disapproval of abortion. My wife Lois worshipped and volunteered at this church before we were married (married, by the way, in this same church) so we were doubly shocked when the leadership also recently trashed voter guides which a pro-life activist was trying to distribute to educate church-goers on candidates’ positions concerning issues such as abortion. Notwithstanding the fact that such voter guides are perfectly lawful for churches to disseminate, Lake Avenue unreasonably feared the loss of their precious tax exempt status. Planned Parenthood and the Satan they serve were thrilled by Lake Avenue’s cowardice. How can it be that America’s Christian colleges and seminaries are giving us such weak pastoral leaders? It starts with weak curricula, taught by weak faculties.

Christ gave us the Parable of the Good Samaritan as an ideal example of the risks we should take and the sacrifices we should make to mitigate injustice and human suffering. But when lots of churches and Christian colleges and seminaries became businesses rather than ministries, many pastors and administrators became corporate CEOs. Commitments to justice and mercy were eroded by concern for profit and loss. Anti-abortion activism is bad for business, so women and children are sacrificed to the tender mercies of the abortion industry. Planned Parenthood despises the term “abortion industry,” but in recent court filings pro-aborts have been forced to acknowledge that killing babies is big business. Northland Family Planning Centers, for instance, conceded in *Northland v. CBR* that our parody of their abortion sales video had hurt their business. In another prominent case, the National Organization for Women (NOW) argued before the U.S. Supreme Court in *NOW v. Scheidler* that our good friend Joe Scheidler’s abortion photo signs outside abortion clinics interfered with interstate commerce. That is a clear admission that an abortion clinic is a commercial enterprise. *National Review*, June 2, 2014, opined that “NOW was probably right that he discouraged business.” Christian pastors and college administrators share the same commercial concerns when attempting to ban abortion photo signs. And abortion isn’t the only issue over which churches are abandoning their principles.

The *Los Angeles Times* reported a story headlined “Church’s vote on Israel draws strong reactions” on June 22, 2014. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) divested its stock holdings in Caterpillar, Hewlett-Packard, and Motorola, because these corporations help facilitate Israeli policy regarding lands whose ownership is disputed by the Palestinians. Genesis 12:3 warns regarding Israel that “... I will bless those who bless you

and those who curse you I will curse.” But so what? Several years ago I attended a PC(USA) General Assembly which featured a prominent Princeton Seminary professor who blandly intoned that “The writings of Matthew, Mark and Luke are no more authoritative than the writings of Tom, Dick and Harry.” When Princeton teaches students that Scripture doesn’t matter much because it is the speculation of man and not the revelation of God, the impact on the churches its graduates will pastor is devastating. No less disastrous is the outcome when evangelical schools such as Biola and Liberty teach future pastors that abortion doesn’t matter much because it’s someone else’s responsibility. Presbyterian clergy curse Israel and evangelical clergy ignore child sacrifice. Newsmax.com, May 27, 2014, posted an article titled “Ted Cruz: Palestinians must recognize Israel’s right to exist.” It quotes the U.S. Senator observing that Palestinians “... have refused to recognize Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state and have refused to renounce terror” He adds that Hamas, the terrorist organization with which the Palestinian Authority is forming a coalition government, “is openly committed to Israel’s destruction”

The PC(USA) has also sanctioned same-sex marriage, and its position on abortion is so extreme that it also voted down a motion to urge protections for late-term babies born alive as a consequence of Gosnell-type botched abortions. What Christian colleges and seminaries teach -- and don’t teach -- helps determine whether the church remains devoted to the tenets of a truly Biblical faith, or drifts into apostasy -- or even heresy.

In the 1980s, my wife Lois, CBR’s Director of Crisis Pregnancy Outreach, was a nursing student at Biola University. Biola is the Christian college which recently threatened to arrest nursing student Diana Jimenez for publicly displaying a CBR abortion photo sign which ultimately dissuaded a Biola student from killing her baby. The resulting controversy forced the university to revise its restrictive expressive rights policies and permit students to show abortion signs in an area adjacent to a well-traveled pedestrian thoroughfare. This fall we will test the new regulation to confirm that the university has, indeed, created a meaningful new right, or only appears to have done so.

Lois’ sociology professor at Biola was Dr. George Nishida. On September 27, 1985, the university newspaper quoted pro-abortion comments made by Dr. Nishida at a campus forum. The article bore the shocking (at least at a Christian college) headline “I Am Pro-Choice ... But I Am Also Pro-life.” The story quoted Dr Nishida declaring that “My personal philosophy is, and always has been, pro-choice.” He added, “There was a law passed in 1973 that allows a person to make a choice. It gives the woman the ability to choose whether she wants [abortion] or not. It is a conscience matter -- a morality matter and I go along with pro-choice. I know it’s unpopular here [at Biola]. I’m probably the only one around here that’s going to stand up and say this.” Then he added somewhat cryptically, “I don’t like to deal with abortions, but by the same token, being a pro-choice person, I have to allow whoever the opportunity to go for an abortion on demand” By this he meant, as he casually explained to my horrified wife outside of class, that he had been driving Biola students to an abortion clinic -- where they could get what he called “safe” abortions. And parents send their daughters to Biola to get safe educations.

In Dr. Nishida’s obituary at memorialwebcasts.com, his son states that he died in 2010, but he also notes that Dr. Nishida “... retired [from Biola] in 1997 and was appointed emeritus professor.” Conferring the honor of emeritus recognition is a congratulatory act which permits a retired faculty member to retain his full rank and title. In an article appearing in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 7, 2011, titled “Emeritus Status: It’s a Matter of Honor, Especially When It’s Denied,” Perry J. Brown, provost and vice president for academic affairs at the University of Montana, explained that “It’s meant to honor faculty who have been really outstanding citizens within the university and contributed to our community in a variety of significant ways” Does Biola really believe that a supposedly Christian professor contributes significantly to the university community by driving pregnant students to an abortion clinic? Why would Biola, a Christian school, honor a faculty member who supported the right to butcher a baby? This was not quiet support. It was not merely a discreet matter of personal conviction. It was an in-your-face

declaration, at a university forum, and in the university newspaper. It reinforced the moral confusion of students who were already morally confused regarding abortion.

How does it not trivialize child killing when a senior faculty member, a department head, makes a public mockery of everything the university claims to believe about abortion? How was this man not a dangerous predator, who was preying upon impressionable young women? Did he not betray the trust of parents who sent their daughters to Biola, secure in the mistaken belief that the faculty would be protective of their well-being? How many of these young girls might have rejected abortion had this “man of God,” this academic authority figure, not openly identified himself as “pro-choice” and then given them permission to kill their babies -- by personally conveying them to Planned Parenthood? And he justified this betrayal by arguing the premise that there is such a thing as a “safe” abortion.

On a related subject, a dismaying essay titled “Female Circumcision: The Ethics of Harm Reduction Policies,” Rachel Ruderman, in *The Michigan Journal of Public Affairs* – Volume 10, Spring 2013, defends female genital mutilation using the same kinds of misogynistic rationalizations used to justify abortion by Dr. Nishida and Planned Parenthood. “This paper argues for acceptance of a harm reduction policy, which centers on the promotion of medicalized and safe symbolic female circumcision to fulfill cultural norms while promoting the health of women and girls worldwide.” The author defends “the viability of female circumcision as an intermediate step towards eventual eradication of FGM” [female genital mutilation, the pejorative term for the euphemism “female circumcision”]. This classic “lesser-of-two-evils” position is reminiscent of the “reasoning” of those who defend “safe, legal abortions.” The latter, however, don’t pretend to believe abortion is evil and they certainly don’t intend to ban it.

To Ms. Ruderman’s dismay, the Western World’s condemnation of this barbaric practice is universal and unqualified. She nonetheless maintains that because “Western advocacy groups and non-governmental organizations, though well intentioned,” are “without cultural sensitivity and knowledge of the deeply engrained nature of this issue, their policies may actually serve to undermine women in these communities.” But atrocities are wrong in any culture. Ms. Ruderman goes so far as to actually claim that “when countries have attempted to ban or limit FGM their initiatives have repeatedly backfired.” In a claim familiar to those of us who battle global pro-abortion activists, she cites examples of genital mutilation bans following which “... support for the practice remained high, and because of the ban ‘most incidents happen in secret, sometimes unhygienic, back-street operating rooms – creating a big risk of infection.’” That is precisely the lie Dr. Nishida and Planned Parenthood have used to argue that banning abortion hurts women.

That George Nishida could have publicly expressed these kinds of scandalous assertions without touching off a scandal at Biola offers evidence that abortion has never caused much outrage at the school. Most students and faculty oppose it at some level, but nothing in any Biola curriculum teaches that stopping abortion is a primary responsibility of the church. And students who take abortion more seriously are taught little or nothing which might prepare them to mobilize the church against abortion. With your help, we hope to change that.

Curricular reform is unlikely to occur in the absence of student-led campaigns which demand new pro-life ministry majors. There will be no impetus for such campaigns if students are never confronted with the horror of abortion. If it remains an abstraction, they will never perceive it to be child-sacrifice of the sort against which God rages in the Old Testament. That is why the right to display abortion photos at Christian colleges is so vital. Yet such displays are resisted almost everywhere -- including Liberty University.

At lc.org, the website operated by Liberty Counsel, an expressive rights legal services organization, founder Matt Staver, the Dean of Liberty University Law School, ironically declares that “Students on public school campuses [Liberty is private] enjoy constitutional protection of free speech, including religious speech [Liberty students are denied speech freedoms]. Student speech can be prohibited only when the speech

activities ‘substantially interfere with the work of the school, or impinge upon the rights of other students [the *Tinker* case].’” At Liberty, however, student speech can be prohibited merely because it is likely to annoy someone. While Dean Staver, whom we like and respect, fights for freedom of expression for public school students, his university denies those same rights to their private school students. Elsewhere on his website he says “Liberty Counsel will be the friend of schools that recognize the free speech rights of students and the foe of those that violate their constitutional rights.” Yet Liberty refuses to recognize the free speech rights of its own students when they try to expose the horror of abortion. Thank you for helping us change that misguided policy at nearly every Christian college in the country.

At Biola, the pro-life student group we are helping start and advise will be urged to launch its drive for curricular reform by displaying abortion photos and circulating petitions urging the university to posthumously revoke George Nishida’s emeritus status. Can Biola credibly claim to be serious about abortion while honoring faculty members who provide students with limo service between campus and Planned Parenthood? Can Biola credibly claim to be serious about abortion without offering majors which train pro-life professionals to fight child sacrifice?

Dr. Nishida’s obituary at memorialwebcasts.com says “In retirement he and Mom enjoyed visiting their children and grandchildren.” It adds that “He was very proud of his grandchildren” One wonders if Biola is proud of Dr. Nishida for robbing Biola students and their parents of the children and grandchildren whom he abused his position of trust to help kill. If not, now is the time to make amends to all those Dr. Nishida betrayed. Take away the honor he never deserved and issue a public apology to all those victimized by Dr. Nishida’s treachery and Biola’s supervisory negligence.

June 23, 2014, the *Los Angeles Times* published a front-page story headlined, “Latino leaders target laws that left scars,” with a sub-headline which said, “Newly empowered, lawmakers revisit the hard lines imposed on [illegal] immigrants by state voters in the 1990’s.” The story quotes a UCLA Medical School professor who believes that “... just as the state has apologized for other blemishes in its history, such as the internment of Japanese Americans [such as Dr. Nishida’s Japanese American contemporaries] during World War II, so too it should acknowledge the pain felt by Latinos because of Proposition 187. ‘This is one way to try to address and repair the past.’” Aside from the fact that it is absurd to compare the injustice of confining Japanese Americans, without due process of law, with the justice of telling illegal aliens they may not force their way across our border to collect welfare benefits, if California owed the Japanese community an apology for stealing their freedom, Biola must certainly owe its alumni and their parents an apology for George Nishida stealing their children and grandchildren.

Lord bless,

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

Gregg Cunningham
Executive Director

P.S. CBR needs you to help us fund new staff who will work to launch and mentor serious pro-life student groups on Christian college and seminary campuses. Please become a regular monthly donor, and if you already are, please pray about increasing your amount. Better Christian schools mean better Christian leaders and a mobilized church.