

Current Issues

How Far Ought We To Go? What about Operation Rescue?

By Pastor Jeff Meyers

About six years ago I attended a planning meeting for a “rescue” that was to be held in a major city in Alabama. The plan was to block the entrance of a local abortion mill through “non-violent” law-breaking (trespassing) and thereby to save babies; and, when arrested, by refusing to provide the authorities with our real identities, to clog up the justice system. I had every intention of participating in and promoting it. Some of my best friends in seminary had spent time in jail for their bold protests and attempts to block abortion chambers. I wondered if it wasn’t time for me to take a stand. I was (and am) unequivocally anti-abortion. Abortion is murder, pure and simple. Operation Rescue was perceived at that time to be the vanguard of pro-life activism, so I was drawn to it quite inevitably. Nevertheless, what I had not yet done before attending that rescue planning meeting, was to *think* about the philosophy and tactics of rescues. The discussion at the planning meeting forced me to evaluate Operation Rescue. At that time I wrote an open letter to friends and fellow ministers in the Presbyterian church (November, 1988) stating my reservations about the movement.

I revised and reprinted my earlier essay in 1992 after the Republican National convention in Houston, Texas. The question of the legitimacy of rescues was forced upon thinking Christians all over the country when the media devoted an inordinate amount of air time during that convention to the controversy over abortion, especially the radical protests of the pro-life organization Operation Rescue in Houston. The rhetoric and tactics of Operation Rescue and other such organizations seemed to escalate to new levels of radicalism. Both the national and local news programs provided us with images of screaming pro-life protesters, limp Christians being carried away by the police, and Operation Rescue leaders tearing up court injunctions.

I offer my evaluation once again at the close of 1994, six years later, with only a few modifications. The tactics have escalated once again. I am convinced that the mentality that gave birth to rescues has now spawned the escalation of anti-abortion tactics into the realm of violence and even execution. The T.V. news shows us the self-righteous, smiling face of Paul Hill standing before a judge, charged with the first-degree murder of an abortionist in Pensacola, Florida. He will most likely be sentenced to the electric chair. Seven years ago I “predicted” that this would happen. Even though Operation Rescue repudiates what Paul Hill has done, nevertheless, considering their ideology, it’s difficult to understand what substantial differences there are between them. If saving babies is the ultimate value (as the Operation Rescue rhetoric proclaims), then everything else is relative, including the lives of abortionists. I am convinced that many Christians involved in Operation Rescue are sincere and devoted Christians whose motivations are praiseworthy. This obvious fact, however,

does not exempt us from the duty of evaluating the movement from a biblical-theological perspective. This is what I have sought to do.

Originally, my essay dealt specifically with Operation Rescue since they were virtually the only national organization dedicated to radical measures. The pro-life organizational landscape has changed somewhat since then. Now there are a host of other organizations similar to Operation Rescue, some advocating even more radical measures. My comments should be applied to all such groups who are devoted to unlawful, fanatical, even violent methods in order to stop abortion.

Because of the biblical principle “whatever is not from faith is sin” (ROM. 14:23), I cannot participate in a rescue. I may be wrong, but I believe that such an avenue of action is not Biblical or prudent, Proverbs 24 notwithstanding. In order to help you think through the theological and practical questions relating to the current rescue rage, I am offering my thoughts on the subject. These are the reasons why I cannot in good conscience participate in a rescue or support violent or deadly measures as a means of stopping abortion.

Let me assure you that I am not waffling on the abortion question. I am just as hard-nosed as ever. I believe that abortion is a foul, unprovoked, premeditated murder. I also believe that the maximum penalty for abortion ought to be the death penalty (Gen. 9:6; Ex. 21:23-25; Rom. 13:3,4). Pro-lifers don’t ever seem to think through this issue. The death penalty for such wanton destruction of innocent life is eminently biblical.

I believe that Christians ought to do anything and everything *lawful* to put a halt to abortion and rescue the unborn, including preaching, teaching, picketing, marching, lobbying, and much more. I even believe that violent, deadly force ought to be used to stop abortion. Yes, I really did say *deadly force*. Pay attention to what I am about to say. This power, however, does not belong to private citizens or organizations. I think it would be lawful and just for lower courts and local governments to bring this kind of power to bear upon the situation. The civil government has been given the power of the sword to “terrorize” evildoers (Rom. 13:3, 4), such as those who murder unborn babies for profit. But I don’t believe that *anarchistic* and *individualistic* measures such as rescues, firebombings, or murdering abortionists will help restore God’s order in society. Let me try to explain my position. There are a number of reasons why I don’t think rescues are biblical or prudent.

Patient Faith

First, the *impatience* of many pro-life activists is not a valid motivation for excessive and dramatic behavior. I can sympathize with their disappointment. The statistics are mind-

numbing. Millions and millions and millions of unborn babies killed since 1973. But their frustration with the progress of the pro-life movement, their impatience and desire for results does not justify the use of more and more radical means to attain the goal of stopping abortions. This kind of frustration and impatience is growing. There is an increasing and unhealthy thirst for *immediate* results among pro-life activists. The reasoning is that since we don't see results *now*, then something must be wrong, something more must be done, something that will give us immediate, visible results.

This is a symptom of the modern mentality of immediate gratification, which has overturned God's ideal of patient, persevering faith. We may have to wait generations for our culture to change. We are called to "dig in" and continue to use the God-ordained methods (preaching, teaching, evangelism, prayer, etc.) and wait for God's timing. As individuals who do not hold public office, we are *not* called to take

I believe that an abortion is a foul, unprovoked murder. I also believe that death ought to be the maximum civil penalty for doctors who perform abortions (Gen. 9:6; Ex. 21:23-25).

matters into our own hands. Because of the sensationalism of popular Christianity and the excessively dramatic and flamboyant texture of modern American Christianity in particular, *we have a major problem understanding and exercising patient faith*. It's too dull. We think only of the here and now, only of this generation and the accomplishments that we can "see." The Bible has a lot to say about patience and waiting. I would suggest Jim Jordan's excellent article, "Rebellion, Tyranny, and Dominion in the Book of Genesis" in *Christianity and Civilization 3: The Tactics of Christian Resistance*, Gary North, ed. (Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School Press, 1983), pages 38-80. It was Adam's ungrateful impatience which was at the root of his disobedience to God.

Political Solutions

Second, rescues may save a few lives, but *they will not restore God's order in our society*. In fact, even if they are "successful" and civil magistrates do respond, *Christians will have been trained to lean upon civil and political measures to effect change in society*. This may have disastrous effects. Consider the civil rights movement of the 50's, which many "rescuers" have used as a *positive* example of what can happen when people use non-violent civil disobedience to obtain justice. Randal Terry's pamphlet "Higher Laws" does not help here. If anything, Terry's comments helped to solidify my *opposition* to the rescue movement. He cites the anti-slavery and civil rights movements as justification for

rescues in his pamphlet. Now the civil rights movement may have had some limited, immediate results in terms of civil law, but *the long term effect* on American blacks has been anything but helpful. The civil rights movement taught many American blacks to depend on political action for status and success. It taught them that politics was where it was at. Many learned their lesson well and became unnecessarily dependent upon the government. Thomas Sowell (I hope you're familiar with his works) has been lamenting the "lessons" that many of his fellow blacks learned from the civil rights movement for some time (see any of his books on this subject). George Gilder, in *Wealth and Poverty*, traced many of the present troubles in the black community back to the mentality they "learned" from the civil rights movement.

I think the parallels are obvious and ominous. I fear the same problems for evangelicals in our present situation. Reformed Christians know better than to think that political action is the answer to our problems. *The real action is not in the political arena!* Our main problem in America is not political but *religious*. We cannot use the humanists' strategies and methods, simply because they seem to give results, and then hope that God will bless our efforts. This is revolutionary, not reformational. It is following the lead of "liberation theology," not reformation theology. It is a very big mistake. It is one of the central philosophical/theological mistakes made by Randal Terry and Operation Rescue.

Political action falls in the "little help" category. This is Daniel's prophetic evaluation of the Maccabean political revolt in Daniel 11:34, 35. History does not move in terms of political action. This is a modern fallacy. More accurately, this is a *pagan* fallacy for which modern culture has fallen. Ancient pagan cultures, like modern states, were primarily interested in *power*. The maintenance of force and the seizure of money are of primary interest to the state today. If we think these are the most important things, then we are thinking like pagans. If we really think that political action—"social upheaval" as Terry puts it in his pamphlet—will transform society and make it a righteous society, then we are thinking like pagans. This is the number one problem with the conservative right-wing as well as the liberal left: they both believe that politics and political action will effect positive, lasting change in our culture. They have swallowed and digested the pagan world-view.

God's order in our society will be restored when He is ready, and when we, his church, are faithful to His law. Abortion is a curse—God's curse—on our ungodly society. Most people fear God's judgment in the future *as a result of* the widespread practice of abortion in our land. This is a mistake. Abortion is the judgment. If this is true, and I think it is inescapable (see Deut 28), then no matter how hard we try to remove the curse, no matter what radical political methods we use to attempt to stay the judgment of abortion, they will all fail. *The root problem* will remain: *America's apostasy*, both ecclesiastically and culturally. That must change first,

then abortion will stop. Besides, practically speaking, we will never be able to persuade the pagans of America to stop sacrificing their children until they convert to Christianity and see the practice for what it really is: a violation of God's law and an attack on his image bearers.

Jeremiah faced a similar problem in his day. Among the Judeans there were armed zealots who intended to stage an armed resistance against the invading Babylonian armies. According to these zealots, the Babylonians were the problem. They needed to be repelled—with deadly force, if necessary. Jeremiah rebuked them. He told them that as long as the church was impenitent, any form of civil rebellion or armed resistance against the invaders would only make things worse. The Babylonian army was a curse sent by God. They would indeed rape and kill and pillage. The only remedy was repentance toward God. By the time of Jeremiah, however, God's patience had worn thin. Jeremiah told them to submit to the Babylonians and wait for God's redemptive judgment (Jer. 27:5-8, 12; 29:7). Would men like Paul Hill be able to submit to such a prophetic oracle? After all, murder is murder and rape is rape; the Babylonians must be stopped, even if it requires deadly force.

The same is true today in America. As long as the church is impenitent, *all attempts to rebel against the state so as to force it to outlaw abortion will fail*. All attempts to end abortion by violence will fail. Abortionists are not the ultimate problem. If America is to be saved from divine judgment and if America is going to stop killing babies, the church must repent first. "Judgment begins in the house of God" (1 Pet. 4:17).

Politics, Politics, and More Politics. . .

This leads me to a third area of disagreement with the Operation Rescue's philosophy. Do we really hope to rid this pagan, secularized country of abortion by political action of any kind? Peter Leithart comments on the frequent appeals to the so-called success of modern political movements by rescuers: "The civil rights movement succeeded because it resonated in the larger culture; the civil rights leaders were 'speaking the same language' as many of those with the power to change the laws. Can we believe that anti-abortion protests will resonate through the culture the way civil rights protests did? The question can be rephrased this way: Is abortion a *contradiction* in the system, or is it a logical outcome of the basic assumptions of the culture? If it is the latter, which I believe it is, the protests are not likely to gain sympathy with those who make and enforce the laws." (Peter Leithart, "Operation Rescue: Pro and Con," *The Biblical Worldview*, a monthly newsletter published by American Vision, Atlanta, GA., Vol. 4, No. 9, p. 8.)

Leithart again highlights the central problem. *The problem is the religious foundations of our society, not the outward practices*. The problem is that our country and rulers have rejected Christ as King and his laws as the only perfect

standard of justice. Until this changes, we are not likely to get any results from radical political action, no matter how dramatic or sensational. Most people in our country are pagans who have no desire to see abortion outlawed. They would rather see *Christianity* outlawed and us thrown to the lions than to give up their child sacrifices. The average citizen waxes eloquent in moral outrage when he hears of radical proliferators who picket abortion clinics, but will not even think twice about sending his pregnant wife to a doctor who dismembers unborn babies with a steel curette on the side for a little extra cash. Such is the nature of our American culture. It needs theological heart surgery, not a political face lift.

Individualism, Anarchy, and Proverbs 24

Then there's the fourth issue: does any *individual* have the right to take the law into his own hands to try to effect change? Notice I did *not* say, "the right of an individual to break the law when he is *commanded* or *required* by the civil authorities to do something which he in good conscience cannot do." An individual, under normal circumstances, does not have the right to break the law *in order to effect some change in society*, no matter how important "the cause" may seem to him.

Let me make this very clear. I'm not against resistance. Nor am I against civil disobedience. Nevertheless, I am against private citizens or organizations claiming the right to rebel *selectively* against the local governments *in order to accomplish some social good*. This is not biblical, notwithstanding Terry's appeal to the Bible. In every biblical instance that Terry refers to in his pamphlet those that disobeyed the civil authorities did so because they were being commanded or required to do something which God's law strictly forbade.

An individual, under *normal circumstances*, does not have the right to break the law *in order to effect some change in society*, no matter how important "the cause" may seem to him.

The midwives were commanded to kill the babies. They had to refuse. Moses parents were commanded to kill their child. They had to disobey. Rahab was personally commanded to reveal the whereabouts of God's spies. She rightfully deceived the soldiers. Daniel was told not to pray. In obedience to God he went on praying. The Magi disobeyed Herod, because he was requiring them to reveal Christ's location. All of these do not prove Randal Terry's point. They only prove that it is right to disobey the civil rulers when they *command* or *require* us to do something that is unbiblical. They do not justify the use of civil disobedience by individuals *to further a cause* (which is the ultimate goal of Operation Rescue).

Mr. Terry, however, seems to think that his cause is biblical just because he quotes Proverbs 24:11 (“Rescue those that are being led away to death”) and then *defines* “rescue” as physically intervening to save a person’s life. Using this logic Terry demands that we have an obligation to intervene *physically* to save everybody that is being innocently put to death. This is very poor exegesis and casuistry. Where did Terry get the idea that “rescue” or “deliver” in Proverbs 24:11 means “physically intervening on behalf of the one in danger”? The word in the original is נָצַר (*nצר*), and a glance at any Hebrew lexicon will reveal that this word may have any number of nuances of meaning depending on the context. It does not, however, *always* refer to physical deliverance. A careful examination will reveal that it very seldom refers to “physically intervening” in another’s behalf.

Operation Rescue's ultimate goal is not rescuing babies, but “social upheaval”. . . . Their official strategy is to *create disorder*, and thereby gain recognition and success for the pro-life cause.

Proverbs 24:11 does not tell us *how* to deliver those being led away to death. Pay attention. The *means* are not identified. It *does* inform us of our general *duty*. Just because Operation Rescue *calls* a sit-in at an abortion clinic a “rescue” does not give them the right to draw a one-to-one application from Prov. 24:11. I agree that we must attempt to rescue babies. I have been doing that for years. I attempt to rescue them by picketing, and many women have read our signs and decided not to abort. We rescued the child! I rescue by preaching. I rescue by evangelism. I rescue by teaching. I rescue by praying. Some rescue by crisis pregnancy work. None of this is “physically intervening,” but it is still “rescuing”!

Proverbs 24 does not tell us *how* to rescue, but it tells us *that* we ought to rescue. We must look to the rest of the Bible to inform us of the godly means of delivering the unborn. After all, if we really want to rescue, if we really want to “physically intervene” to save the children, surely there are more *efficient* ways of physically intervening! Why does Operation Rescue choose such “nice,” “non-violent” ways of physical intervention? Such sure-fire techniques of physical intervention would include such things as poisoning all the doctors who perform abortions, bombing the clinics, kidnapping the girls who attempt to go into the clinics, or even shooting the abortionist in the head with a shot gun. What if

I put together an organization called “Project Rescue,” which was dedicated to kidnapping pregnant girls before they could have abortions and keeping them hidden till they gave birth? This would be “rescuing” wouldn’t it? It’s even “physically intervening.” Can I claim Proverbs 24:11 as justification for this kind of activity? Hardly. What am I trying to say? I am trying to illustrate by means of a *reductio ad absurdum* argument that Operation Rescue’s use of Prov. 24 does not prove that we must physically intervene in order to participate in rescues. And furthermore, if the passage does require physical intervention, then it does not rule out violence and kidnapping! It proves too much. Operation Rescue has not proven from Prov. 24:11 that it is legitimate and biblical to rescue the unborn in the way in which they insist.

Let me say a few more words about Proverbs 24:11. First, this passage is a *proverb*, not a universally binding *commandment*. Every Bible student worth his salt knows that the Proverbs are “occasional” wisdom-sayings and don’t apply to everybody in every situation. The danger every teacher must avoid with the Proverbs is the tendency to “overextend” the proverb in application. For example, Proverbs 26:27 claims that “If a man digs a pit, he will fall into it; if a man rolls a stone, it will roll back on him.” Does this forbid us from digging pits? Does it state a *law*: whenever anyone digs a pit, he will necessarily fall into it? Hardly! It doesn’t apply universally. Even though it is not stated in the text itself, we understand that the proverb applies to certain kinds of pits dug by certain kinds of people for certain specific purposes. To transform it into a law and legislate against digging pits would be ludicrous. I believe that Operation Rescue’s use of Prov. 24:11 is just as inane. The book of Proverbs is wisdom literature, not a list of legal stipulations like Exodus 21-23.

Second, the Proverbs cannot be separated from Christ and the covenantal community. They are not moralistic rules, but Christ-centered wisdom for God’s covenantal community. Psalm 82, the parallel passage to Proverbs 24, establishes that “rescues” have *primary application within the covenant community*. I wonder whether this proverb was meant to imply that every Israelite in the land was obligated to rescue physically all the pagan children sacrificed in the nations surrounding Israel? I doubt it. The primary application was to be made within the covenant community. Remember, the pagans around Israel (and sometimes in their midst) often sacrificed their children. God condemned child sacrifice in the Old Testament (Lev. 18:21 20:2-5, etc.). God’s prophets boldly condemned it; but—and this is the point—the Lord did not ask the Israelites to do rescues in the pagan temples of the surrounding nations. It never happened.

The third observation I’d like to make about Proverbs 24 is that, according to the larger context of the book of Proverbs, the *primary responsibility* for rescuing belongs to the civil rulers, the king and the judges. It is certainly significant the book of Proverbs was written by the king to function as

a manual of conduct for his son. It was designed to help the son learn how to rule. The king's son needed to know these things so that he could succeed his father as a just and prudent ruler. The context of Psalm 82 is similar.

Thus, one biblical way of “rescuing” would be for the “lesser magistrates” or local governments to resist the higher magistrates (the Federal and State courts) out of obedience to the law of God. This is precisely what our founding fathers did. It was not a revolution, like the French Revolution, but a war for independence by the local and lesser magistrates of the American Colonies against the tyranny of King George. I could go into this in more detail, but I won't. For the logic behind my view I would suggest that you review Calvin's *Institutes*, Book 4, Chapter 20. Also, examine the difference between Knox and Calvin on the question of the individual citizen's right to rebel. Calvin opposed Knox's anarchistic methods of resisting evil governments. He successfully demolished Knox's idea that any individual had the right to rebel against the civil rulers. Calvin's political philosophy carried the day in 17th and 18th century England and America. You can begin your study of this subject in Douglas Kelley's excellent book, *The Emergence of Liberty in the Modern World: The Influence of Calvin on Five Governments from the 16th Through the 18th Centuries* (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1992).

Until we declare our rebellion against the powers that be, until the time comes when it is necessary to *declare war* on our Federal government, not until it is necessary to declare our total independence from the USA, until then, we must continue to operate in obedience to its laws *in those areas where we are not being required to break God's laws*. If they decide to force *our* wives to have abortions then that is another story. The Bible is clear in that case, we must not submit. But no one is being forced to abort their children yet.

Revolutionary Goals

Let me return to the question of motives. Now, let's be honest with one another. I have frequently heard rescuers insist that the only (or primary) goal of rescues is to save babies from death. If that is true, why is it necessary to have huge crowds of people? Why then all the hype about crowds and numbers? Why do they give false names when arrested, if not to foul up the local police system in order to get publicity? Why is this being publicized as the best way to *educate* the nation and stop abortion? Honestly. If our goal was just to rescue babies, if that was what was really motivating us, then we would have been doing what the Direct Action League has been doing in St. Louis for years. They don't need all the publicity. They don't need all the media coverage. They don't need big crowds. The general public in St. Louis hardly knew what they were up to. Three or four of them go down to the local clinic every week and keep girls from going in. Then they are put in jail. They get out and do it again. Their motivation is to save babies, not change the world. I am not

defending the Direct Action League, nor do I agree with their tactics, but as far as I can tell from what they do, their motivation, unlike that of Operation Rescue, is singular.

Operations Rescue's strategy is to *create disorder*, and thereby gain recognition for the cause of abortion. Terry's pamphlet climaxes on this note. He advocates “social upheaval” and “tension” in the society. Let's be up front. *The ultimate goals of Operation Rescue is not rescues, but “social upheaval” with a view to political change*. He claims that this is the answer to the abortion problem. Again, I say this is using unbiblical revolutionary tactics. This is the pagan

Operation Rescue has not proven from Prov. 24:11 that it is legitimate and biblical to rescue the unborn by the means which they advocate!

dream of salvation by political action and upheaval. I agree with Leithart again, “Nowhere in Scripture did anyone step outside the law for the purpose of creating disorder and gaining recognition for a cause. . . creating social tension should not be offered as the purpose of a Christian action.” These are, of course, the precise tactics of Marxism and liberation theology. These were the tactics used by the civil rights movement. They were the tactics of the French Revolution. It is the mentality of every Marxist revolutionary in the Third World today. *This is precisely the mentality that we as Christians want to avoid*. It is pagan to the core. It is a Hegelian nightmare. It has no part in the Christian worldview. And I want no part in it.

Once we are locked into this mentality, where will it end? Here is what I “predicted” six years ago. These were my exact words: “I predict the rescues will accomplish nothing for the pro-life movement and the ‘heroes’ of that movement will vanish. If, however, the movement does achieve momentary momentum, limited ‘success,’ and publicity, *the mentality will not disappear*. The leaders of the rescues may disappear. But other leaders will rise up. Something *more* radical must be done, they will say. Something more dramatic. After all they are killing babies in there. It's time for some real action. Rescues didn't work because they weren't radical enough.” This has happened. I ask you, Christian, is that the bandwagon that you want to get on? Not me. I got off years ago.

The Young and the Restless

Let me say something else that may sound mean, but which I think is true. I saw it happen when the theonomy/reconstructionist movement was getting under way in the late

70's and early 80's. There are certain parallels with Operation Rescue that are striking. I have noticed that Operation Rescue, like other activist organizations, tends to attract more than its fair share of single-issue activists—immature Christians who pressure others to get involved in what they think is the ultimate crusade. The same thing happened with theonomy. Many of the leaders in Operation Rescue write off everybody who does not immediately participate as *compromisers*. The same thing happened with theonomy. They are *impatient* with people who want to examine the Bible to see if it indeed does justify the kind of behavior that they are advocating. The same thing happened with theonomy. If you're not "saving babies," they say, you're not *really* pro-life. That kind of stuff. The same thing happened with theonomy. Theonomists claimed that you weren't *really* doing "kingdom work" unless you were involved in reform-

Worst of all, when these movements are not radical enough for them, they move on to something more outrageous. Witness Paul Hill.

ing economics, politics, and Christian education. Now I've learned a lot from my theonomic days and my theonomic brethren, but I don't buy these kinds of tactics. Unfortunately, this kind of thing often happens in these kind of movements—the loudest, most radical people are elevated to leadership. They attract the worst element in Christendom. Worst of all, when these movements are not radical enough for them, they move on to something more outrageous. Witness Paul Hill. Operation Rescue is not for me. I've learned my lesson.

Furthermore, I am not particularly attracted to Operation Rescue's leadership style. The public behavior of their leaders has been disturbing. I was particularly appalled by Randal Terry's "performance" on ABC's *20/20* in October, 1988. Prancing around the "rescue" in Atlanta with a cellular telephone and answering calls by referring to himself as "Maxwell Smart" was immature and foolish. It made the whole affair seem like a big game, a big publicity stunt. I have seen this kind of thing happen over and over again. What does this kind of behavior reveal about the maturity level of the leaders of Operation Rescue? About Terry's fitness for elevation to National leadership? Am I being too harsh? I don't believe so.

Paul Hill is no better. Hill appeared on Phil Donahue

shortly after the first abortionist was murdered in Pensacola in order to defend the execution. The elders of his Presbyterian church admonished him for this, but he refused to listen. He flouted their authority by continuing to defend the execution. Eventually Hill was excommunicated for his stubborn refusal to submit to the wisdom of the officers of Christ's church. This is not the kind of man we are to imitate and follow. According to Paul, we ought to take note of him and avoid him (2 Thess. 3:14). He may be a brother, but he ought not to be a leader.

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, let me remind you that the really radical activities are not political in nature. 2 Cor. 10:3-5 makes this abundantly clear. Paul warns us: "For though we live in the world, we do not wage war as the world does. The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have Divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ. . . . You are looking only on the surface of things."

We need to be reminded that *the really effective means* are not those that the world would point to as effective. The really radical stuff goes on in the church. Our ultimate goals are not political. Our ultimate goal is not a constitutional amendment. We have fallen for the humanistic doctrine of political salvation. Furthermore, we have fallen for the humanistic doctrine of salvation by knowledge and education. We don't believe that multi-media presentations and massive educational programs will cause non-Christians to fight for what is right. That's garbage. We don't believe that the main problem is political or even epistemological. Pagans *know* that abortion is murder (Rom. 1:32); they just refuse to admit it. The problem is not education. We believe that the *main* problem is religious and ethical, internal and not environmental. We believe that the Spirit of God, using *biblical means* such as preaching, worship, evangelism, etc., will effect a revival and reformation in this land. This will happen when the church repents and God sovereignly works in the hearts and minds of men and women in this country. Why not work to cleanse America's worldly evangelical churches! Why not work to restore biblical theology in pulpits in our land! Why not do some real radical stuff—like 40 days of fasting? Or why not whole services dedicated to praying for God's wrath to descend upon the abortionists? Why not prayer? Why not corporate, formal prayer against the abortionists in our country? This is how history moves according to the book of Revelation, not by political action, but in response to the prayers of God's people. In Revelation chapters 6 and 9 particularly, we see the church praying and God responding with judgment and deliverance *in history*. Worship, prayer, apologetics, and evangelism are our primary weapons; they are much more powerful and effective than political and social measures.