Should we use violence to fight abortion?

It’s not often that a majority of Americans reach common ground on abortion, but after abortionist George Tiller was gunned down in his church, both sides agreed that killing to end abortion is wrong.

Why do we take that position? And why must non-violent means of fighting abortion prevail?

1. Human beings are special because they are made in God’s image (Genesis 1:26-27). Murder violates the sanctity of human life and transgresses civil and moral law (Ex. 20:13). If, as we say, the unborn child is a human being and abortion is murder, then we cannot condone the murder of anyone. The Bible is clear on this point (Prov. 28:17, 1 Peter 4:15).

2. Those who end human life are accountable to God, and to God-ordained human governments (Genesis 9:5-6, Romans 13:1-7). Governments, which “bear the sword,” may not perfectly punish wrong-doers or protect the innocent, but it’s not up to individuals to take matters into their own hands.

3. According to civil and moral law, deadly force by a private citizen is only justified under certain conditions: if it is the unintended effect of the act of defending oneself or another against an assailant’s unjust attack. The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission’s 1994 *Nashville Declaration of Conscience* compellingly demonstrates how this relates to violence against abortion providers:

   “Private citizens are not allowed to intend to kill another human being and are not allowed to engage in premeditated acts of deadly force in order to accomplish what they intend. In other words, a private citizen can intend to stop, but not to kill, an assailant regardless of the final result. Attacks on abortion doctors fail this test. Furthermore, an act of homicide is unjustifiable if the attacker’s victim could have been adequately defended in any way other than causing the attacker’s death.

   “[T]he killing of an abortion doctor in actuality does not constitute a meaningful defense of unborn life . . . because an abortion doctor is only one of the participants in the act of elective abortion, and not the most important one . . . The killing of an abortion doctor does nothing in itself to diminish a woman’s demand for an abortion . . . As long as abortion is legal . . . we must influence the actions of women who are considering abortion.

   “The overwhelming majority of abortions represent a morally unjustifiable form of killing. It is a unique form of killing, involving several parties. An abortion is undertaken by a physician who performs abortions, at the request of an unborn child’s mother. Often, a woman is pressured by the child’s father to have an abortion. Pressure may also come from family members, friends, and others. Her decision is then permitted by the civil law of the United States. Each participant in this act of unjustifiable killing, including the government of the United States (and ultimately ‘we the people, who are the sovereign of this government and have elected its officials), bears a share of the responsibility.”

The Declaration goes on to describe the various moral responses that the pro-life movement uses to address each facet of the problem:

- Abstinence education programs aim at lessening the demand for abortion by upholding God’s plan for sexuality and the sanctity of marriage.
- Pregnancy care centers and maternity homes offer pregnant women practical support for choosing life for their unborn babies.
- Political involvement to change abortion laws is undertaken at every level: voting, lobbying, campaigning for pro-life candidates, drafting pro-life legislation, communicating with government officials, drafting pro-life party platforms, running for office, initiating boycotts, and so on.
- Sidewalk counselors and picketers gather peacefully near abortion clinics to pray and reach out to abortion providers and their customers.
- Pro-life health care professionals refuse to view abortion as good medicine and instead care for both mother and child. (The numbers of abortion providers are down from a high of nearly 3,000 in 1981 to 895 in 2015. Currently, pro-life doctors are threatened with the prospect of losing the privilege of practicing medicine unless they perform abortions or agree to refer women to doctors who will.)
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Why do we take that position? And why must non-violent means of fighting abortion prevail?

1 Human beings are special because they are made in God’s image (Genesis 1:26-27). Murder violates the sanctity of human life and transgresses civil and moral law (Ex. 20:13). If, as we say, the unborn child is a human being and abortion is murder, then we cannot condone the murder of anyone. The Bible is clear on this point (Prov. 28:17, 1 Peter 4:15).

2 Those who end human life are accountable to God, and to God-ordained human governments (Genesis 9:5-6, Romans 13:1-7). Governments, which “bear the sword,” may not perfectly punish wrong-doers or protect the innocent, but it’s not up to individuals to take matters into their own hands.

3 According to civil and moral law, deadly force by a private citizen is only justified under certain conditions: if it is the unintended effect of the act of defending oneself or another against an assailant’s unjust attack. The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission’s 1994 Nashville Declaration of Conscience compellingly demonstrates how this relates to violence against abortion providers:

“Private citizens are not allowed to intend to kill another human being and are not allowed to engage in premeditated acts of deadly force in order to accomplish what they intend. In other words, a private citizen can intend to stop, but not to kill, an assailant regardless of the final result. Attacks on abortion doctors fail this test. Furthermore, an act of homicide is unjustifiable if the attacker’s victim could have been adequately defended in any way other than causing the attacker’s death.

“[T]he killing of an abortion doctor in actuality does not constitute a meaningful defense of unborn life . . . because an abortion doctor is only one of the participants in the act of elective abortion, and not the most important one . . . The killing of an abortion doctor does nothing in itself to diminish a woman’s demand for an abortion . . . As long as abortion is legal . . . we must influence the actions of women who are considering abortion.

“The overwhelming majority of abortions represent a morally unjustifiable form of killing. It is a unique form of killing, involving several parties. An abortion is undertaken by a physician who performs abortions, at the request of an unborn child’s mother. Often, a woman is pressured by the child’s father to have an abortion. Pressure may also come from family members, friends, and others. Her decision is then permitted by the civil law of the United States. Each participant in this act of unjustifiable killing, including the government of the United States (and ultimately ‘we the people’ who are the sovereign of this government and have elected its officials), bears a share of the responsibility.”

The Declaration goes on to describe the various moral responses that the pro-life movement uses to address each facet of the problem:

- Abstinence education programs aim at lessening the demand for abortion by upholding God’s plan for sexuality and the sanctity of marriage.

- Pregnancy care centers and maternity homes offer pregnant women practical support for choosing life for their unborn babies.

- Political involvement to change abortion laws is undertaken at every level: voting, lobbying, campaigning for pro-life candidates, drafting pro-life legislation, communicating with government officials, drafting pro-life party platforms, running for office, initiating boycotts, and so on.

- Sidewalk counselors and picketers gather peacefully near abortion clinics to pray and reach out to abortion providers and their customers.

- Pro-life health care professionals refuse to view abortion as good medicine and instead care for both mother and child. (The numbers of abortion providers are down from a high of nearly 3,000 in 1981 to 895 in 2015. Currently, pro-life doctors are threatened with the prospect of losing the privilege of practicing medicine unless they perform abortions or agree to refer women to doctors who will.)
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Life Matters Worldwide exists to equip believers for participation in legitimate means of fighting abortion, which must continue. We shouldn’t allow the actions of a lone gunman to deter us from speaking the truth about abortion, or demoralize our commitment to non-violence. Acts of violence will not end the violence of abortion, but lead to more acts of violence.
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