

LONE GUNNERS FOR JESUS

Letters to Paul J. Hill

Gary North

Institute for Christian Economics
Tyler, Texas

copyright, Gary North, 1994

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

North, Gary.

Lone gunners for Jesus : letters to Paul J. Hill / Gary North.
p. cm.

ISBN 0-930464-73-7 : \$3.95

1. Abortion – Religious aspects – Reformed Church. 2. Hill, Paul J. 3. Pro-life movement – United States. 4. Law (Theology) – Biblical teaching. 5. Nonviolence – Religious aspects – Reformed Church. 6. Government, Resistance to – Religious aspects – Reformed Church. 8. Dominion theology. 9. Reformed Church – Doctrines. I. Title.

HQ767.35.N67 1994

261.8'36667 - dc20

94-37301

CIP

Published by

**Institute for Christian Economics
P.O. Box 8000, Tyler, Texas 75711**

A LETTER TO PAUL J. HILL

Sept. 29, 1994

Paul J. Hill
Escambia County Corrections Dept.
P. O. Box 17789
Pensacola, FL 32522

Dear Mr. Hill:

Sometime in the months following the murder of the abortionist in Florida, Dr. Gunn, you sent me two position papers. One was called, *Was the Killing of Dr. Gunn Just?* You added this parenthesis: "Rough draft, numerous revisions still being made." Obviously, you have other things on your mind these days besides continuing the revisions of your rough draft. I am responding to this paper belatedly because you seem to have taken your own suggestions seriously enough to shoot an abortionist, kill his escort, and wound the escort's wife. That, at least, is what you are accused of.

The subtitle on your paper is called, *A Call to Defensive Action*. You also sent another paper titled, *"Defensive Action" Is a Pro-Life Organization Proclaiming the Justice of Using All Action Necessary to Protect Innocent Life*.

I did not respond to your letter or to your papers. I cannot find your letter in my files, but I did save your two papers. I

should have responded. Perhaps I might have persuaded you that you were headed in a terrible direction. In all likelihood, though, you would not have taken me seriously. I say this because you were excommunicated by your local church, and you did not take that seriously. Your church asked only that you cease speaking in public – such as on the “Donahue” show – in defense of the right of anti-abortionists to kill abortionists. So, there is no persuasive reason for me to believe that you would have taken seriously anything that I might have written. I do not expect you to take this letter seriously. On the assumption, however, that men can repent before they are cast into hell, which is where you are clearly headed, I am responding here.

Judicial Theology

I say that you are headed for hell because I speak judicially. You wrote to me, presumably because I am associated with the Christian Reconstruction movement. You are well aware that we are noted for our judicial theology. You attended classes taught by Dr. Greg Bahnsen in the late 1970’s at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Mississippi. In one of your papers, you cite a book by R.J. Rushdoony. We do think judicially and speak judicially. Ask a judicial theologian his opinion, and you should expect a judicial answer.

The New Testament is clear: when a man is excommunicated from his church, he is to be regarded by Christians as a heathen. We are told specifically by John that we are not to wish such a person Godspeed. “Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 1:9–11).

The New Testament is equally clear that God honors lawful excommunications. Jesus spoke to church officers: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 18:18). So, I take your excommunication seriously, even though you do not.

You were educated as a Calvinist in a Calvinist seminary. What did Calvin say about excommunication? He was quite clear. He cited Matthew 16:19. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Then he wrote that "the latter applies to the discipline of excommunication which is entrusted to the church. But the church binds him whom it excommunicates – not that it casts him into everlasting ruin and despair, but because it condemns his life and morals, and already warns him of his condemnation unless he should repent. . . . Therefore, that no one may stubbornly despise the judgment of the church, or think it immaterial that he has been condemned by the vote of the believers, the Lord testifies that such judgment by believers is nothing but the proclamation of his own sentence, and that whatever they have done on earth is ratified in heaven."

When an excommunicate then goes out to create his own house church and serve himself and his family the Lord's Supper, as you did, this goes beyond mere excommunicate status; it goes to the status of outright rebellion. Here is a man who is creating his own church, his own world of supposed judicial authority. Here is a man who is bringing the sacraments of the church into his home, in the name of God, when he has been lawfully condemned by the institutional church and told to repent. That act alone judicially enables me to say that by every judicial standard the Bible offers, you are going to hell. You are in open rebellion. God does not honor those men who flagrantly rebel against His church, set up a home church, and

ordain themselves to ministerial status. Self-ordination under such circumstances is a form of self-excommunication.

You are accused of having shot to death two men and wounding a woman. You have not denied these accusations. You are said to have used a shotgun at close range – a weapon not noted for its ability to inflict death on a discriminating basis.

The reports say that you ran. If correct, then you did not act as a man of courage would have acted. You did not act as one who believed in some elevated principle. You shot and ran. This indicates to me that you knew in your heart that your act was, biblically speaking, an act of murder rather than the God-authorized defense of a just cause. A man defending a just cause does not run. He commits his act of civil rebellion in the name of a higher law and then submits himself to the sanctions of the state for having violated state law.

This is what the people of Operation Rescue do. They stand in front of an abortion clinic, to be beaten by the police, arrested, sent to jail, fined, and suffer a loss of their income. They suffer the consequences of their actions. They are people of courage.

Murder, Defined Biblically

The sixth commandment reads, “Thou shalt not kill” (Ex. 20:13). The God who mandates this is also the God who ordered the total annihilation of the Canaanites (Deut. 7:16), so this verse cannot legitimately be interpreted as a defense of pacifism.

What is murder, biblically speaking? It is the slaying of a human being by someone who has not been authorized to do so as a covenantal agent.

A member of the military can lawfully kill a designated enemy during wartime. In Old Covenant Israel, the man eligible to serve in God’s holy army had to pay blood money to the priesthood at the time of the army’s numbering, just prior to battle (Ex. 30:12–16). This was atonement money (v. 16). So

fearful is killing, even as a member of God's holy army, that God mandated a special payment. While we no longer are required to pay money to a priest, the implication is clear: killing is a very serious matter.

A man can defend his household against an unauthorized criminal invader (Ex. 22:2-3). He is the head of his household: a covenantal office. This is not self-defense as such; it is the defense of a legitimate sphere of authority, the home, by one charged by God through the civil government to take defensive action. But this right is never said to be universal in the Bible; it is limited to the protection of one's family.

A man can participate in the execution of a criminal convicted of a capital crime. "At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall he that is worthy of death be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death. The hands of the witnesses shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterward the hands of all the people. So thou shalt put the evil away from among you" (Deut. 17:6-7).

In Old Covenant Israel, there was an office called the blood avenger, which was the same as the kinsman-redeemer. This was the man who was nearest of kin. When a man accidentally killed another, he had to flee to a designated city of refuge. If the blood avenger caught the suspect en route, or outside the walls of that city, he was authorized by civil law to execute the suspect (Num. 35). This office no longer exists because cities of refuge were an aspect only of Mosaic Israel.

When a corporate crime was so great that God's negative sanctions threatened the entire nation, the state could authorize corporate executions. The example here is the national sin of the golden calf. The Levites' lawful slaying of the 3,000 men after the golden calf incident removed the corporate threat (Ex. 32:28). But they had specifically been called into action by Moses, the God-inspired head of the civil government. Moses deputized them prior to their judicial action.

Under holy warfare conditions, a Mosaic priest was authorized to kill someone who was committing a moral infraction so great that it would have brought bloodguiltiness on the entire community. The primary example here is Phinehas' execution of the copulating couple during the war with Midian. The visible mark of the displeasure of God was the plague that had broken out immediately prior to Phinehas' action. This plague stopped after he executed the couple (Num. 25:6-14). The same was true of Samuel's execution of Agag: he was a prophet, and it took place under wartime conditions (I Sam. 15:33).

The point is, in each case, the distinguishing mark of the right to execute an enemy of God was the holding of a covenantal office: military, head of household, witness, deputy, or wartime priest or prophet. That is, the authorization to execute a transgressor under the Mosaic covenant was ordained by God and revealed in His law.

To kill another deliberately is murder. The murderer is outside God's covenant of salvation. "Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21). Christians are not to tolerate such people in their midst. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men's matters" (I Pet. 4:15).

God will cast every unrepentant murderer into the lake of fire: "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake

which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Rev. 21:5–8).

The Fundamental Issue

I want to talk at this point about what I regard as the real issue here. You will probably not admit that this is the real issue. Those who are psychologically disposed toward revolutionary violence, autonomous acts of rebellion, and premeditated murder will probably also not believe that I am balancing the judicial issues properly. Nevertheless, it is time for someone in the camp of the theonomists to address the judicial issues carefully and precisely. It is not that we have completely been silent, but there is a division in the theonomic camp, and since I am the one who has come out in favor of non-violent resistance in my books, I guess I should be the one to continue to defend the position.

The grim fact of the matter is this: abortion is a universal practice. Estimates today indicate as many as fifty million unborn infants are aborted annually, worldwide. In the United States, something in the range of a million and a half pre-born infants have been legally aborted every year since 1973. But compared to the total number of abortions worldwide, we are not the major abortionists.

It is not just that there are many abortions being conducted worldwide today; it is that abortions by the millions have been practiced over the history of man. It is such a common practice and has been such a common practice that the original Hippocratic Oath of the classical Greek world included a promise by the would-be physician not to practice abortion. This clause was taken out of the Hippocratic Oath in the United States during the 1970's. The lure of income was too great for the physicians, so they removed that ancient traditional clause from the modern version of the Hippocratic Oath. The point is this: abortion is an ancient practice, and God has allowed it to go on without

bringing immediate judgment against those societies in which abortion was practiced. Why should this be?

The main reason why God has tolerated abortion without bringing judgment against societies that practice it is that abortion has been illegal in most societies. In the language of the pro-abortionists, abortion has generally been performed in back alleys. This is where abortion should be performed if they are performed. Back alleys are the perfect place for abortion. They are concealed. They are difficult to seek out, both for buyers of the service and for civil magistrates seeking to suppress abortions. They are unsafe places, placing murderous mothers under risk. Back alleys are where abortions belong.

The covenantal problem comes when societies legislate to allow abortions to be practiced at a profit on Main Street. The problem comes when abortionists can lawfully advertise in the press for people to come in and buy an abortion. Main Street abortions are what bring a society under the judgment of God. Legalized abortions reveal a deep-seated lawlessness on the part of the community.

The Guilt of the Community

In your defense of the killing of Dr. Gunn, you continually refer to the "community." I always get suspicious when people appeal to collectives in order to justify individual action. You quote from Michael Bray's paper supporting Operation Rescue. This is under the section, "Ethical Basis for Defensive Action." Here is what Michael Bray said, according to you: "The fact is that the guilt for the shedding of innocent blood remains upon the citizenry until the punishment is exacted from the offender. Blood guilt is purged only through punishment of the guilty. If the crime goes unpunished, the community bears guilt for the shedding of innocent blood. The community has a strong incentive therefore, to seek justice in order to avoid the burden (Deuteronomy 21:1-9)."

Deuteronomy 21:1–9 is a very important passage. Bray was correct to cite it. So were you. But you have not understood it. That passage deals with a dead body found in a field. The victim has been murdered, but no one knows who committed it. The elders of the city closest to the field come out to participate in a sacrificial offering in order to remove the bloodguilt from the city. They kill a heifer; the Levites then sacrifice it. The text reads: “And all the elders of that city, that are next unto the slain man, shall wash their hands over the heifer that is beheaded in the valley: And they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O LORD, unto thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel’s charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them. So shalt thou put away the guilt of innocent blood from among you, when thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the LORD” (Deut. 21:6–9).

Michael Bray’s citation of this passage was correct. There was bloodguilt under the Mosaic Covenant, and the way to escape God’s corporate negative sanctions was for both the priests and the civil magistrates to acknowledge before God that they did not know who had slain this victim, that they washed their hands because of it, and they slew an animal to atone for it. They were atoning not only for the sin of murder but also for their own ignorance. They were making certain that bloodguilt did not extend to the society. They were announcing publicly that they did not approve of this murder. And because they did not approve of it, and they sacrificed something valuable to prove they did not approve of it, God brought them out from under corporate judgment.

We must think judicially about this passage. The intent of the passage was to show that God does not hold a community or a society guilty for the acts of an individual that are immoral, if the community takes appropriate actions to suppress the action. That is, if the community passes laws against the prac-

tice, seeks to enforce these laws against the practice, and brings sanctions against those who violate the law, then that society is not brought under the judgment of God. The state is authorized to bring sanctions against those individuals who commit such acts against the law of God precisely because of the threat of God's corporate sanctions. If the state does not take action in the name of God, then God will take action in the name of God and bring the sanctions against the whole society. This is the teaching of Deuteronomy 28:15-66. This is the teaching of the whole covenant pattern of Old Testament law.

Finally, if societies do not acknowledge this by seeking to suppress illegal acts, God does bring judgment against them. This is why God sent the prophets before the people and before the kings: to warn them. By violating God's law, the people risked bringing the entire society under the direct negative sanctions of God. They risked captivity to Babylon, they risked captivity to Assyria, they risked military invasion, they risked being subordinate to Moab and Philistia and all the enemies around them. God would bring his sanctions against them all, corporately, if their ordained civil and ecclesiastical representatives did not act humbly and confess their ignorance in the face of an unsolved crime, and attempt as best they could to bring sanctions against evil-doers.

The point that Bray makes is correct. The community does have an incentive to bring evil-doers to justice, and if the community cannot locate the evil-doers, then the community has to admit that this is not because the community approves of such actions that the authorities do not bring sanctions against evil-doers. Rather, the authorities do not know who the evil-doers are. They can't find the evil-doers, or the evil doers somehow have escaped the nets of justice. This is the focus of the Deuteronomy passage.

But then you come along and say that the individual Christian has the right before God to act in the name of the commu-

nity. In that statement, you have moved away from biblical law into open revolution.

The Question of Judicial Representation

In your paper, "Was the Killing of Dr. Gunn Just?" on page 4, you cite R. J. Rushdoony's 1971 book *The One and the Many*. You cite his discussion of the Trinity, in which he discusses the Trinity as being equally one and equally many: the equal ultimacy of both unity and diversity. As a philosophical concept, this is a correct analysis of the meaning of the Trinity. But then you apply it in a unique way. You write: "All of reality reflects the nature of God and the equal ultimacy of the one and the many. When applying this principle to our civic life one may ask, which is more important, the leadership the individuals have elected (the one) or the individuals that constitute the society (the many)? The answer is that neither are more important, they are equally ultimate." And then, in bold face, you add this: "Therefore, both the individuals and their authorities have equal ultimacy as to their responsibility to defend life."

Here you make the classic mistake of the revolutionary. You move away from covenantal law to radical individualism. You go in the direction of pure anarchism. You are an anarchist. And your statement shows why you are an anarchist.

The biblical position is that there must always be judicial representation. Adam represented all of mankind before God in the fall. Jesus Christ represented all of mankind as well as His people before God in His death, resurrection, and ascension. There must always be representation. Moses represented the civil magistrates of Israel. Aaron represented the people as the high priest of Israel.

There must always be judicial representation, and it is established biblically through ordination. There are but three covenantal offices that God recognizes: Church, State, and Family. Each of them is established by a vow taken before God. We state a self-maledictory oath in our marriage vows, " 'til death

do us part." In the Church, we are baptized, which symbolizes going through the death and resurrection with Jesus Christ. Death is always a possibility for covenant-breaking. This death is announced through excommunication. In the state, we take a vow, or at least implicitly we do, to uphold the law. We are brought under the sanctions of God if we unlawfully violate an oath of subordination. The point is: there must be, in every covenant, a representative. This representative is ordained to his office.

The father represents his wife and his children before God because he holds a high covenantal office to which he has been ordained. The minister represents the congregation because he has been ordained. The civil magistrate represents the covenanted nation because he has been elected or lawfully appointed by those who have been elected. There is no lawful covenantal office without ordination.

What you are talking about in your essay is the equal ultimacy of both the individual and the ordained civil magistrate in fighting crime. This position is utter nonsense biblically. There cannot be equal ultimacy of those two because one of them has been ordained and one of them has not. The officer has a covenantal responsibility before God that is unique, but the individual does not. The officer is oath-bound to enforce the law, while the individual is oath-bound to obey it. One of them is at the top of the hierarchy and is invested by God with the power to exercise the sword, while the other is not.

Your theory of civil law does not reveal any trace of judicial subordination. Your system of interpretation of Rushdoony's passage is a violation of every principle of biblical covenantal law because there is no hierarchy in your system. Every covenant has to have a hierarchy. Every legal order has to have a judge. Every ecclesiastical order has to have a minister. But you obviously do not believe this. When you were excommunicated, you set up your own home church in which you were the self-ordained authority, by which you said you had the right to

administer the sacraments to your wife and your children. But who ordained you? Who anointed you? No one. You were an excommunicate at the time you ordained yourself.

You are an anarchist and a rebel. The problem is, there are a lot of others just like you, with the same mind set, who are equally armed and dangerous.

The secular anarchist says that he speaks for himself – a pure anarchist. He says, “There is no authority beyond me.” This is the doctrine of the divine right of the individual. The divine right of the individual teaches that there is no lawful court of appeal beyond him. This is the pure anarchist.

Most anarchists are not pure anarchists. You are not a pure anarchist. You claim that you speak in the name of the community. And presumably, you have two communities in mind: the church of Jesus Christ, which excommunicated you, and the civil government, which has locked you up and now threatens to execute you. Yet you, as an unordained individual, claim that you possessed the right to act for the community in the name of the community. Either you spoke in the name of the church and the state or else you spoke in the name of the broad-based community as a whole. This is not clear in your essay.

Here is the judicial reality: no one ordained you to this ecclesiastical position as spokesman; no one anointed you to this civil position as spokesman. You ordained yourself, anointed yourself, to speak both as priest and civil magistrate in issuing your theological manifestos. Then you gunned down a man, gunned down his escort, and wounded the escort’s wife. And you did this, you claim, not in the name of yourself simply as an individual, but in the name of Jesus Christ. You did this, you say, as a representative agent of Jesus Christ’s kingdom, both ecclesiastical and civil. Because you were once ordained and issued a theological manifesto, you took up a shotgun and killed them. Who ordained you? Who anointed you? The answer is: you anointed you. You ordained you. You, in your

capacity as an equally ultimate man under God, ordained and anointed yourself. Then you got your gun.

Not many people are trained to think judicially. Not many are trained to think biblically. Even fewer are trained to think covenantally. The problem is, you had a little theonomic training, a little theological understanding, and a whole lot of pride. You also had a shotgun. And so you combined what little you knew of biblical law and what little you knew of theology with your shotgun. And the result is your incarceration.

Fortunately, your church had excommunicated you before you grabbed your shotgun. The press has not been able to tar and feather the Christian church, because the church exercised its good judgment and declared you outside the jurisdiction of Christ's ecclesiastical kingdom. It publicly announced that you are going to hell unless you repent. That cleared the church of any responsibility for you. This is an enormous blessing to the church of Jesus Christ. If more churches would do this, there would be less embarrassment for the church of Jesus Christ when those who are excommunicated go out and practice exactly what they preach. But churches do not excommunicate people very often, and so churches get tarred and feathered by the press when those under their jurisdiction do things much less violent than what you did.

Community Standards

Your problem is a theological one. But you did address a real problem. The problem you addressed is the problem you would not admit. The problem is that the American community agrees with the Supreme Court of the United States. The general American public agrees that abortion should be legal.

Maybe it does not agree that the third-trimester abortions should be legal, but it is not going to throw out of office the civil magistrates who enforce the Supreme Court's ruling. In fact, the Supreme Court has authorized third-trimester abortion and any other kind of abortion, but the public will not fight it.

A handful of people have fought it, but the public refuses. The voting public will not vote out of office a man who is pro-abortion. In fact, time and time again, the public re-elects those people to office.

So, the fact of the matter is this: your problem is not that Deuteronomy 21 is not being enforced just because it is an Old Testament law. Your problem is that the basic presupposition of that law is being manifested today. God is eventually going to bring corporate judgment against a society that approves of the slaying of the innocent. This is our problem. The problem is not some doctor down in Florida who was practicing abortions. The problem is that a majority of the community approved of the doctor in Florida who was practicing the abortions.

I have already said that abortions have been going on for a long time. Abortions have been universal. But God's wrath isn't universal because most societies in the past have had laws against abortion and have tried to stop the abortionists. So, God acknowledged that they were doing the best they could. He did not bring His judgment against those societies because they were at least trying to stop this terrible practice. The problem comes when communities decide that the murder of the innocent is a convenience worth legislating. When societies make abortion legal, God's wrath can be expected. And so I will put it in one phrase. *The problem is not abortion as such; the problem is legalized abortion.*

If you identify an individual abortionist as a murderer, you are saying that he is guilty of a terrible sin. You are correct: he *is* guilty of a terrible sin. Nevertheless, the Bible is silent on the systematic practice of abortion. The governing passage in Exodus 21 can be used and should be used to justify laws against abortion, but it does not specifically talk about self-conscious abortion. It says that when two men are struggling, and one of them strikes a pregnant woman and the child is born, if the child is born dead, he should be executed. From the relatively narrow concept of abortion in this case, we can make legitimate

judicial applications. If, as an accident, a woman has her child aborted, and this is a capital crime, then we can legitimately conclude that if it is a self-conscious effort to kill the woman's child, then abortion is still a capital crime. We move from the narrow case law to the broader application. This is the biblical judicial principle of "If this, then how much more that."

But the reality is that there is no verse in the Bible that says directly that the practice of abortion is illegal. There is no verse in the Bible comparable to the original clause of the Hippocratic Oath forbidding abortion. There is nothing this graphic; there is nothing this specific. But there is undoubtedly a very clear passage, which you quote at least indirectly through Michael Bray, regarding the bloodguiltiness of a society that does not wash its hands ritually of murder because it cannot locate the murderer. The fundamental judicial principle is clear: societies must enforce God's law and must seek out, as best they can, the perpetrators of crimes, and bring sanctions against convicted criminals. That is what is clear in the text. The law against abortion is less clear.

I contend that the Christian's focus of legitimate concern regarding the abortion law is the abortion law itself. The focus of God's primary civil concern is not with the practice of abortion as such, but rather with the moral character of the people. He wants to see if they will pass laws against abortion and enforce these laws against abortion. He wants to see if they will legalize abortion. When they legalize abortion, they have subjected themselves to God's corporate sanctions against bloodguiltiness.

This covenantal concern is not the focus of your concern. It is also not the primary focus of most pro-lifers. They are concerned with stopping individual abortions. The more radical their theology, the more they focus on the deaths of specific infants at the hands of specific abortionists. This is not the focus of the Bible.

I am not saying that abortions are right. I am saying that the practice of abortion as such is not God's primary focus of concern. It is the practice of legalized abortions that is the focus of God's concern and wrath. When abortion is legalized, this testifies to the depraved moral condition of the community. It is the moral condition of the community that most concerns God, not the fact that this or that physician is practicing abortions. God can bring judgment in eternity, and will, against those who practice abortion and against the mothers who authorize it. Abortion is a crime in God's eyes. But the focus of God's concern is not with stopping the abortions by his representatives' individual actions. The focus of God's concern is to legislate against abortion and then to have the representative ordained agents, that is, the civil magistrates, take public action against the abortion. God's judicial focus, in other words, is corporate and judicial. This is the focus of God's concern in the question of abortion.

The local question – whether or not babies are being killed by specific abortionists – is a secondary matter judicially. In the eyes of God, the primary concern is corporate and judicial. This is what we are supposed to learn from Deuteronomy 21:1–9. Corporate guilt has not been understood well by the pro-life movement. And surely, this was not understood by you.

The problem is the community. The community approves. Let us not mince words: the United States electorate approves of abortion on demand. It will not bring political sanctions against those politicians who remain silent on abortion or who actively promote abortions. The problem is in the hearts of the people. This is our primary covenantal problem.

What can be done about abortion if the primary focus of concern is not abortion but the legalization of abortion? What has to be done is to change the minds of the people. Then, second, what has to be done is to enact laws against abortion, and to pass a constitutional amendment authorizing the law to

legislate against abortion. The matter is judicial. The matter is civil-political.

The Technology of Low-Cost Murder

Now come chemical abortifacients. This is what is going to stop physicians from practicing abortion in the United States. Price competition is the greatest threat to the local abortionist, not some self-appointed revolutionary bringer of justice like yourself. It is the fact that women will be able to walk into some large store or local drug store and buy some pills – “morning after” pills – for \$10.95 (or \$39.95, on special, for a giant, economy-size bottle), take those pills, and kill their own infants. Price competition is the looming treat to the killer physicians, not the pro-life movement.

When such products are finally for sale, the pro-life movement will be forced to come to grips with the judicial reality of abortion, namely, that it is legal. At that point, all of the pro-life posturing had better end. We will have fewer picket lines in front of physicians’ offices. It will do no good to picket a physician if he has been driven out of the death business because it is so cheap to get home-based abortion out of a bottle. He is not going to be practicing abortions. Mothers will be practicing abortion. It will do no good to go out and shoot physicians. The advent of cheap abortifacients is when the legalization of abortion visibly becomes the real problem, when it becomes discount abortion, mass-produced abortion.

The problem is the legalization of abortion, not some killer physician on the corner. The physician on the corner who is practicing abortion is a symbol, and it is good to challenge the symbol in the name of the real issue, which is the legalization of abortion. But that local physician is not the main problem. The big problem is that modern technology is going to find a way to have dirt-cheap abortions and make millions of dollars along the way. We are going to get mass-produced abortions. We will no longer worry about a comparative handful of abortions: a

million and a half a year. We will not know how many deaths will be administered. It may be twice as many; we will have no sure way of knowing. What we know is that abortion will be so unbelievably easy that the numbers will skyrocket. There is going to be no way to stop it by picketing. Besides, we will not have anyone specific to picket.

What are pro-lifers going to do? Organize picketing against Wal-Mart, which sells 10,000 products? Are we likely to get the buyers of 9,999 of those other products not to walk in the door, just because the store sells one product which we don't like? Do we think that such picketing is going to stop some murderous mother or anyone else? Picketing will stop almost nobody. We will not be able to target a particular practitioner any more. There will not be a visible representative any more. There will only be the society that wants the abortions and millions of women who want abortions.

There are tens of millions of men and women who will not vote to ban the sale of such a product. This is our problem. It is a political problem resting on a specific moral foundation: humanism. The problem is judicial. It is corporate. And finally, when the physicians are driven out of business by mass produced abortifacients, pro-lifers are going to face a new reality. They are going to realize that it is not abortion as such that is the covenantal problem. It is the problem of a society that has legalized abortion.

An anti-abortion protester today may save a few lives on a particular day. There may be a protest that saves a couple lives, but there is still going to be a million and a half that are not saved this year. There will be a million and a half who are going to die, whether or not you protest. The protests are symbolic. The protests are focusing on the evil of the act. But if they are to be life-saving, the protests must be used to call the whole society to its moral senses. The primary problem is the whole society, not the abortionist around the corner. This is a symbolic war which must be fought politically. When mass-

produced, inexpensive, price-comparative abortifacients are available on the shelves of Wal-Mart, most pro-lifers at last will figure this out.

To picket an abortion clinic is legitimate. It is a public way of saying, "We do not approve of what goes on in there. We call upon God to give us time to organize, to seek out ways to get abortion re-criminalized. We ask God not to bring His negative corporate sanctions against us. We are doing our best."

It is also a way of scaring other physicians who would become abortionists if there were not so much embarrassment attached to the profession. The physician inside the clinic has a seared conscience (I Tim. 4:2). His professional colleagues may not. In any case, they fear the public exposure.

Picketing an abortion clinic rarely saves lives directly. It saves lives indirectly. Picketing is for God's sake. It can sometimes save lives directly, but picketers should know the truth: the act is more symbolic (representative before God and men) than immediately corrective. The act is part of the process of consciousness-raising and conscience-raising for the participants, not a way to save lots of lives directly.

When cheap abortifacients are readily available, picketing will no longer work. The standard confrontational tactics will no longer work. The murderers will no longer be visible, nor will the places of execution. When murder is done in the privacy of the home, picketing will no longer serve many purposes, other than picketing politicians and, perhaps, the manufacturers.

Picketing is a temporary tactic, not a long-term strategy. But at least it has benefits. Murder does not.

When mothers perform in-house abortions, what will men like you do? What good will a shotgun be? Will your imitators invade homes and shoot down women they suspect of using morning-after pills? And if they do this, what will happen to those unborn infants? Your disciples, not the mothers, will then become the murderers of unborn infants.

Your perfectionist, guilt-ridden tactic of self-ordained judge-and-jury execution may make perverse sense to fanatics today, before the technology of mass murder is on the shelves, but the tactic clearly becomes self-defeating the day the new technology arrives. This should tell you that your tactic is wrong today. You obviously did not think through the implications of your recommended plan of action. I hope that those who might otherwise imitate you do think it through, before it is too late for them and also for the hundreds of thousands of innocent infants whose lives will be lost because of the political reaction your tactic will produce in normal human beings. These people vote. This is what your murderous perfectionism ignores.

Voices of Virtue

But there will still be a few people like yourself: self-appointed voices of virtue on Robespierre's model, who will not accept this political frame of reference. They will move to the next stage. Your position is really quite mild compared to what may come. Your position is that you, as a self-ordained and self-anointed man, have the lawful authority before God to gun down one lone practitioner of abortions and his escort, and put a couple of pellets in his wife while you are at it. That is a mild-mannered position compared to what may come. The real hard-core practitioners of revolutionary virtue are going to understand the logic of your position. You really were not consistent. People say that you finally became consistent with your position, but they are incorrect. You were not consistent with your position because the real position that is consistent with what you are saying is to put bullets into Supreme Court Justices. The real position you are advocating is to gun down every legislator who will not vote against legalized abortions.

Your position is really revolutionary. Open revolution, that is what you are calling for. Your "defensive action" theology is aimed not only at some local physician who is going to kill two or three babies or ten babies today and more tomorrow. The

problem for your theology is the U.S. Supreme Court, which has authorized the killing of a million and a half a year. If the government is the problem – and it surely is the problem – then what is the logic of your position? If you can save a life by gunning down a local abortionist, how many lives can you save if you gun down authorities who have legalized abortion?

You gunned down an abortionist's private escort. What if that bodyguard had been a policeman? What is the difference, given your doctrine? You teach: (1) the individual's right to gun down local abortionists; (2) the individual's right to gun down their bodyguards; and (3) the equal ultimacy of the individual and the civil magistrate in saving lives. So, kill cops.

We saw such a plan in action in Columbia. The Medellin drug cartel would gun down judges. They would gun down policemen that opposed them. They understood that their problem was at the top, not at the bottom, and so they offered rewards: \$1500 to kill a policeman. They offered more to shoot a judge.

This is where your position is heading. Someone will make the jump which you have been unwilling to take. You shoot down a local abortionist. The policeman arrests a local drug seller. Will either action stop the action? The people at the top are the problem, some follower of yours will conclude. He will see the logic of your position: "If I have the right to gun down a local abortionist, I have the right to gun down his accomplice. If I can lawfully fire a shotgun and wound the accomplice's wife because she, too, is basically an accomplice, then I have a right to gun down the ministers who excommunicated me for publicly advising violence against abortionists. If I have the right to gun down a practitioner, don't I have a right to gun down the judge who has authorized the practice? Don't I have the right to gun down the politician? Don't I have the right to gun down the voter who has voted for the politician, who in fact is in favor of abortion? Don't I have the right to gun down every-

body who is pro-abortion? Aren't they all responsible, and if they are, am I responsible for stopping them in any way I can?"

That approach to justice is what the French Revolution rested on. You are creating the legal basis of just such a revolution. You are the self-appointed voice of virtue, and all someone needs to put your theology to work is a guillotine or its technological equivalent. One of your disciples will figure out that the problem is not the guy on the corner who commits the abortions; the problem is the entire society which has approved and authorized and legislated the abortions. There is nothing in your theology to call a halt to someone who takes your principle of revolutionary violence and does his best to impose it. Because that is where it ends. It ends on the guillotine. It ends with the Robespierres of this world cutting off the heads of tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, of the accomplices of evil. That is where autonomous, "equal ultimacy" revolution always ends when it is not stamped out early. That is where your position ends.

When the individual has the right to take up arms against the local practitioner of evil, even when the practitioner has been authorized by law to practice whatever it is, then the next step has to be to take up arms against his representatives: the judicial representatives of the people. Remember, the people approve. The fundamental problem is the people and the hearts of the people, not some profit-seeking physician around the corner. The real problem, biblically speaking, is the hearts of the people. How are you going to change the hearts of the people by gunning down the physician on the corner?

Perfectionism and Unlimited Guilt

You ask in your essay on Dr. Gunn, "At what point do you think it would be just to use force to protect innocent life?" (p. 8). I ask in response: "At what point do you think it is no longer legitimate to use force to protect innocent life?" You seek to

legitimize the theology of the lone gunner for Jesus. I seek to ward off the theology of the anarchist revolutionary movement.

There are 50 million abortions conducted each year. Am I responsible to pick up a gun and shoot any abortionist anywhere on earth? Has God ordained me to cleanse the earth of abortionists? Your theology sets no boundaries on the use of violence. National borders have no judicial relevance for those seeking to cleanse by force the world of abortion. Evil is evil, wherever it is practiced. If the lone gunner for Jesus has been given equality with the civil magistrate in protecting the lives of the unborn, this license cannot end at a national border. The late Ayatollah Khomeini issued a death warrant with a \$5 million reward for the man who kills Salmon Rushdie. He did not place any geographical restrictions on this death warrant, nor did he place temporal boundaries. The death warrant is presumably still in force, and Rushdie is still at risk.

Where are the judicial boundaries of responsibility? Where are the judicial boundaries of violence? By removing the death penalty from the state, your theology transfers it to the lone gunner. What restricts him? His common sense? That is what your essay appealed to: "Common sense tells the individual that he should protect his neighbor from unjust harm" (p. 1). But how clearly does common sense speak in history, and how carefully do lone gunners with a sense of mission listen to it?

Your theology offers no judicial boundaries. It offers no boundaries on the sense of guilt in the hearts of men. There are unborn babies dying today, all over the world. Where does my responsibility end?

The unbounded perfectionism of your theology leads to intense guilt and the deviant behavior such guilt can produce. I am not guilty for my refusal to kill abortionists. I have not been authorized by God to kill abortionists. Abortionists are not under my God-given authority. They have not invaded an area for which I am responsible to the point of being authorized to kill them. But I *am* guilty if I do nothing politically to reverse

the legalization of abortion. That authority has been given to me.

Yours is a vigilante theology. Where in the Bible does God authorize the vigilante? Where in the Bible is the vigilante authorized to conduct a trial and execute its verdict?

The political reaction against vigilantism will likely prolong the legalization of abortion. Your vigilante theology, if believed and acted upon, will prolong the legalized slaughter of the innocents. Your personal perfectionism and your guilt-driven vigilantism may well result in the deaths of more babies than your victim could have performed in a lifetime. To delay the re-criminalization of abortion by just one week would allow the slaughter of almost 29,000 innocent lives in the U.S. Your act will probably delay it much longer than a week.

When it comes to responsibility for the deaths of the innocent, you are a guilty man. The blood of far more than an abortionist and his escort is on your hands, especially if you are declared innocent. If you are declared innocent, you will have imitators.

Non-Violent Resistance

I am in favor of non-violence and non-violent resistance. I have written two books about it: *Trespassing for Dear Life* and *When Justice Is Aborted*. Gandhi won, not because he used violence, but because he used non-violence, and his opponents used violence against him. The strategy of non-violence works because it calls forth the worst manifestations of the evil in the hearts of those against whom the non-violent protest is aimed. The public can see the police clubbing the protestors. They can see them breaking their arms dragging them out, throwing them into paddy wagons, putting them into jail for months at a time. Non-violent resistance was Martin Luther King's method, too.

The strategy of non-violent resistance is premised on these facts: (1) the public as a whole is doing the wrong thing; (2) the

public is allowing the government to do the wrong thing in the name of the public; and (3) the public's mind can be changed if non-violent tactics reveal that those who enforce the law have to do terrible things against righteous people who are standing up for principle.

The difference between non-violent resistance and violent resistance is very great. Non-violent resistance says that we must take a public stand against a public evil and suffer the consequences. Non-violent resistance says that those magistrates who represent the people as a whole are going to do evil things in public if what they have been authorized to do is essentially evil. Non-violent resistance against legalized abortion is aimed at calling the public to its collective senses. But if the public no longer has collective senses, and if the public in its heart is murderous, then non-violent resistance is not going to work directly. Non-violent resistance is going to call down the wrath of God on the society.

What you forgot, and what violent resisters want to forget, is that there is a God in this process, and He does act in history to bring His sanctions. You were not authorized by God to represent the public. You were authorized by God to do non-violent things and suffer the consequences personally. You were authorized by God to stand in the gap and get your head beaten in, maybe on videotape, to be broadcast on the six o'clock news. You were authorized to get the public infuriated against the agents who bashed your head in. That is what you were entitled to do. But you were not entitled to gun somebody down. God allows the sword to be used only by someone who is ordained to do it. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord." So says Romans 12. Romans 13 says that the state is authorized, as a minister of God (v. 4), to act as God's lawful agent of vengeance. If the civil magistrate brings vengeance against evil-doers, then God does not have to, and He will not bring vengeance in history against the society as a whole for authorizing a civil magistrate to do evil.

There is a biblical hierarchy of vengeance. God is at the top, and the civil magistrate is under Him. You and any other private citizen are not part of this hierarchy. That is why it says, "vengeance is mine, saith the Lord." You forgot that. Those with a revolutionary bent in their psychology will also forget that.

What you did was not only against civil law, it was against God's law. What you recommend is not only against civil law, it is against God's law. Individuals do not have the right under biblical law to bring violence in the name of the community. They have not been ordained to do it, and they are not part of God's lawful, ordained hierarchy of vengeance.

Your position would bring bloodshed to all of society. There are no judicial limits on your position. There are no boundaries on who will be at risk from the self-ordained private vengeance-bringers with their shotguns and their weapons of violence. Your position cannot be limited judicially to the abortionists around the corner. Logically, it must go beyond that. It must go to the civil magistrate who is the legal bodyguard of the abortionist on the corner. It must move from the civil magistrate to the judge who has authorized this protection, and must finally move from the judge who has authorized it to the public which approves of it. There are no limits on the bloodshed and the violence in your system. There are no limits because there is no hierarchy. There is no civil court of appeals. There is no hierarchy of vengeance in your system. It is each man bringing judgment on the others in his capacity as a self-ordained magistrate. You ordained yourself to serve the Lord's Supper as a minister of God in the church, and you ordained yourself to gun down individuals as a civil magistrate. You possessed neither authority.

If we had biblical law, you would be tried and, if convicted, executed by the witnesses who testify against you. You would have no possibility of appeal. You would be delivered into God's supreme court. The only reason you will probably not be

executed is because we live in a society that does not believe in biblical law. The only thing that will save your earthly life is the corrupt legal system that would not prosecute your victim, the abortionist. The only thing that is going to give you time to repent is the moral and judicial corruption of the American legal system. The legal system you thought you could replace will probably not do what God says should be done with you.

That is the great irony here. You are going to be able to think about what you did and, by the grace of God, repent of what you have written and what you have done, only because this is a corrupt society. You will be given time that you do not deserve before God because this society pays very little attention to God. The society that legalized abortion is the society that is going to let you get off the hook compared to what biblical law absolutely requires be done with you.

Conclusion

I write to you, not because I really expect you to repent. I write to you because you are a representative of others who are afflicted by the same revolutionary mentality. I write also to the churches that may have men and even women who think like you inside their own congregations. I would warn every church that has someone like you voicing such opinions publicly to excommunicate that person immediately. Because if people like Paul J. Hill go out to wreak their private vengeance – their self-ordained, self-anointed vengeance – against others in this society, and the church has not publicly excommunicated such people in advance, then the church of Jesus Christ will be tarred and feathered by the press for not having had the courage to deal with these law-breakers.

It is time for the churches to think judicially. It is time to bring an end to the theology of individual license and individual ordination. It is time to issue a warning against all the self-ordained civil magistrates with their shotguns and all the self-

anointed home church, family-church ministers who are serving the Lord's Supper to their families.

This should not be regarded as a letter favoring abortion. It should surely not be regarded as a letter favoring legalized abortion. It should not be regarded by the public as being against non-violent resistance against abortion and legalized abortion. It is a letter which must be understood as a call to return to biblical law, a biblical doctrine of the covenant, and a concept of lawful order. It is a call to return to the doctrine of hierarchy and sanctions. I pray that this call will be taken seriously, for if it is not taken seriously, we are going to enter into a period in which vengeance is appropriated by individuals who are in rebellion against man and God, who are going to spread lawlessness on an individual basis into a society that is already committed to a rebellion against biblical law and against Christian principles. Godly people will be caught in the crossfire. The crossfire will be between the secular humanists who pay no attention to God's law, and therefore legalize abortion, and the self-anointed, self-ordained bringers of private justice who pay no attention to civil law or church law and who, on their own autonomous authority, are going to gun down the beneficiaries of the secular humanist order.

We are caught between the collectivized corporate evil of humanist civil law and the anarchistic autonomous evil of self-ordained revolutionaries. We are caught, in other words, in a crossfire between the one and the many. That is not where I want to be or where I want the church to be. The church had better begin taking steps to remove from its membership rolls all those who call for violence against individuals in the name of the community, when in fact in our present situation, the community stands against God and against God's law. It does no good to take up the sword privately against representatives of an evil community or against the beneficiaries of an evil community. God's judgment threatens the entire evil community.

The problem is not the abortionist around the corner. The problem is the hearts of the people. The hearts of the people can be changed by prayer and perhaps by personally costly symbolic resistance. But the hearts of the people cannot be changed by gunning down the abortionist around the corner. That will set the hearts of the people in their wicked ways. Nothing will change for the better; it will only get worse. More babies will die. Then the judgment of God really will come.

This is a political fight, a judicial fight, but not a military fight. It is not a fight to "save one life today." It is a fight to keep the judgment of God from coming on the entire society. That is the meaning of Deuteronomy 21:1–9. We must take those verses seriously.

Your statements to the press and your arrogant demeanor indicate that you are now engaged in creating a media image: a man who does not fear men because he fears God more. In fact, you do not fear God at all – not the God who has revealed Himself in the Bible as the eternal foe of all murderers. Jesus warned: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). You have despised the limits that God has placed on vengeance (Rom. 13:1–7). You have forgotten His warning: He shall bring vengeance (Rom. 12:19). He ordains some men to bring vengeance in His name. He did not ordain you to such an office. On the contrary, He has ordained your prosecutors, your jury, and your judge. They have the authority and, if you are convicted, the responsibility of delivering you speedily into God's heavenly court. Your sentence there, apart from your public repentance in history, is sure: "Guilty as charged!" Why? Because you refused to plead guilty in God's earthly court.

The blood of tens of thousands of innocent infants whose lives will not be spared because of the predictable political revulsion against your public testimony will be on your hands. Do what you can to wash it off while you are able. Change your

public testimony before the trial begins. Change your public demeanor from strutting arrogance to heartbroken apology. Above all, repudiate your murderous tactic as expressed in your essays. If you don't, you are eternally doomed.

You asked me months ago me to comment on your essays. I have now done so.

You were quoted in the *New York Times* (July 31, 1994) as having announced: "My role is a prophetic role. . . ." A prophet in the Old Covenant publicly identified transgressions that were so great that God threatened the society with corporate negative sanctions. The office of prophet disappeared when God ceased to give men totally accurate knowledge of the immediate future. But a prophetic role still exists: identifying public evils and forecasting the kinds of judgments that God brings against such public evils. In this respect, I have served you in a prophetic manner. But I am not alone. Your church warned you prophetically by excommunicating you. You ignored this warning. The state warned you prophetically by passing laws against murder. You ignored this warning. I am now warning you. I suggest that you do not ignore *this* warning.

Sincerely yours,

Gary North

A SECOND LETTER TO PAUL J. HILL

Today is October 18, 1994. I have now received three letters from you, dated October 7, October 10, and October 11. While you remained silent in front of the initial jury that condemned you, you have been quite lengthy in your responses to me.

You asserted in your October 7 letter: "I am a member of the Trinity Church in Valpraiso FL where Archie Jones is a member." You are not a member; you were excommunicated well over a year ago. (I will deal with this later.) But Dr. Jones was my employee in 1980. James Jordan is a member of the Trinity Presbyterian Church. He is still on my payroll, part time. You said in your letter that you were a friend of Greg and Gloria Keen in seminary. Greg Keen abandoned his wife in 1992 while a member of the same church as I was, which promptly and properly excommunicated him. Pathways in your past lead to me. Please regard this letter as a sign to the Christian public that says "Detour."

Presbyterian Law

I begin with your October 10 letter, since it dealt with the important issue of Presbyterian law. You quoted the Westminster Confession of Faith, as well as its Shorter Catechism (1646). You were once ordained as a Presbyterian minister, which required your public affirmation of these documents as judicially binding on you.

You cited provisions regarding the moral law. Specifically, you cited Chapter XIX of the Confession regarding God's covenant of works with Adam: "God gave to Adam a law, a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity, to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience. . . ." You then cited the Shorter Catechism on the sixth commandment: "The sixth commandment requireth all lawful endeavours to preserve our own life, and the life of others" (A. 68). You then went on to a discussion of the rights of policemen to defend people vs. the rights of individuals to defend them, which you claim are equally ultimate rights.

Your October 7 letter briefly mentions the discussion of the sixth commandment found in the Larger Catechism. The judicial question is this: What does the Larger Catechism define as *lawful*? The Shorter Catechism is silent on this point, as befits a shorter catechism. We must go to the Larger Catechism for further enlightenment. Question 136 asks: *What are the sins forbidden in the sixth commandment?* The answer is this: "The sins forbidden in the sixth commandment are, all taking away the life of ourselves, or of others, except in the case of publick justice, lawful war, or necessary defence; . . ."

Attendees of the Westminster Assembly were asked by Parliament in 1646 to add Bible verses in support of these documents, and in 1647, the Assembly did so. In the note on *publick justice*, the Assembly cited Numbers 35:31, which forbids any restitution for murder other than the public execution of the murderer. (This law surely applies to the judge who sentences you if a jury convicts you of murder.) To explain the phrase *necessary defence*, the Assembly cited Exodus 22:2-3, which authorizes a man to kill a thief who has invaded his home.

The issue here is self-defense against an unauthorized invader of a specific boundary: a man's home. As the God-authorized defender of his home, the resident is allowed to repel the invader by force, including deadly force. The judicial issue here is two-fold: office and jurisdiction. The law identifies the God-

ordained officer who defends the household: anyone who lawfully dwells within the home. The jurisdiction is explicit: property (space) which the individual lawfully occupies.

If a man or woman calls for help to defend his home or other space which by law is under his or her jurisdiction, an outsider thereby becomes a delegated agent of an ordained, God-authorized officer: the person who lawfully occupies that space. The outsider could legitimately risk confronting the invader with force if he could see that the authorized defender has been illegally restrained, such as bound and gagged. A jury would have the post-conflict responsibility of sorting out the legal details, such as the legitimacy of the outside defender's assumption of the lawful defender's implicit call for help.

One thing is sure: the outsider who guns down the supposed invader does his moral cause and judicial case no good when he then leaves the scene of the event. Your October 7 letter says that the state's witnesses said that you did not run away; you merely walked away. You also left behind a woman bleeding from your attack that killed her husband. It is a felony when a driver involved in an auto accident immediately drives away from the scene of the accident where someone has been injured. This is called hit and run. What is it when a lone gunner leaves the scene of his crime? Gun and run?

If the supposed invader was in fact on his own property – within the boundaries of a lawful self-defense – then the jury should have no problem deciding who the real invader was, and who possessed the God-ordained right of self-defense. Your victim was a God-ordained officer in charge of his own property. He had lawful jurisdiction within that boundary, as described by Exodus 22:2. There was no call for help except an implicit one, and that implicit call was issued against an unlawful invader. According the conditions specified by Exodus 22:2, *you* were the unlawful invader. Also, you were not a mere thief; you were a murderer.

As Nathan told David, "Thou art the man" (II Sam. 12:7). David repented. Will you?

Your theological defense relies on highly selective quotations from the Westminster documents, to which you once took an oath. Those documents condemn you as a murderer, as does the Bible text cited by the Larger Catechism.

Your immortal soul is on the line. So are the reputations of the church that suspended you from lawful access to the Lord's Supper, the jury that has already condemned you for a Federal crime, the jury that is virtually sure to condemn you for a local crime (murder), the Westminster Assembly, and the Bible. I am doing what I can to persuade you of Nathan's warning, but I am also doing what I can to defend the biblical legal order that in fact should govern the jury's decision.

You continually refer in your letter to God's moral law, arguing that everyone is required to uphold it. I agree with you on this point. Juries are bound by this moral law. Your jury is therefore required to convict you. The first one already has. The second one probably will. Then you should be executed.

If you ever get paroled, you will kill again, won't you? You will feel duty-bound to kill again. After all, the judicial issues will not have changed. The prosecuting attorney, the jury, and the judge had better understand your motivation.

The Neighbor in Trouble

Your October 7 letter emphasizes the neighbor who is being beaten. You cite the case of the Good Samaritan and the priest (p. 9). Wasn't it the responsibility of the priest to intervene if he had caught the robbers beating up the man? The answer is yes, it was. He might have intervened physically. He might have intervened by running to find a policeman. Does this answer in any way justify your actions? I don't think so.

Let us restructure your argument better to match your own situation. A priest is walking along the highway, and he sees another man who is *suspected* of being a robber. The man is on

his own property. There is no victim in sight. The priest walks over to the suspected robber and announces: "We both know that you are planning to commit several robberies today. Someone may even be killed. I will not permit this." The priest then pulls out a gun and kills the suspect.

The priest did not do this on the basis of vengeance, i.e., for the suspect's past crimes. He was not authorized by God to bring such retroactive judgment. The priest did not do this because he saw the man committing a crime. The priest did this because, *according to the priest*, he possesses the right of active defense. The priest says that inside the suspect's place of business, the suspect probably would have committed a crime later in the day. The priest took it upon himself to execute the evil-doer in advance: a pre-emptory strike, as it were.

What should be done to the priest? He should stand trial, and, if convicted of murder, he should be executed.

You did not catch your victim in the act. You killed him in his own parking lot. You presumed that he would commit an abortion later in the day. That he was willing to do this, there can be no doubt. The question is: Can a lone individual gun down another person because of the lone gunman believes he should bring pre-emptory justice? Should our legal system exempt from punishment all self-appointed executioners who claim to be able to read their victims' minds?

If the civil government were to allow you to get away with this crime, there would be no end to the bloody violence that would be unleashed. It would be open season on us all, including our wives, just as it was for the escort's wife. This is why there is no equal judicial ultimacy of magistrates and gunmen.

You have raised a legal issue: Who lawfully protects the unborn child? You have claimed that it is every person's equal authority to do this. But is it? Biblically, the parent has this initial authority. But the parent is the person hiring the assassin-abortionist. The state then should step in and stop the act. But the state has authorized this form of assassination. Thus,

you conclude, there must be what I have called an implicit cry for help from the unborn infant.

You argue that anyone has the God-given authority to intervene to stop the act by killing the hired assassin. To which I ask: Says who? You argue that the equal ultimacy of the one and the many authorizes any person to intervene. This is an abstract philosophical argument in search of specific biblical support. Your one suggested biblical example was Moses' slaying of the Egyptian taskmaster. First, Moses caught the tyrant in the act. You did not. Second, Moses was an adopted member of the household of Pharaoh, the supreme civil ruler. You held no such position of authority. Third, Moses did not imagine that his own people would immediately reject his act of interposition. You did know; you had already been excommunicated. So, you did not act in terms of civil authority, which you did not possess, or representative authority from the church, from which you had been judicially excluded. You are not Moses.

Your defense then turned to history. And what history you have turned to! You cited as a legitimizing precedent the bloody work of John Brown (p. 13). You did not specify whether you were talking about his raid on Harper's Ferry in 1859, which more than any other event brought on the Civil War, or his murder of four unarmed men at Pottawatomie Creek, Kansas, in 1856. In either case, it astounds me that you would cite Brown in your defense. Otto Scott's book, *The Secret Six: John Brown and the Abolitionist Movement* (Times Books, 1979), has stated the case against Brown in no uncertain terms. Since Scott was an employee of Rushdoony's Chalcedon Foundation from 1983 until two weeks ago, it should have occurred to you that Brown is not beloved in Christian Reconstructionist circles.

Then you cited the peasant revolts of Western Europe. That you should cite those murderous hordes as your predecessors reinforces my original contention: you are a revolutionary. It was to their legacy of mass destruction that Karl Marx's colleague Friedrich Engels also appealed in *The Peasant War in*

Germany (1850). For decades, Marx's name was on this book, not Engels' name. The co-founders of Communism understood quite well who their predecessors were and what they did. I think you do, too.

You refused to respond to my technological argument, namely, that with the introduction of chemical abortifacients, the war on the unborn moves from the public clinic to the medicine cabinet in the home. I asked you: How will those committed to your tactics defend the unborn child when Mama swallows something that will kill it? Will lone gunners invade homes, shooting down mothers, thereby also killing the infants? You prudently remained silent. I can hardly blame you. There is no possible answer that conforms to your call to defend the innocent through private execution.

You have thrown away your life in a futile attack on a technically obsolescent medical procedure. You were fighting the old war, not the next one. You have played the fool's role in a deadly drama, but unlike fools in most dramas, you were armed.

This is what bad theology frequently does to those who adopt it. It makes fools out of them.

What I am saying is that you autonomously gunned down two men without cause. I am also saying that you symbolically attacked a representative of a medical specialty that is about to become obsolescent. I will add this: your act, if imitated, will speed up the introduction of chemical abortifacients. This will bring murder down to mass-discount price levels. As the price of this bloody service falls, more of it will be demanded. As murder gets easier and cheaper, it will become more common.

If the American abortifacient industry erects a statue honoring its most distinguished marketer, you should be the subject.

You lose either way, i.e., the victimized infants lose. If your act creates a successful political reaction against the pro-life movement, the resulting extension of time for legalized abortion will destroy untold hundreds of thousands of innocent babies. On the other hand, if your murderous act is imitated,

and medical abortionists leave the business, mass chemical slaughter will begin a lot sooner.

In either case, vastly more blood will be on your hands than the blood of those two men in the parking lot.

You wrote your October 11 letter: "Gary – you know in your heart of hearts that what I'm saying is true." On the contrary, I know in my heart of hearts that if you do not repent publicly for both your writings and your twin acts of murder, you will stand condemned in God's heavenly court, just as you have stood condemned in man's courts, both ecclesiastical and civil.

You ended with this: "Repent of your error, Gary, in God's name, and for the love of those made in his image. Quit suppressing this *manifestly* apparent truth, that whatever Force is justified in the defense of a born child is justified in the defense of an unborn child." You even capitalized Force.

You are correct only with respect to what the civil authorities should do to protect both the born and the unborn: execute convicted perpetrators. You are incorrect with respect to what the private individual can lawfully do when church, state, and family have declared otherwise. They have authorized evil things in our day, but this fact does not authorize the creation of a new office: the lone gunner for Jesus. The solution to murder is not murder. More to the point, the solution to a suspected murder this afternoon is not a pre-emptory murder this morning.

The state does not have the God-given authority to shoot down a person just because some public official believes that later on this afternoon, the suspect may commit a murder. You did not possess this authority, either. What the state cannot lawfully do to stop a crime, the lone gunner for Jesus cannot lawfully do.

Your Ecclesiastical Status

You challenged me in your October 11 letter to talk with the elders at Trinity Presbyterian Church, which you claim did not

excommunicate you but only suspended you from the Lord's Supper. That is, you were supposedly merely forbidden to take communion. You stated that in my initial letter, I had misrepresented your judicial status. I contacted Rev. Schneider, your former pastor, who informed me today that you were an excommunicate prior to the shootings.

You argue that your original excommunication (May, 1993) was overturned by the higher court that you insisted should hear the case. The penalty was reduced to a suspension from the Lord's Supper, which is the penalty of excommunication ("away from the communion table"), though indefinite rather than permanent. But the court warned you to get this matter settled. It told you to return to church. You never showed up again.

As you well know, for a suspended church member to break away and form his own home church is an act of rebellion (contumacy). It is an excommunicable offence. The local church excommunicated you a second time. It cleared this decision with the higher court, which verbally consented. The pastor was writing a detailed position paper on your case to submit to you when you shot the two men. But the church did not send you the letter and the position paper officially informing you of its decision, which it presumed you understood. The church has tried to explain all this to the press, but Presbyterian law is not readily comprehended even by Presbyterians, let alone by reporters. The church has said repeatedly that it excommunicated you, and you have never publicly denied this.

Spare me your nit-picking technical objections. Jesus warned against straining at gnats and swallowing camels (Matt. 23:24). You are overly concerned about my supposed misrepresentation of your present church membership status, yet you are without remorse for having gunned down two unarmed men.

The judicial issue here is your ecclesiastical rebellion. You were formally and publicly designated as an ecclesiastical rebel many months before you pulled the trigger. The Trinity Pres-

byterian Church thereby saved itself and the church at large from a very embarrassing situation. The press has generally ignored the church issue because your local church did the correct thing while there was still time. Had it not done so, it would have been pilloried by the press.

I hope this will serve as a warning to other congregations. If they leave people on their rolls who espouse your views, they are asking for trouble. They are also asking for trouble if they do excommunicate such people but fail to get every word on record and then refuse to release formal judicial summary documents promptly, as your most recent counter-claims prove. Your church thought you knew you were excommunicated; you now claim that you weren't. Be assured: you were. Rev. Schneider assures me that a letter to this effect will be sent to you tomorrow: October 19.

Conclusion

Your autonomous act has placed in jeopardy the lives of perhaps millions of unborn infants, either because of a potential political backlash against you that will extend the present abortion laws or because of the speeding up of the introduction of abortifacients. Therefore, I am doing what I can do deflect the public's legitimate moral outrage against you from hitting the pro-life movement, as well as God's church. By God's grace to His church, you took your murderous action as a church-condemned man. If the media can be persuaded to report your case honestly, the public will regard your dual assassination as the act of a condemned man outside of God's church and acting on his own in defiance of Bible-revealed law and therefore also God's moral law. To the extent that you are portrayed as representing Christianity, you become a gigantic liability. This is why there is such a thing as excommunication. This is why God honors it in eternity.

Unfortunately, the public may see you presented by the media, not as a martyr, but as the creator of a martyr. I prefer

to see your victim positioned as a hired assassin, which every abortionist is, biblically speaking. This positioning will not be what the media will try to establish during your trial, but I still have high hopes that you will not be positioned as a *hired* assassin, with the church in the broadest sense as the one who hired you. You were an assassin acting on your own, but under the authority of the dark one with whom Adam covenanted, and with whom you implicitly covenanted by failing to submit to the discipline of your church. Again, I am speaking judicially. I cannot read your heart or your mind – just as you could not read your two victims' hearts and minds. We have to go by what the law says. Biblical law says you are presently trapped under Adam's covenant and its eternal negative sanctions.

Even if the media ignore this, Christians who read my letters may come to the correct conclusion. I hope so, anyway. That is why I wrote these two letters. I am concerned that the general public will see you as a Christian, which you are not, judicially speaking, while the Christian public will see you as merely misguided, when you were (and remain) self-consciously, defiantly rebellious against church authority. Rev. Schneider says you gloated in your excommunication, telling him and the other elders that you were proud of it.

Don't worry about your next jury. The worst the state can do is execute you. Worry about what God can do (Matt. 10:28).

Sincerely yours,

Gary North

* * * * *

On November 2, 1994, Paul Hill was convicted of first degree murder. He offered no defense during his trial – no cross-examination of witnesses, nothing. Nevertheless, had he wanted

to defend himself based on his defense of the unborn innocent, this would have been prohibited. The judge ruled as inadmissible any defense based on the defense of unborn children. This means that the judge in effect had passed sentence on him; the jury was to serve as little more than a rubber stamp. In fact, an American jury has the sovereign right to declare a man innocent for any reason it pleases. It can judge both the law and the facts of the case because it possesses final sovereignty when it declares a person innocent – the law against double jeopardy. But judges seek to thwart this absolute judicial sovereignty by prohibiting jurors from hearing certain kinds of evidence and certain lines of argument. Judges do not inform jurors of the sovereign authority of the American jury to declare anything it wants behind closed doors.

Having remained mute in his two trials, Federal and local, Hill was declared guilty by both juries. This jury deliberated for only 20 minutes. On November 3, the jury was ready to consider sentencing, although the judge has the final say – another way to undermine juries. At this point, Hill at last spoke up: to warn the jury in the name of God. “In an effort to suppress this truth, you may mix my blood with the blood of the unborn and those who have fought to defend the oppressed. However, truth and righteousness will prevail. May God help you to protect the unborn as you would want to be protected.”

Here was an excommunicated man – judicially the equivalent of a heathen – calling his jurors before the bar of God’s justice. Here was a murderer who had gunned down two men and injured a woman, presenting himself as a God’s prophetic spokesman. Here was a man who had left the scene of his crime, telling the jury that it had a responsibility to defend the oppressed. Here was a self-appointed bringer of shotgun vengeance warning the jury against . . . what?

The jury took four hours to come to a conclusion: death in the electric chair. Life for life: this is God’s mandate. The jury did its duty. The church had already done its duty.

Scripture Index

Exodus

20:13	7
22:2-3	5, 33
30:12-16	4
32:28	5

Numbers

25:6-14	6
35	5
35:31	33

Deuteronomy

7:16	4
17:6-7	5
21:1-9	8, 17, 29
21:6-9	9
28:15-66	10

I Samuel

15:33	6
-------	---

II Samuel

12:7	35
------	----

Matthew

10:28	30
-------	----

16:19	3
18:18	2-3
23:24	40

Romans

12:4	26
12:19	30
13:1-7	30

Galatians

5:21	6
------	---

I Timothy

4:2	20
-----	----

I Peter

4:15	6
------	---

II John

1:9-11	2
--------	---

Revelation

21:5-8	6
--------	---

INDEX

anarchism, 11

abortifacient, 17–21, 38–39,
41

abortion

accomplices, 22

back alleys, 8

Bible, 15–16

God's focus, 16–17

illegal, 7–8

legalized, 17

local, 17

Main Street, 8

number, 18, 23

numbers, 7

politics, 29

protest, 19

re-criminalization, 25

resistance, to, 25–26

universal, 7, 15

Adam, 11

alleys, 8

anarchism, 13

army, 4

assassins, 36, 37, 41, 42

atonement, 9

autonomy, 7, 23

Babylon, 10

back alleys, 8

Bahnsen, Greg, 2

baptism, 11

blood avenger, 5

bloodguilt, 9, 16, 30

bodyguard, 27

boundaries, 24, 27

Bray, Michael, 8, 10

Brown, John, 37

Calvin, John, 3

Canaanites, 4

church, 14

churches, 28

cities of refuge, 5

civil magistrate, 12, 17

Colombia, 22

common sense, 24

community

approval, 17

guilty, 9

judgment, 9

representative, 13

spokesman, 13

standards, 14–17

conscience, 20

covenant

hierarchy, 12

institutions, 11

office, 12

- pattern, 10
 - crossfire, 29
- David**, 35
- Defensive Action, 1, 21
- Donahue Show, 2
- Engels, Friedrich**, 37
- excommunication, 2, 11, 14, 40–41
- execution, 5, 6, 27
- father**, 12
- French Revolution, 21, 23
- Good Samaritan**, 35–36
- guillotine, 23
- guilt, 20, 24
- Gunn, Dr., 1, 8, 23
- hell**, 2, 3
- help, call for, 34, 37
- hierarchy, 12, 26
- Hippocratic Oath, 7, 16
- household, 5, 34
- humanism, 29
- individual**, 12
- individualism, 11
- Jones, Archie**, 32
- Jordan, James, 32
- judgment, 15
- justice, 36
- Keen, Greg & Gloria**, 32
- Khomeini, 24
- King, Martin Luther, 25
- kingdom, 13
- Levites**, 5
- lone gunman, 24, 36, 38, 39
- Main Street**, 8
- Marx, Karl, 37
- military, 4
- minister, 12
- Moab, 10
- Moses, 37
- mothers, 8, 18, 20
- murder, 6, 9, 20
- Nathan**, 35
- non-violence, 25
- oath**, 11
- office, 12
- officer, 12
- Operation Rescue, 4
- ordination, 12, 27
- pacifism**, 4
- peasant revolts, 37
- people, 16, 29
- perfectionism, 20, 23–25
- Philistia, 10
- picketing, 18–19
- pills, 18
- police, 22
- politics, 19, 29
- pre-emptory strike, 36, 39
- priest, 35–36
- priesthood, 5–6, 9
- prophet, 10, 30–31

repentance, 2, 28
representation, 11, 13, 26
resistance, 25–26
responsibility, 24, 25
revolution, 11, 21, 23
Robespierre, 21
Rushdie, Salmon, 24
Rushdoony, R. J., 2, 10–11

sacraments, 3
Schneider, Rev., 40–41
Scott, Otto, 37
self-defense, 5
shotgun, 4, 14
sixth commandment, 33–34
spokesman, 13

subordination, 12
Supreme Court, 21

technology, 17–21, 38
Trinity, 11
Trinity Presbyterian Church,
32, 40–41

vengeance, 26–29
vigilante, 25
violence, 7, 23, 24, 27
virtue, 21–23

Westminster Confession,
32–33
witnesses, 5

Does the Bible *Really* Have the Answers?

"The Bible has the answers to life." Well-meaning Christians say this to non-Christians. But do they really mean it?

It's one thing to tell people that the Bible has the answers to all of life's problems. It's another thing to be able to provide these answers, and also provide the biblical evidence.

It's risky to tell someone that the Bible has all the answers if you don't know where to look up the answers in the Bible. Someone may call your bluff.

Meanwhile, most Christian college professors tell us: "The Bible isn't a textbook on [my academic subject]." In other words, they deny that the Bible has answers to life's questions. They deny that the Bible tells them what they should believe in their areas of authority.

Economic Questions

What if someone asks a Christian this: "What's the Bible's answer to poverty? To inflation? To unemployment? To tax policy? To economic depression?" What should the Christian answer? He will probably not know what to say.

The Institute for Christian Economics was established in 1976 to provide biblical answers for economic questions like these. The ICE is dedicated to applying the Bible to economic theory and policy.

The ICE has been publishing detailed books on economic questions since 1982. Gary North, the founder of the ICE, has written five volumes of his *Economic Commentary on the Bible*: Genesis through Leviticus. He has also written dozens of other books relating to economics, history, and theology.

If you want answers, you can find them in these books, or in one of the ICE's newsletters: *Biblical Economics Today*, *Christian Reconstruction*, and *Biblical Chronology*, which are sent to ICE's supporters.

Humanism Is Bankrupt

For three centuries, Christians have lived on the scraps that have fallen from humanism's table. But humanism's table has always been filled with food stolen from the Bible.

Now the humanists' pantry is almost bare. As humanists have abandoned belief in an orderly universe, in fixed moral law, and moral cause and effect, they have begun to lose faith in science, technology, and the free market.

Humanists are afraid of pollution, afraid of economic growth, afraid of bogeymen such as the greenhouse effect (no evidence of worldwide warming), the growing hole in the ozone layer (no evidence that ozone holes keep growing or that aerosol sprays cause them), and other non-existent horrors.

The Way to Turn Things Around

Christians can't beat something with nothing. If humanism is wrong, then where are the uniquely biblical answers? If Christians cannot suggest any, why should the public pay attention to them? Christians need biblical answers.

To get answers, sign up for a free six-month subscription to the ICE newsletters. Send your request to ICE, Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711. Just say, "Sign me up for my free subscription."