

There was a particular reason why I was on the show in my opinion. I was featured there because I was saying things that are not said by many people. I have said in response to the recent slaying of a practicing abortionist in Florida that this is justifiable homicide.

The condemnation of this action has been mindless. Nonpacifist Christians who declare the full humanity of the fetus condemn those who forcefully defend the helpless child without even offering an explanation for this ostensible inconsistency. Even contemporary apologetes for the high profile operation-rescue style of intervention have offered no explanation for the strict line they draw between "peaceful" and "violent" methods of intervention.

Chuck Colson pulled no punches in response to the Griffin event. In his Prison Fellowship newsletter, *Jubilee*(May/June 1993), he wrote:

Dr. Gunn's murder was a horrid, senseless act, immediately condemned by responsible prolife leaders. And it left not only a bereaved family, but also a nation struggling to maintain its democratic balance.

Colson's characterization of the homicide as "senseless" is a thoughtless, knee-jerk reaction. Twelve babies whom Gunn intended to kill didn't die that day. By the abortion industry's own reckoning three or four of them will survive to natural birth, thus firmly establishing the shooting as sensible and salutary. I might suggest that if the country hasn't lost it's democratic balance from the death of 30 million babies, it can remain quite stable through the loss of a few damned (Evangelically Theologically speaking) abortionists.

There is a need for a fresh look at the ethics of the use of force. Are Christians pacifists? Is there a legitimate time or place for a Christian to use force. Is there ever a time when he may shed blood?

What ought the Samaritan to have done had he come upon the victim in the midst of the beating? Or, if you will, what would Jesus have done? In order to avoid doing harm to his "neighbors" - the muggers - would he have hidden himself behind a rock and waited until the beating and robbing of the neighbor victim was complete before loving him too? Or would he have wielded a sword in defense of the victim neighbor against the aggressor neighbor? The questions illustrate the fundamental issue of forcefully defending the innocent at the expense of the guilty assailant.

More difficult is the ethical question of self-defense at the expense of another, even the aggressor. While the duty to use force to protect others is a sound