

Tape 7:

Let us pray.

Shine in our hearts the Lord Jesus Christ who loves all humanity, the pure light of your Devine knowledge and open the eyes of our minds that we may understand the announcing of your holy gospel. Serve us in all your blessed commandments so that the trampling all carnal desires we may begin to live according to the spirit, both willing and doing everything for your pleasure. For you are the light of our souls and bodies, Christ God, and we render the glory to you and your eternal father and to your all holy, glory and life-giving spirit now and always, and forever and ever, Amen.

The saying goes that survival is the first law of the jungle. The jungle is all against all. And survival is required of you if you are to do anything else. And so the fight is to survive. We often hear people say; O I know Jesus was the Lamb of God. I know he was the suffering servant, I know he taught the Sermon on the Mount and to return good for evil, and to love your enemies. I know he rejected violence and homicide, and enmity, but it's a jungle out there. People out there are willing to crush you, step on you, hurt you, destroy you. It just can't be done.

Of course the question then has to be raised. If Jesus' teachings are impractical, why did he teach them? On the other hand, there is nothing in the Gospel. Absolutely nothing in the Gospel that says the follower of Jesus, the Christian, is relieved from following Jesus' teachings until the rest of the world does. It is nonsense to say when the central committee of the Communist Party in China begins to follow Jesus' teachings, then we Christians will. The very nature of Jesus coming into the world, God coming into the world, was that he was only one, living a particular truth, whether anyone else lived it or not. He did not wait, nor did the apostles or disciples wait for everyone else to live the teaching. All the Jews in the area and so forth and so on. They lived them. It is no excuse for Christians to say that no one else is living these things and therefore it's dangerous for me to live them, and therefore I am accepted or exempted from living the teaching of Jesus.

It is no excuse for Christians to say if I live these teachings, if I take seriously and live Jesus sermon on the mount, if I try to love as Jesus loves I won't survive. It is no excuse for Christians to say Jesus teachings are impractical because if the will of God is impractical, then we have no place else to go. Original Christianity was not called Christianity. Christians are first called Christians long after the death and resurrection of Jesus and antiarch. Its recorded in scripture. The original name of Christianity was The Way – The Way - in scripture. It was called The Way which meant a way of living; a moral way of existing in the World consistent with the will of God. Jesus teachings were the way. We all know deep in our hearts that Jesus really does expect us to live what he taught. Regardless of our rank or our place in the church, regardless of how much we rationalize and justify not living what Jesus taught, we all know that we are meant to live what Jesus taught. Regardless of how well we live what other people teach, whether it be Plato or Aerostotle or just someone in the local newspaper talking, we all know

regardless of how well what other people teach, the living that counts is living what Jesus taught. What I'd like to do today and this evening that may be helpful to you, is I would like to try to examine what is probably the central impediment to living what Jesus taught us to live. I take my understanding here from the Biblical scholar as I mentioned Father John L. McKenzie and you can find what I'm talking about here in his interpretation of the new testament which is called the power and the wisdom. But I use it not because he says it but because I think he's on to something and I think this is essential reality that keeps Christians from making a commitment day in a day out to love as Christ loved. So let me begin by putting up on the board a little sketch of what is kind of an analysis of what are the impediments or what is the essential impediment that prevents Christians from living the gospel. The gospel as Jesus taught it, not the gospel as modified according to what we feel we have to modify it in order to survive in this jungle. McKenzie says that there is an abyss between Christian ethics and rational ethics. There is an abyss between the ethics that Jesus taught and the ethics of reason. Ethics is the just the way of right and wrong to live, OK. He says, and I agree, all rational ethical systems, all ways of right and wrong based on reason alone, whether they be Aristotle or Plato, whether they be personal or social ethics, whether they be just the ethics of someone who is uneducated and worked out his or her own way – all rational ethical systems have as their primary operational first principle – survival. All ethics of reason have as their primary operational first principle – survival. If they are personal ethics, its personal survival. If its collective ethics, its social survival. But survival is the primary value in all-rational ethics. Why? Well phylosopically speaking since reason buckles when it comes up against death, reason has no power, absolutely none to get beyond death. If you know how to get beyond death by reason alone, if you've figured that out by reason alone, you won't have to bet on the Irish sweepstakes to have some money. All you have to do is – people will be at your door throwing money. But reason stops, it just stops dead at death. It can do nothing with death, therefore, if there is going to be a good a true a beautiful, if there are going to be wonderful things in life, whatever they may be, you have to survive first. If all you're working with is reason. Therefore the first obligation of rational ethics is to survive. Then we can do other things. The test of this is all rational ethical systems have secondary intercalary?? Values. For example, no killing, or they may have no lying or no stealing, etc. No committing arson, as values. But, when survival is threatened then you can kill, you can lie, you can steal, you can burn people's houses down. Which shows that survival is the primary value in rational thinking, rational ethical thinking. In fact, in rational ethics, survival justifies anything. All governments, for example, have as part of their operations, things like the KGB, or the CIA, or the Mused – these kinds of operations that are black ?? operations. They are not legal, they are totally unconstitutional, but all governments have them. They operate outside government. They kill, they maim, and they do all kinds of things the governments find necessary. No one knows what they do. But every once in awhile by accident, something that they did comes into the paper. The CIA or the KGB did this, or the mused did this. Something gets into the paper that shouldn't get into the paper. And there's no explaining it because it's illegal, its unconstitutional, its immoral and so forth and so on. And what does the head of Government say to explain it – it's a national security matter. And everyone's "oh a national security matter, then it's alright". What he's saying and telling people is don't ask me about it, it was a matter of survival for the

states and survival justifies anything. This is the consciousness of every day rational ethics. On the other hand, McKinsey says the operational first principle of Christian ethics is the primary operational principle of Christian ethics, is Christ like love. To love as Christ loved. Love as defined by Jesus. This governs the entire ethical structure of Christianity. As a matter of fact, he says, love is not the center of Christian ethics, love is the center and the circumference and everything in between. What is not an act of love is morally worthless in the Universe. That is, it has no effect on evil – none. When McKenzie says that Christ like love is the primary value, and says that what is not an act of love is morally worthless in the Universe, he's saying nothing more than St. Paul said in his great hymn of 1 Corinthians 13. If I have all the eloquence of men and women are angels but speak without love I'm nothing but a gong booming or a symbol clashing. If I have faith to move mountains but am without love it will do me no good whatsoever. If I give away all that I have piece by piece to the poor, and even if I let them take my body to burn, social service and mo???, but without Love I am nothing at all. Love is the primary value in Christian ethics. St. Paul picks those categories of religious oratory, faith, mo??, social service in the extreme, because if anything could save without love, these things would save without love. If anything had value without love, these realities have value without love and if they don't, nothing does. A cup of tea passed to someone who's thirsty. A cup of tea passed to someone who's thirsty without love is morally worthless in the Universe. It does nothing to change the reality of evil in the Universe. We all know how we can for example pass a cup of tea to someone and its done in such a way in such a bad spirit, that they would rather die of thirst than take it. We all know how on the other hand we can pass a cup of tea to someone and it can be an expression of concern, care, love, friendship and so forth. What McKenzie is saying is, in the Christian life, the particular act, religious oratory or St. Paul too, religious oratory is a cup of tea is supposed to be the carrier of the spirit of Christ, the spirit of Love. And by carrying the spirit of Christ the particular act does what its supposed to do; and that is it confronts and conquers evil in ways we do not understand because love is the power of God. Now, obviously to any of us there is a world of difference between getting up in the morning and saying "it's a jungle out there and I've gotta take care of myself". Arming oneself in the morning practically, you know. To go out there and fight it out in a dog eat dog world. Vs. getting up in the morning and saying "today my task is to love as Jesus loves anyone who confronts, crosses my path". Those are two different consciousnesses. Utterly different consciousnesses. They are separated like this. They are two different choices about what to do with life that day. As far apart as they are, psychologically and emotionally, the consciousness of facing life in a survival ethic and a consciousness of facing life in a way in an ethic of loving as Christ loved. What ultimately separates Christian ethics from rational ethics is this: What is the primary value in rational ethics, survival, is not even on the list of values in Christian ethics. Survival is a non-value in the New Testament. Survival is not a value in the Christian way, in the Christian ethical or moral life. Why? Because survival is guaranteed. I am the resurrection in the life, he or she who believes in me will live forever. Nothing, to quote St. Paul can separate you from the love of God made visible in Christ Jesus our Lord. Survival is guaranteed. No one outside yourself can affect your eternal happiness your eternal life. And all that you need for eternal happiness and eternal life. Not Hitler, no one, absolutely no one. Not the next-door neighbor, no one. No one, in other words, no one can interfere with your

loving as Christ loved. You can be absolutely powerless and nailed to a cross and you can still love as Christ loved. Now as McKenzie points out, the ultimate folly of rational ethics is this: When survival is threatened, all the other values go out the window and their very opposites become noble. When survival is threatened, you can kill, you can burn peoples houses down. You can lie, you can steal. You name it you can do it. But after all that is done, survival is not what is achieved. At a bare minimum, at a bare maximum rather, all rational ethics can do is perhaps, perhaps and only perhaps, add a cubit or two to your life. An hour or a few days. But rational ethics in no way shape or form gives survival. Only a moment or two of longevity. What Jesus is talking about is life is short, eternity is long. Rational ethics deals only with the – at best – with trying to get an hour or two of longevity in physical life. What Jesus guarantees is eternal life.

Now says McKenzie, it is only after you see this that this sentence in the New Testament makes sense. Love your enemies. The enemy, says McKenzie, is not someone we set out here and say you are my enemy. The enemy by definition in the World is that one who negatively affects the survival of some self-interest. It may be my job, it may be my good name, it may be my country, it may be my life. But the enemy is the one who threatens, or at least we imagine he or she does, the survival of some self-interest, that's the enemy. McKenzie says you do not, what the new testament love of enemy does not mean is I make someone an enemy, put him or her out here and love them. It means there is no reason in existence to make anyone an enemy. Because no one, no one in your life can threaten the survival of all you need – for eternal salvation – no one. Absolutely no one. There is no need to make people enemies. The worst enemy that you would have if you were a secular person, a non-Christian person, the worst enemy you can imagine, gives you the opportunity to love as Christ would love. To love the enemy as Christ loved the enemy. And therefore gives you a chance, an opportunity to enhance your salvation and the salvation of the other party. But the freedom to love your enemy comes with the belief that survival is guaranteed. That Jesus is the resurrection and the life and those who believe in him need not fear death. Nothing can separate us from the love of God made visible in Christ Jesus, to quote St. Paul.

That's what frees people to love the enemy. Without that belief, that Jesus is with us, that God is with us; loves us, cares for us, watches over us and will protect us for eternity. And wants us to live out of the image and likeness that we're made in to live out of that God who is love, without that belief that God protects us, love of enemy is impossible. In fact, in rational ethics, love your enemies' makes no sense at all. You can't even say it – its illogical. To say love your enemies when your primary value is to protect yourself from your enemies, anyone who threatens your survival, is a nonsense sentence. Jesus liberates us to love our enemies by guaranteeing us that he loves us and that we will survive. That no one outside of us can negatively affect us.

Let me tell you something about loving your enemies. Love your enemies is the only sentence in the new testament, the only sentence in the new testament, that all schools of biblical scholarship agree upon as being the very words of Jesus. It is the single sentence that we are certain that Jesus spoke. It has no precedents, it does not exist in the Old Testament, it is Jesus work. Love your enemies are the very words of Jesus. Second

thing, every time love your enemies occurs in the New Testament, it occurs in the plural, never in the singular. Which means all enemies, that is anyone that threatens anything, is not to become like the pagans allow that person to become – an enemy. For what difference if we love those who love us, even the pagans do that. But I say to you, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, pray for those who persecute you, we know the words. It means all enemies – the next-door neighbor, the guy at the job, the guy at the grocery store that steals money from us, the Russians, it means anyone who could possibly be an enemy. All enemies.

And finally, love your enemies in the new testament never occurs as a declarative sentence, it always occurs as an imperative sentence, a command. It is not an option in the gospel. No place in the gospel is presented other than as a command. This is what you must do. And it's the very words of Jesus. You see what does love your enemies' mean? What does it mean to live in this consciousness? That survival is guaranteed as a Christian, that's what we believe. We are baptized into Christ, we are one with Christ. Christ won't lose anyone that the father has given to him. We are safe, we are secure. What does that mean in actuality? Well many years ago, 30 years ago, more than 30 years ago now, this priest that I was talking about, the biblical scholar, John L. McKenzie, was on a television program in which it was one of these programs where people discuss a particular problem. This was a new thing at the time in the late 1950's, but the subject at that time, in the late 1950's, which you may or may not remember – one of the great moral questions of the day was, what if someone goes and builds a bomb shelter to protect them from a nuclear attack? And then the sirens ring and the nuclear bombs are coming, and he goes down to his cellar, a bomb shelter, and locks himself in. One person can live in the shelter indefinitely, but 2 people can't survive in it because of oxygen, food liquids and so forth. What do you do? What's the moral thing to do? That was the question in front of the panel that night. And so there was McKenzie who was a biblical scholar and there was a lawyer I think from the University of Chicago, and a political scientist from Northwestern University, and someone else I think the Paul University. And they went on and talking about as this question was talked about at the time. The way people would talk about, you'll probably remember, one person would argue that well the man bought and paid for the shelter himself, it was his shelter, and therefore he had an absolute right to it. Then the other person would say something like, yea but well suppose the person in the shelter was just a bum, couldn't do anything, couldn't help anybody, but the person outside was a doctor and could help people after the bomb came. Then the other person would argue, yea well he might have been a doctor, but the bum was smart enough to buy the shelter. And on the discussions went, back and forth and back and forth and back and forth. Now McKenzie was a brilliant man and very, very talkative. During this particular program, when there was only about 10 minutes or so left of the program, the moderator said, Father McKenzie, we've been here for almost an hour, and you haven't addressed the problem, you haven't said a word. Now you've been on our program before and you've always had wonderful insights and so forth, and you've sat here for almost an hour with simply not saying anything to the problem. Why? Why haven't you said anything? And he said, I haven't said anything, he said, because for the Christian, there's no problem. And the moderator says what do mean, a nuclear weapon is coming, a man is in his shelter, one's inside, he goes through

the whole thing again. And McKenzie said absolutely not, there is no problem to the Christians. If what you're assuming is the Christian is the one inside the door, he said its very clear what the Christian must do. He says, if the Christian is the one inside, then the Christian knows from the gospel that he's supposed to love as Christ loves. But loving as Christ loved is not a generalized feeling of love for all humanity, gospel love is very, very concrete. You are to love the neighbor that crosses your path moment to moment every day. Not a generalized feeling that I love humanity. Now here you have a neighbor outside and this person is absolutely terrorized, pounding at the door. He's terrorized – you have a way of helping him, you have a way of relieving the terror. You open the door, as a Christian, you walk out, you let him go in, there's no problem. And the moderator said, what do you mean Father McKenzie there's no problem? He said, nuclear weapons are coming, they're going to blow the place up in ten minutes. He says that's not a problem, as long as I love as Christ loved, I go to Heaven. And then there was that dead silence on television. It might have only been ten seconds but it felt like 50 years, you know. And finally the moderator just broke it and said, well we've just got to get back to our discussion. The point being, everyone was discussing out of this and he was responding out of this. He wasn't stupid. He knew this kind of talk could go on forever. But he knew in reality there was only once choice, you are either going to love, or you weren't going to do it. In the moment.

And so, to quote McKenzie just one more time here, he says, the gospel is simple to understand and simple to execute. The gospel is simple to understand and simple to execute providing we are willing to suffer. All the libraries are filled up with books and tones telling us why we don't have to follow Jesus. Why we can change Jesus teaching. Why we can ignore Jesus teaching the minute we don't want to suffer. As we said yesterday, the gospel does not say suffering saves, the gospel says love saves. But it recognizes in a world where evil has inundated all reality to love, you may have to suffer. The gospel is simple to understand, simple to execute, providing you are willing to suffer.

I look back at the picture of St. Theresa in the back of this chapel, ????, and I think about love your enemies. And we often think of loving your enemies and loving as Christ loved in terms of loving the national enemies. But as I pointed out, love your enemies' means anyone that would become an enemy. It makes no difference where you live. You can live in Africa, you can live in Ireland, you can live in a monastery, wherever you may live, people can become your enemies. They can negatively affect something that you want or that you want to keep. When St. Theresa was dying in September of 1897, her sister Pauline records that at one time one of the sisters came into the room with a broth, kind of a soup that she had just made, into the infirmary room where Theresa was. And she wanted Theresa to drink the soup, take some of the soup, because she had gone to such trouble making it. And as you know there is a point where you can get so, so sick that you can't even swallow. In fact every breath is just gruesome in going through the throat. It's physically impossible. She couldn't swallow. She couldn't take even a spoonful of the soup. The sister got more and more agitated, and finally in a huff left the room with the soup. But as a way to strike back, a way to strike at Theresa when she got out of the room, there was a sister passing by, right by the room. And she says to the sister passing by, she says, huh, they think that one in there is such a good person, she's

not even a good sister. And then she tells the story, that she wouldn't take the soup. But in the strange way that evil attacks people through people. That was precisely what Theresa did not need to hear. She was dying at 24 years old, she had struggled to be a good sister, and when your sick, the way things hit you, and when she heard the sister say, that one there isn't even a good sister, it just crushed her. And she broke into tears thinking she should have tried to swallow the soup, and just crushed. Well anyway, her sister Celine came into the room a minute later and saw Theresa in this state. Suffocating and crying at the same time, because it's the last month of tuberculosis. And she tried to find out what was going on and finally Theresa told her the story about the sister coming into the room and what she said. And Celine did what perhaps what most of us would do, she turned around and went to fly out the room and get the sister and straighten her out. And Theresa says no, no, no, and they had a little back and forth, and she says don't do it, and Celine says she can't get away with that, insensitive, and on and on and on. Theresa says I know what I have to do, I'll take care of it. Celine says to her, how can you take care of it, you're on the bed, you can't move, your sick. She says I'll take care of it, I'll take care of it, I'll take care of it a hundred percent. And finally Celine says how are you gonna take care of it? And she says I know exactly what I have to do. When that sister comes into the infirmary again, I have to give her my biggest smile. She took care of it one hundred percent. The ingredients were there for immunity all over the place, but she knew what Christ would do to return good for evil. And that's why she is who she is and that's what her little way is. The secret hidden little deeds of Christ like love toward both friend and enemy. It's not just nations, it's the smallest, it can be in the family towards a child or a husband, or a wife or a mother – it goes on and on. But the thing is, this wasn't even an issue to her. How people would think about her, what would happen tomorrow in terms of survival, whether it would be done again. Her good name or anything else was all let go, and the only issues was to love the person. And of course you survive.

Now it seems to me that in talking about this subject, there really is a dimension that we have to raise. In the late 20th century we have run in to an incredible and overwhelming moral problem – abortion. Its an extraordinary problem, and it wouldn't be right to do a conference on the lamb of God, without addressing it. I think it was Martin Luther that said if you proclaim the gospel in all its fullness, except as it relates to the great moral problems of your day, you have failed to proclaim the gospel. In other words, you an go out and tell people about the trinity and about the virgin birth and so forth, but if they have a real problem going on the gospel has to be related to what they're living. And often times, we do just the opposite of that, we relate the gospel to everything and anything, except what's going on in front of us.

It reminds me of a story of a monsignor back in Boston who was retired, the monsignor was about 87 years old and every Wednesday he used to go to the senior citizens home to say Mass for the senior citizens which was nice and good and so forth. He would always give a little sermon at the senior citizens home every Wednesday, but as the story goes, the problem was that every fourth Wednesday, as sure as you live, every fourth Wednesday to the senior citizens, his homily would be a flaming sermon against artificial birth control. Now I'm not arguing about the objective truth of the sermon, this it's that this isn't a problem here. Senior citizens have problems, but this isn't one of them. He

wasn't bringing the gospel to the reality of the situation. And so we must bring the Lamb of God to the reality of abortion. The way I'd like to do it is this...I'd like to begin by asking you to think of two pictures, one right after the other. The first picture is this: a small clean well lighted room, 2 or 3 people there, high tech equipment, trained in the equipment, technology is just an extension of the senses, microscope is an extension, the eye, bulldozer of the hand. One of them looks through the equipment, and they see 1,2,3 little dots. They know if they look deeper, they will see that these dots are not dots but human beings. They will see human fingernails or human hands. They will see a human genetic system that only human beings have. Above all they will see an entire human future. But they don't look at the dots any deeper, they just treat them as dots, they turn on the equipment and they destroy it. That's a B52 bomber over Iraq, killing the enemy. I don't know why those dots down there to the bombardiers, why they thought they were enemies. What they thought was the survival that was at stake, but they thought that these people so negatively threatened survival that they had to be destroyed. And so they destroyed them. I don't know what the survival was, but they thought it. It may have been that if they didn't drop the bombs they would have been prosecuted. Or if they dropped them inaccurately they would have lost their job with the airlines, when they get out, their good recommendations. It may be that they really thought that if they didn't stop the Iraq's, that the Iraq's would go and be attacking the United States in two years – I don't know what they thought. But they were the enemy and survival is the first law and they killed them because they threatened their survival.

Now think of another clean well-lighted room. High tech equipment, 2 - 3 people who could use it. One of them takes a piece of the equipment and looks through it and sees 1 dot, 2 dots, 3 dots. If they look further they would see these dots are not dots, but had human fingernails, human hands. An entirely human genetic system, and above all a human future. But they don't look further, they turn on the equipment and they destroy the dots. That's an abortion clinic. I don't know why they think the child in uteri is the enemy, but what is going on is the same thing as in war. That child in uteri threatens the survival of some self interest that that person wants to survive. I don't know what the self-interest is. It may be that if they have the baby they will be embarrassed with social, just putting people down. It may be that they feel they can't afford the baby, they'll go broke. It may be they psychologically feel they can't handle...I don't know what the problem is. It may be that they wouldn't be able to go to school. That child so negatively affects the survival of some self-interest, it has become the enemy and therefore must be destroyed.

Now here is the point. I want to be very, very clear. Jesus teachings are, Jesus teachings, the gospel teachings are, love your enemies. Love your enemies. In utero and post utero. Jesus teachings are not love your enemies in utero, but you can kill them post utero. The teaching love your enemy in utero, but you can kill your enemy post utero is nothing other than a piece of philosophical speculation from reason as to who can be selectively killed in this world. It is not the teaching of Jesus. Jesus teaching is love all enemies. Anyone that teaches love your enemy in utero, that is no abortion, but you can engage in war and capital punishment is not teaching the gospel. They are teaching philosophy. They are making a distinction based on their own, remember our circle, their own little

perception of existence as to who can be killed and who shouldn't be killed. They are thinking the child in utero shouldn't be killed, but you can kill people outside the womb. That's not Jesus teaching. Jesus teaching is the teaching of love all your enemies – in utero and post utero.

Now there are other people in the world and those people teach you can kill the child in utero, but you can't kill anyone post utero. That also is not Jesus teaching. Jesus teaching is love your enemies in utero or post utero. Regardless of where the person exists that negatively affects your life. Your task is to love that person as Jesus loves that person.

Abortion is spreading. It's spreading all across the world and its spreading all across the church. The figures in the United States are that Christians have as many abortions as non-Christians. Poland has one of the highest abortion rates in the world. The figures are spreading and for some reason with this terrible, terrible evil, the power of God is being prevented from coming into the situation and stopping it. What I'm suggesting to you is this – the power of God is being prevented because so many of those who oppose abortion are not opposing all the other things that Jesus rejects. They are teaching philosophy instead of proclaiming the gospel. In January of 1991, the war in Iraq in the Gulf had started. On January 16th of 1991. In the United States, January 22 every year is the big anti abortion day because that's the anniversary of the Roe Wade decision that made abortion legal in the United States. So hundreds of thousands of people gather to oppose abortion on January 22nd of each year. On January 22 of 1991, hundreds of thousands of anti-abortion people were in Washington. There were hundreds and hundreds of signs – kill Hussein, bomb Iraq, nuke Hussein – pro war signs. The sign of American patriotism during that war to the people going over there and killing was the yellow ribbon. It was like a sea of yellow ribbons out there in the anti-abortion group. This is not the teaching of Jesus. The teaching of Jesus love all your enemies, reject all homicide, love as I have loved wherever the person is – in utero or post utero. But when you teach that you must love as Christ loved in utero, but you can kill people post utero, you don't have to love them as Christ loved them post utero, you absolutely undermine your own statement. You undermine it. The figures indicate, I'll just talk the United States right now. 70% of the anti-abortion people in the United States – 70% of the Christian anti-abortion people in the United States approve of capital punishment. Killing people if they commit a crime. Totally forgetting, it's totally contradictory in the extreme to Jesus. Jesus didn't proclaim the execution of prisoners, Jesus was a prisoner who was executed. Over 90% of the Christian people who appose abortion in the United States support war. Something that Jesus never taught. And why is it you ask that no one can hear what's being said. The answer is because what is being proclaimed is I will use homicidal violence when it's in my interest, but you can't use it when it's in your interest. That is not the teaching of Jesus. The teaching of Jesus is to love as I have loved which means no homicide – in utero, post utero. The teaching of Jesus is regardless of how survival appears to be threatened, just love in the situation and trust God. But how can you say to others love in a difficult situation. Say women with difficult pregnancies for one reason or another, when you yourself are doing just the opposite and have done just

the opposite and support just the opposite. And that is killing in a situation where your interest is threatened.

And so what I'm raising here tonight is, the power of God is directly proportional to the purity with which the gospel is proclaimed. A watered down gospel simply interferes with the power of God working. We either teach what Jesus taught or we have nothing to teach. But we have to teach it in all situation where it applies, not just where we want to teach it. Because if we only teach it where we want to teach it, then everyone else is going to say you are a farce. You are putting heavy burdens on us, but you won't carry them yourself, where your interests are threatened.

And so we are confronted here with a most serious problem. Are we going to return? Are we going to return to living under the protection of Abba – father, the God who is love. Are we going to return to that in all areas of life, or are we just going to tell women with difficult pregnancies that they have to accept the protection of the father and accept what they see is going to destroy their life. Are we going to say our homicide is right, but your homicide is wrong. Or are we going to preach, our task is to love as Christ has loved towards every human being – in utero and post utero – which means we don't kill any human being. Said another way, are we going to follow the way of the Lamb of God and proclaim the good news of God's love for everyone and the value of every human life because god loves every human being. Are we going to proclaim the value of the child in utero because God loves him or her and the value of every human being outside the womb because God loves them, or are we going to say I will love as God loves the child in utero, but I won't do it to the person outside, I will kill him if necessary. The fact is this; the proclamation, the good news is, nothing can separate us from the love of God made visible in Jesus Christ, that that is the protection of the Lamb of God. But the way we proclaim that is to live it, proclaim it, in terms of our ordinary life, and then we have the authority to proclaim it to other people to live in their lives. But if we do not live under the protection of God and we choose the protection of violence in our life, then we have no authority whatsoever to proclaim to others that they shouldn't choose protection of violence when it comes to their lives.

And so I conclude with this: The Lamb of God is the way that we proclaim the word of God to the world by our words and deeds. It is the instrument for bringing the power of God to the world. Our lamblike behavior in a jungle of wolves is what releases the power of God that will pacify the wolves and it will bring the time when the lion lays down with the lamb. But if we will not choose to follow the Lamb of God, if we modify the teachings of Jesus to what we want them to be, then no power comes through us and evil runs ramped. The time has come to really come to grips with the fact that to choose to follow the lamb of God is to choose to reject the survival ethic for ourselves and others and to live under the protection of the father who is the God of love and who guarantees us in Jesus that nothing can separate us from him.

