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Preface

This book is not addressed to any government or any unbeliever. To unbelievers we recommend such works as W. H. Turton’s *Truth of Christianity*. Those who have not experienced Christ’s redemptive love will, as a general rule, find themselves without the inclination or power to take the way which we believe is right for the Christian. Furthermore, we do not advocate violent rebellion against any government. We submit to those who have rule over us and shall endeavor to demonstrate to them the Christian way. However, where their command conflict with what we believe to be a Christian duty and privilege, we must refuse to submit to it. Even then the government shall not experience any violence on our part. Nothing but a dictatorship maintains that there is no law higher than the state.

We do not exalt ourselves over our brethren who have not yet seen the mind of Christ on this vital subject. They differ from us as much as we differ from them and we have taken no more of a self-righteous position than any individual takes when he stands for any position which he believes to be true. We realize, of course, that we have not perfectly portrayed the way of redemptive love. However, that does not excuse us from ever endeavoring to follow that way.

Let none misunderstand us. We realize that sincere soldiers possess many admirable qualities and that they make tremendous sacrifices. However, such a realization does not imply that we endorse the business of killing for Christians.

Most Christians readily admit that war is incompatible with the principles of the Christian life. How, then, do they justify Christians killing? We have endeavored to examine their attempt to do so. We hope they will weigh the entire argument. It will be necessary to bear in mind that this book assumes a familiarity, on the reader’s part, with the position to which this constitutes an answer. Since it is addressed to the brotherhood which has been discussing this question of late it is very likely that our assumption is justified. If the reader is a non-Christian we ask him to remember that we view this subject from an entirely different frame of reference than the one from which he views it. We are not here arguing the question: Should an unbeliever believe the Bible? Instead we ask: Should a Christian try to kill enemies?

We gladly acknowledge our indebtedness to many writers and friends.
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CHAPTER I

The Christian Conscientious Objector

Does the New Testament (NT) support the conscientious objector (c.o.)? If it does, the course for the Christian is clear since his actions must not be regulated by the natural man, by public opinion and pressure, or by the difficulties which the position may entail. Although c.o.'s may differ as to just what a Christian should do in war time, they are at one in the answer to the question: Does the Christian have NT authority to kill any man purposefully? Does it permit him to kill his fellow man and thus be exposed to the reproach made against Christianity by a c.o.?

"I regretted leaving that cell for the ordinary one because the latter contained no book except the Bible, and as Christians were blowing each other to pieces with gunpowder and ripping each other up with bayonets and quoting this book in support of the process, the Bible did not attract me." (J. P. M. Millar “We Did Not Fight”, pp. 240-241. Edited by Julian Bell.)

1. THE BASIS ON WHICH THE QUESTION MUST BE SETTLED

(1) It is not by conscience alone. No question is settled until it is settled right. It is not settled right for the Christian until it is settled by the letter and the spirit of the NT. A misinformed conscience may do horrible things (Acts 23:1; 1 Tim. 1:13; Cp. Titus 1:15; 1 Tim. 4:1-3). Conscience must be nurtured and guided by the NT. However we should not go contrary to what we believe is right. If conscience is not worthy of respect in war-time it is not in peace-time.

(2) It cannot be settled by a priori judgment. Christians must not make up their minds that it is impossible for
Jesus to teach that we must give up property and life rather than kill enemies. We must have a willingness to do His will whatever it may involve. One should ask himself: *Am I willing to follow it if it does mean that?* If one is not willing, there is no need to study further for his mind is already made up—without any reference to the NT.

(3) *The nation does not become Christian because of a crisis.* War does not change the Christian's relationship to the world although it does make the contrast between the church and the world more apparent. Neither does it change the sinfulness of the world; it simply brings to fruition the evil and helps make us more conscious of it. Sin is as sinful in peace-time as in war-time and at no time should the Christian act from unchristian principles or do unchristian deeds. The world cannot make the decision for the Christian.

(4) *It must not be settled by the natural man.* With the natural man as the authority we can easily justify every manifestation of human lust and sanctify every passion. The question is not what is the *human* thing to do; it is "What is the *Christian* thing to do." It is not what *unregenerate* nature will do, but what those who are partakers of the *divine* nature should do (2 Pet. 1:4).

"Were you children of Adam, as you are by human generation (by birth), it would suffice that you should be perfect, as other men are; but, being as you are children of God, by Christian regeneration, it does not suffice that you be perfect, as other men, but you must be perfect, as children of God, blushing to exhibit habits inconsistent with those of the children of God. (Juan De Valdes, "St. Matthew's Gospel", p. 89. Edited by J. T. Bettes.)

(5) *It cannot be settled by unaided human reason.* That we cannot see why Christ commanded it, is no more a valid objection against the c. o. position than it is against
Acts 2:38, Christ's incarnation, the atonement, or Isaiah 53. We walk by faith and not by unaided human reason (2 Cor. 5:7). Much of the NT is foolishness to the world (1 Cor. 1:18). We need to use reason to examine His credentials and to discover His teaching; but not to pass judgment on them. Human reason is as apt to set aside Matt. 5:27-32 as 5:38-48.

(6) *It cannot be settled on the basis of the difficulties in which it may involve a person.* When the credentials of Christ lead us to acknowledge His authority, no amount of difficulties or unanswered questions can keep His teaching from constructing the Christian position. The Christian asks: Is it Scripture; and not: Is it easy? popular? It is not, Is it comfortable; but, Is it the way of the cross? (Lk. 14:27). It will involve difficulties. "The real principle for which the early martyrs died has yet to be established; and we cannot be sure that it will be at less price." (W. E. Orchard). There may be questions on which we may not give a thoroughly satisfactory answer. However, we believe that the positive evidence for the c. o. is not overthrown by a few difficulties.

(7) *The question is not: "Should the Governments bear the sword?" They do (Rom. 13:1). The question is: Has God authorized the governments to use Christians as agents of vengeance? or Christians to be so used? We are dealing with Christians, not with the world.*

(8) *The question is not: "Did the Jews go to war?" They did. But has God authorized the Christian to kill at the government's command?*

(9) *The question is not to be settled by what you have believed, in times past, to be right.* If the length of time that a thing is taught and believed, if the number of people who believe it, if the zeal with which it is propagated; makes a thing right then there is no error that is not sanc-
tified. However, the sanctification which we seek is that brought by the word of Christ (John 17:17,19).

(10) The question is not whether any particular war is a righteous war. All sides in every war claim justice and righteousness. Does a righteous war mean that one side is entirely right? If so, how and who determines it? If one side is just partly right, how do we evaluate the relative rightness? If one side is only relatively right, should we fight solely for one side? Does the government or the individual make the decision? The main question, however, is: “Where is the NT authorization for Christians to engage in a righteous war”?

(11) The world objects to the c. o. position. The world objects to numerous Christian positions. However, their objection does not change NT teaching. Since the spirit of returning good for evil, of surrendering the spirit of retaliation, is the distinct Christian doctrine of conduct, it is to be expected that the world will oppose it.

(12) Men might despise us. Men did not always think well of the Master. “In order that man may not despise thee, dost thou offend God? And in order that thy frenzied fellow servant may not despise thee, dost thou despise the Lord?” (Chrysostom on Matt. 5:38.)

(13) The world will consider us as aliens. At times we sharply feel the fact that we are cut off from the world. This is especially evident in connection with the world’s standard of success, its perverted conception of Christianity, its sordid pleasures and its weapons. Although we endeavor to be good citizens, to submit to the government where such submission does not bring us into dispute with God’s will, to do good unto all men; we are aliens in a real sense—aliens from the world but not from God. (Heb. 11:37-38; 1 Pet. 1:1)

(14) The world will persecute us. This objection is not sufficient to change at NT doctrine. Persecution is one proof
that we are not of the world. (John 15:18-21; 16:1-3; 1 John 3:13; 4:4; 5:4-5). We have often overlooked the fact that we must be different from the world in order to elevate it.

Wilfred Monod complained, ‘Alas, that the modern world so rarely takes the trouble to fight us; we are not dangerous enough to be hated, Christians pass unnoticed, not worthy of opposition.’ No wonder, when the Church has been silent so long over the worst of all sins! But if God wills and we obey, it will be different. It is God’s will, says Max Huber, ‘that the Christian shall affect the world through just those qualities which distinguish him from the world and its ways’. The Church . . . . has been too little able to do this . . . she has been too like the world . . . She has not disturbed the world (Heering, 280)

The cross of Christ demands that we be willing to bear persecution for His sake. We must take the path of redeeming love which offers up itself for even its enemies. The real question is not: Should we suffer? It is: Should we inflict suffering on others? And, there is a real difference between the glory of “enduring suffering and the guilt of inflicting it.” The question is not “Shall we do our utmost,” but “What is the utmost Christians can do with Christian means?” (C. J. Cadoux, 1:23.) Redeeming sacrificial, and true parental love, does not

“inquire, ‘Am I loved? Have I been benefitted? Have my merits been appreciated? Shall I be blessed in return? Or, am I hated, injured, cursed and condemned?’ Whether others love or hate, bless or curse, benefit or injure, it says, ‘I will do right; I will love still; I will bless; I will never injure even the most injurious; I will overcome evil with good.’ Therefore its goodness is not measured by or adjusted to the goodness of others but ever finds in itself a sufficient reason for doing good and nothing but good to all moral agents. (Ballou,
21). When we think that we have been greatly wronged and that we are therefore justified in retaliating, let us meditate on Chrysostom’s statement. “Nay, what hast thou endured like thy Lord, bound, beaten with whips, with rods, spit upon by servants, enduring death, and that death, which is of all deaths the most shameful, after ten thousand favours shewn?” (On Matt. 5:38.)

Let the reader study the following Scriptures (Mt. 10:22; Mk. 8:35; 13:12-13; Lk. 6:22-23; Rom. 8:17,18, 35-37; 1 Cor. 4:11-12; Gal. 4:29; Phil. 1:29; 2 Tim. 3:12; Jas. 5:6; 1 Pet. 3:14, 16, 17; 4:12-19.)

(15) All believers have not maintained that the c. o. position is NT doctrine. Therefore, it is claimed, such a position is a manifestation of self-righteousness which claims superior knowledge of the NT and a superior holiness of life. This reproach is hurled against the c. o. position by both the unbeliever and believer. But it overlooks the fact that it is possible for people to be mistaught, to misunderstand the Scripture. Christ was unable to teach all people with whom he came into contact and thus we do not expect all people to grasp this portion of His teaching. The misunderstanding, by religious people, of John 17:20-21, Acts 2:38, does not change NT teaching or take away the obligation, of those who have been properly taught, to take the NT stand. Regardless of the hoary traditions which we must combat, we must take the Christian stand in all firmness, yet with humility. We must do that which we believe to be right and we must continue to study to determine whether or not what we believe is right. God is our judge, as well as theirs, and we can do no other than that which we believe He requires of us. If this is labeled “self-righteousness,” we must bear the stigma without retaliation—although we should try to explain the position. Heering’s remark is in order here:

“I do not exalt myself above my Christian opponents;
I know all too well that we are all sinners before God. But on this one point, after long and sore strife, my eyes are opened; to me this revelation is holy and complete."

Those who have followed the "restoration plea" have heard the accusation of "self-righteous" too long to be muchly disturbed by it now. It would also be well for accusers to remember that they claim to be better informed than the c. o. They are as far from us as we are from them.

(16) The Christian cannot leave the decision to another—not even to the government. Governments are not always run on a moral and spiritual basis. They have their own selfish interests, ambitions and alliances. Thus, governments cannot make moral decisions, and this question does involve a moral decision, for a Christian. If a government can make such a decision for a Christian, any government can do it. Thus Christians would be forced to the position that it would be morally right to kill other Christians, or do any other deed, if the government made such a decision for them. No government or majority can make right and moral that which is not right for the Christian. If they could, might and majority make right; a proposition which every Christian rejects. We as persons must give an account for the deeds done in our bodies and thus we must not allow those deeds which are destructive of Christian principles. The government does not render an account to God for us. (Rom. 14:12; 8:12; 2:6)

(17) It must be settled on the basis of the entire scope of NT teaching and not on just one de-contexted passage.

"Consider the context; consider parallel texts; consider examples; consider the known spirit of Christianity."
"Any construction or interpretation of the record language of Christ, or of His apostles, in which all these concur, is sound. Any other is probably erroneous." (Ballou, 13)
(18) The real question is: *Is it the will of God for Christians to take up arms and kill their fellow creatures?* If it is not, the Christian transgresses when he does it. If it is the will of God, the following must be produced:

(a) The NT passage which authorizes a Christian to kill another either in self-defense or in the defense of his country.

(b) Where the Christian is authorized to let the government use him as an agent for bearing the sword—in either "public or private" vengeance.

(c) That killing another is compatible with Christian love for all men, which seeks the good of all and the destruction of none, as set forth in Matt. 5:38-48 and Rom. 12:14-21; 13:10. This is a principle on which the world does not operate; but on which the Christian must operate (Matt. 5:47-48). The explanation, of the compatibility of Christian love for an enemy, with the destruction of that enemy, must not amount to a rejection of the distinctive teaching of these passages. Is it not impossible to reconcile the processes of war and the gospel of Jesus?
CHAPTER II

Prophecies of the Peaceful Nature of Christ's Kingdom

The prophets recognized that the kingdom of Christ would be of a peaceful nature and that its subjects would turn from the ways of war.

Isaiah taught that the subjects of the kingdom were to "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks" and that they were not to "learn war any more" (Isa 2:2-4). Without arguing the question here we take the position, with most of the church, that Isaiah spoke of the kingdom of Christ which was fully established in the days of Paul. Even those who do not so apply it must admit that at some time the people of God will refuse to use the sword. However, if it applies to the church it applies now. Early Christians, such as Origen, applied this prophecy to the church (Lee, 63). If it applies to the church it applies to the Christian, for its nature must be the nature of those who have been born into the kingdom. This prophecy must find fulfillment in individual Christians, if it is fulfilled at all, and it cannot be fulfilled in me if I learn the ways of war.

It is either pre-millennialism or pacifism. And we must admit that the willingness of some brethren to take up arms cannot help but strengthen the pre-millennialist in his conviction that that prophecy has not found and is not finding fulfillment in the church of Christ.

Isaiah predicted the Prince of Peace (Isa. 9:6). Christ pronounced a blessing on peacemakers (Matt. 5:9). He never suggested that His disciples were to be warriors with weapons of carnal and physical destruction. Since He is
the Prince of Peace the Christian, as a peacemaker, must
adopt the means which He used and sanctioned in order to
establish peace. Christ used the way of redemptive love and
of aggressive goodness and not the way of the sword. He
so limits us in our efforts at peacemaking.

Isaiah said that they would not hurt or destroy in
God's holy mountain (Isa. 11:6-9). We live in the dispensa-
tion of which he spoke. War decrees that men should hurt
and destroy. It even sends Christian against Christian.

There are other prophecies of the peaceful nature of
Christ's kingdom. We do not here set out to prove that they
apply to the church and thus those who do not so accept them
will not feel their force. However, we are trying to get the
Christians, who do so accept them, to grasp their spirit. Hosea
said that the sword and the battle bow were to be broken
(2:18). Isaiah said that destruction and violence were to be
cast out (60:18). Zechariah said that the battle bow would
be cut off and that Christ would speak peace unto the peoples
(9:10; Mat. 21:1-11; John 1:49; 12:12-16). The Psalmist
spoke of peace (46:9-10).

We must have the kingdom in us if we are really in it.
Thus we must not carnalize the Christian, for the kingdom
is against war and its subjects, who share its nature, must
not fight. Christians are not authorized to act contrary to
their Christian regenerate nature and for them to learn the
ways of war would force them to turn from the principles set
forth in these passages.
Chapter III

Christ's Teaching Which Bears on the Christian and War

Christians have less right and reason to question the decisions of their Commander-in-chief than the soldier in the best national army in the world has to question those of his commander. Christ's authority is supreme in our lives, for when we become acquainted with His Personality and teaching we feel a sense "of obligation which we may defy but which we cannot dispute for his words and witness carry an immediate and instinctive conviction to all who consider them dispassionately with an open mind and a ready will." (Richards: 36).

Jesus while on earth, did not set an example for the Christian in the killing of a national or a personal foe. His lack of the spirit of war dissapointed the nationalistic Jews and it enabled Pilate to see that Jesus was not a political threat to Caesar. Christ did no place the sword in the hands of his people to war against the pagan conqueror who was then in Palestine. However, He did leave us an example of redemptive love which suffers for the enemy and at the hand of the enemy in an effort to convert, not to crush, them. (1 Pet. 2:21; Matt.10:24-25; Rom. 12:17).

1. Did Christ Confront A War Situation?

Christ faced the problem of war—defensive and aggressive. The Jews wanted a military Messiah who would lead them against Rome. Jesus was the Messiah and thus he was brought face to face with current conceptions of the role of the Messiah. Those who are interested in a presentation of this fact should read How Jesus Faced Totalitarianism by Kirby Page. It may be obtained for fifteen cents from the
Christ sent His apostles out as sheep in the midst of Wolves (Matt. 10:16). He predicted that there would be wars (Matt. 24; Mk. 13). He said that His disciples would be persecuted but He did not instruct them to defend themselves, their homes, their ideals, or their religious freedom, with swords (Matt. 10:17,18; John 15:18-21; 16:1-3; Matt. 24:9-13). The early church understood that Christ had not given them the sword for protection against unjustified attack, for in the persecutions recorded in the New Testament, and in the first three centuries, the church did not so defend itself.

Christ told his disciples, with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, to flee, and not to fight, in the days of vengeance (Lk. 21:20). He did not tell them to use the sword to protect their native land. He did not authorize them to operate under a theory of civil government which would have forced them to wage war with the Romans against the Jews. Call them cowards if you want to, but Christ told them to remove themselves from the scenes of conflict.

Christ called Herod “that fox” (Lk. 13:13). Herod put John to death. But Christ simply “accepted the state of the Herodian world in which He had to live” in so far as changing it with the sword was concerned (Westbury-Jones: 57). Not only were there such men as Herod, but the entire land was a place of unrest. The yoke of Rome was a burden both politically, personally and religiously (Merivale, VI:3). The presence of Roman soldiers and their idolatrous images infuriated the Jews (Mommsen, II:189). “Jesus was born into a ferment of discontent with political subjection and economic inequality.” (Scott-Craig:45). “Galilee was full of revolution” “in the early days of Jesus” (Westbury-Jones: 57). But Jesus was gentle toward the Gentiles and recommended love, not violence, in dealing with them. John Foster Dulles recently pointed out that Jesus had called for no arm-
ed revolt against the military dictator of His generation; and that instead Jesus tried to show men how to overcome evil in themselves and in others in a way which did not lead them into blind alleys which end in the pit (Life, 12-28-42, p. 50).

II. CHRISTIANS ARE TAUGHT TO LOVE THEIR ENEMIES (Matt. 5:38-48)

We must love, not strike, those who despitefully use us (Matt. 5:38-48; Thess. 5:15). This love is not a mere sentimentality but a creative, boundless goodwill which seeks to do ill to none and good to all (Rom. 13:10). It seeks the eternal good of the object of its love and all of its means and ends are conceived and executed in love. However, this love is so difficult, so contrary to the natural man, that some followers of Christ have often tried to explain it away to the extent that they become like those who love only their own and they thus treat the enemy as the world treats its enemies (Matt. 5:46-48). Let us notice the objections of those who forget that Christians must outlove the world (Matt. 5:20; 44-48). They forget that those who love their enemies cannot be as efficient at killing enemies as are non-Christians. When we give the enemy what the non-Christian gives him we are not returning good for his evil (Rom. 13:20-21).

(1) No one has ever done it. This objector has never seen the cross of Christ (Rom. 5:7-10; Acts 7:60; 12:1-2; Rom. 12:14-21).

(2) I cannot see why He commanded it. Can you see the why of baptism? of the cross? Do we walk by faith or by sight? (2 Cor. 5:7; Rom. 10:17). Because we do not see why it does not mean that God does not see why and that it should not be carried out by Christians with increasing success.

(3) It is against my nature. It is against the nature of multitudes. But is it against the nature of those who are partakers, in Christ, of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4; 1 Pet.
1:13-17)? Is it against the nature of those who have been begotten again and who have put on a heart of compassion (Col. 3:12)? Shall Christians settle New Testament questions on the basis of what they can do by nature or shall it be on what the Word says and what He enables us to do by grace? The man who rejects any teaching of Jesus because it is “against his nature” admits that he does not have to that extent the nature of a Christian. Some contend that man is polygamous by nature, and unregenerate man does have such propensities, but what Christian would use that argument to overthrow Matt. 5:27-28, 32. “Christ in us” will exalt and perfect our life and elevate “it from the natural to the supernatural life” (Barclay, 520).

(4) *It is too hard, it is impossible.* Stephen did not find it so (Acts 7:60). Who is to judge, Christ or His disciples? Where is the authority to make Christianity easy? Is the way of war so easy? Many other commands of Christ may be rejected with “it is too hard”. None should boast of what he can do by himself, but we should not cast aside the Word because it is difficult to follow. “Are we to doubt that God’s grace is sufficient for the weakest of his trusting children, to enable them to perform any duty He may lay upon them?” (Ballou, p. 180). *Perhaps we shall be surprised what we can stand when we stand for His word.* Because of their courage in bearing violations and death, many “weak” girls became an inspiration to “strong” men in the early days of the church (Spence, section on persecutions). Then, too, men have suffered much for a far less worthy cause. We ought to endure as much or more, if necessary, when aided by God. And it should be in the spirit of humility and not with a proud boast of what we shall be able to stand.

(5) *Such teaching drives people away from the church.* If the teaching is scriptural, this is no objection. Christ’s teaching offended some (John 6:60-66; Lk. 6:45; Matt. 15:12). We are not responsible for setting up the requirements of the gospel, but we are responsible for proclaiming those
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which Christ has already established. If this Christianity displeases us let us say so frankly and no longer profess to be Christian. “Are we to accommodate divine truth and duty to the convenience of our fellow men, in order to multiply superficial disciples? are we to pare down and fritter away the requirements of our heavenly Father, for fear of discouraging and driving off half-hearted professors? Who is it that presumes to daub with such untempered mortar?” (Ballou 180-181). “If we will be Christians, let us try with all our might to do our duty, and see how far we shall be left to fall short.” (181-182). Why should people become offended at this and not be offended at returning evil for evil, which has not given mankind security “from extreme trial, danger, hardship and suffering” (183).

(6) People will take advantage of it. Doubtless. They took advantage of Christ (John 15:20). However, the world’s way has not kept people from taking advantage of you. If we live in harmony with God’s will not as many people will take advantage of us, as we might think at first. This is especially true if we use moral persuasion, love and good deeds on those who oppose us. Ballou, and other writers, have listed many instances in which the way of unbounded good will has actually worked.

The objection really maintains that moral force and goodness are ineffective in both the long and the short run. Have we no faith in God or in man? in the power of good to overcome evil? in the existence of goodness in others which may finally respond to the good we set forth in returning good for evil? that God can deliver us either from death or by death?

Should we fear those who can touch our money and our body but who cannot kill the soul? Or should we fear the path of returning evil for evil which creates evil in us and which if persisted in will assist in our destruction (Cf. Matt. 10:28). Let us remember that our reward is in heaven, not here (Matt. 5:12). Infidels, not Christians, sneer here.
What if I fail to perfectly live up to it, what if I cannot stand it? There may be many failures in the Christian life but that does not give us reason for quitting. If we use such excuses here we shall use them in any other place where it so suits us. If you fail, get up and try again. But if you start "What ifing", recall the words of Chrysostom: “Yea, for first with respect to thy wife thou wilt say, ‘What if she be contentious and extravagant?’ and then as to the right eye, ‘What if I love it, and am quite on fire?’ and of the unchaste look, ‘What then, if I cannot help seeing?’ and of our anger against a brother, ‘What if I be hasty, and not able to govern my tongue?’ and in general, all His sayings thou mayest on this wise trample under foot. Yet surely with regard to human laws thou darest not in any case use this allegation, nor say, ‘What then if this or that be the case but, willing or unwilling, thou receivest what is written.”

It is a figurative passage. “We willingly grant that not all the precepts from 1he Mount were designed to be literally obeyed in the intercourse of life. But what then? To show that their meaning is not literal is not to show that they do not forbid War. We ask in our turn, what is the meaning of the precepts? What is the meaning of ‘Resist not evil’? Does it mean to allow bombardment, devastation, slaughter? If it does not mean to allow all this it does not mean to allow war. What, again, do the objectors say is the meaning of ‘Love your enemies’, or of ‘Do good to them that hate you’? Does it mean, ‘Ruin their commerce,’ ‘sink their fleet,’ ‘plunder their cities’, ‘shoot through their hearts’? If the precept does not mean to allow all this, it does not mean to allow war ... if we give to our objectors whatever license of interpretation they may desire, they cannot without virtually rejecting the precepts, so interpret them as to make them allow War.” (G. W. Knowles, Quakers and Peace, p. 39. quotation from Jonathan Dymond). Even if turning the other cheek is a figurative expression the positive principle is stated in “Love your enemies”.
“Figurative” language does not destroy meaning. Does the figurative language in the following destroy their meaning (Lk. 12:49; 14:26, 27; Matt. 10:16; 7:1; 7:24; 15:13; 13:50; Rom. 6:2; 1Pet. 3:21).

In this passage, (Matt. 5:38-48) Christ referred to what Moses had commanded and He abrogated the law, concerning the taking of vengeance, for His disciples. It was lawful under Moses, but not under Christ. Christ’s prohibition is “exactly commensurate with the Mosaic requirement”. Moses did not have sole reference to “private” vengeance for he included “public” vengeance. If Christ did not prohibit what Moses required, what did He do?

(8) We must be sensible. Who is to judge what is sensible? We must be Scriptural and when we are, we are sensible in so far as God is concerned.

(9) It refers to private, not public, acts of the Christian. This limitation cannot be found in the New Testament and it is a tradition of man (Cp. Matt. 15:2,9). However, the individuals who so limit it do not really believe in their own limitation. They say that war is public vengeance, or that the death penalty of the country’s law is also, and therefore this passage does not apply there. So they do not apply it in war. Then they often argue, for war, from the fact that they would kill an intruder in their home. This is done as a private individual for private revenge and protection. Thus it does not actually apply in a private situation. The spirit of an eye for an eye is thus with them in both relationships. They may say that the law of the land allows them to kill an intruder but they still do it as a private individual and not as a sheriff or a soldier and thus an agent of the government. It is also well not to forget that this taking of vengeance was exactly what Moses allowed and Christ forbade. “That resistance of evil which Moses sanctioned and enjoined, Jesus obviously repudiates and forbids. The prohibition is made precisely co-extensive in all its bearings with the allowances and injunctions of the older code.” (Ballou).
The Jewish law made provisions for vengeance. However, Christ took it entirely out of the hands of the Christian and left it to God (Rom. 12:19). One of God’s agents is the “powers that be” (Rom. 13:1). Others are destroying angels, floods, earthquakes and fires (Revelation). No passage, however, indicates that God uses Christians today as agents of vengeance; or that He has authorized Christians to be so used by their government.

An individual who does a thing does it as an individual regardless of whether or not he does it on his own command or that of another. A Christian must perform all acts as unto God (Col. 3:17, 22-23).

The argument used to overthrow the application of the passage under discussion, can just as well be used to excuse the acts of a Christian, any sort of acts, which are done at the command of a master (Col. 3:22, such as to carry on or start a feud where such were sanctioned), or that a woman could become a prostitute at the command of her husband for she is told to obey her husband and thus she could say she did it in submission to him and as his agent (Eph. 5:22-23). And Roman husbands were sometimes like that. Would it have been right for the early Christians to worship idols at Nero’s command (the ruler under whom Paul wrote Rom. 13) since such pagan worship was a part of the allegiance which Rome believed that its citizens owed to the state? Would it have been right to persecute the church because Rome believed that the church was detrimental to her welfare? Could a Christian say, I persecuted not as a Christian but as an agent of the government in submission to Rom. 13:1-6? Should a Christian be a governmental agent for the scientific breeding of human beings, if so commanded by the government under which he lived? Hitler is as much a power, of the type referred to in Rom.13, as was Nero. Should a soldier in Hitler’s army follow Hitler’s encouragement and instruction to that end? Now if such reasoning applies to war, why not here also? When you have shown
the reasoning null and void here you have shown the same for the war argument based on this procedure.

That this prohibition of Christ was not so limited is indicated by the fact that the law to which Christ referred was given with reference to public acts of vengeance (Ex. 20:1; 21:1, 24; Lev. 24:20; Deut. 19:21). Christ's abrogation is co-extensive with the legislation of Moses on this point. Thus Christ did away, for his disciples, with Moses' teaching on public and private vengeance. The way some individuals, however, "translate" this verse it should read. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, let every man take vengeance on his own offenders, and redress his own grievances; but I say unto you look to the government, complain to the magistrates, carry all your causes into the courts for adjudication." (Ballou, 32). "If the government authorizes you, as its agent, you may carry out 'public' vengeance."

Christ's life did not so interpret this passage. He refused to take part in a "public" act of vengeance (John 8:1-7), or to be a judge over a man concerning the division of property (Lk. 12:14). He prohibited His disciples taking vengeance in the "days of vengeance" (Lk. 21:20-22). He "never sued or taught his followers to sue men at the law" (Ballou, 32).

Contrary to the argument concerning "public" vengeance, Christ "enjoins non resistance alike in respect to personal assault and legal wrong. If a man smite thee on thy right cheek, offer the other. If he sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. If he makes thee a prisoner, and force thee to go with him, resist not. This does not look like teaching men to go to law for redress of grievances, or encouraging them to make magistrates the revengers of their wrongs." (32). The man who was after the disciple's coat was not a thief who came at night, but a man who was using legal means to get the coat. Jesus said "let him have thy cloak also" (Matt. 5:40). In other words, it was before the very magistrates that some of our brethren
in an official public capacity would have said: Sue him for damages for even trying to get the coat. Not only don’t let him have it but sue him to compensate you for your trouble. The man who demanded you to go one mile, with whom you were to go two, was not some crook operating outside Roman law, but “some official demanding labour in the service of the State.” “The disciple will try to ease the situation by doing more than the actual statutory requirement. Thus would Jesus replace law by love.” (Scott-Craig, 37). (Note: “To compel thee to go a mile, is also a proverbial expression . . . both the Roman governors and the tetrarchs compelled them (Jews) to similar service (to ‘carry burdens or messages from stage to stage‘ JDB), or to furnish horses to their public messengers and posts, and to accompany them. The word came, therefore, to express any oppression or compulsory treatment attempted by anyone. (Watson, Richard, Commentary on Matthew) The law concerning an eye for an eye was not a measure of private vengeance but “the institution of organized violence in the service of justice” (Scott-Craig, 37).

Thus we conclude that the law of Moses to which Christ referred was not an “authorization of private revenge, permitting within certain limits the indulgence of personal resentment, but a public measure designed in the interests of society as a restraint upon wrong-doing, and doubtless meant to be carried out by (or under the supervision of) the public officers of the community. Yet this law Jesus quotes for the sole purpose of forbidding his disciples to apply it. We are therefore driven to the conclusion that he regarded the duty of neighbourly love as excluding the infliction of public penalties on behalf of society, as well as the indulgence of personal resentment.” (C. J. Cadoux I:25). Only as viewed thus do we find Jesus doing anything more than merely echoing Moses. The war argument makes Jesus reaffirm—instead of abrogate—what Moses enjoined. It also places the Christian under a double standard of morality. He may
do with vigor in a “public” capacity what he must refrain from doing in a private capacity. He is against it in private and for it in public.

(10) *It merely forbids the taking of vengeance in a mean spirit.* You must kill your enemies in the spirit of love. However, love seeks the good, the eternal salvation, of the object of that love (Rom. 13:10). And to kill an individual is to cut off all opportunity of either you or others preaching the gospel to him. Neither brotherly love (John 13:34-35; 15:12), nor the love for our enemies, which is the love of John 3:16 and Rom. 5:8, or the love of 1 Cor. 13:1-13, could purposefully kill an enemy.

This objection also makes Jesus merely echo Moses for his law did not authorize “personal hate, malice, revenge and wanton cruelty in executing the penalties of the law” (Cf. Deut. 25:1; 16:18-20; 17:2-12; 19:15; Ex. 23:1-8). There is no such thing as “Christian” revenge which destroys the enemy. Matt. 5:38-48 forbids us taking vengeance in any spirit.

(11) *It forbids the taking of vengeance in small, not large things.* Who knows what is large or small? Who is to be judge? The injured? If so, it is likely that all things will be “too great to be endured. (Ballou, p. 32). Is the taking of an eye or a tooth a small thing? or the smiting on the cheek? or taking away our coat at law? or compelling us to render some sort of service? Are our enemies, whom we are to love, just those who do small things to us? is persecution a small thing? Christ said that his disciples would be persecuted as the prophets before them had been persecuted (Matt. 5:10-12). They were persecuted in both small and large things and many of them were persecuted unto death. Now Christ continues, when you are persecuted—and I have said you shall be persecuted as were the prophets—you are not to strike back but you are to pray for them and do them good. As a publican or gentile you would do good to the just, to those who love you, to your brethren; but not to your
enemies. However, as my disciple you must do the good unto
the enemy just as surely, and to the same extent, that you
would to the brother (Matt. 5:43-48). Otherwise, what do
you more than others (Matt. 5:46-47). Christians must go be­
yond that which other men do or they fail, to that extent, to
be His disciples. It is thus that our circle of love becomes
perfect, complete, as is God's, in that it is love of both friend
and foe (Matt. 5:45,48).

(12) It refers to personal, not national, foes. If so,
then the moment we begin to feel that the national enemy is
also our personal enemy, and that we shall strike him for
having struck us, then that moment the passage applies to
him and we must not strike him back! It is also noteworthy
that although the Christians in A. D. 70 lived under Rom.
13 that Christ told them to flee, not fight (Luke 21:20-).

At this particular time Jesus was surrounded by Jews
who hated the rule of Roman, pagan, foreign, dictatorial
power. The Jews were eager for some leader who would lead
them in armed rebellion against Roman dictatorship which
had been extended over them through the conquest, by the
Romans, of Palestine in an aggressive war. This eagerness
to rebel is testified to by secular history (Cf. T. Mommsen),
and New Testament references (Acts 5:36-37; 21:
38). This yearning for a leader to head them in rebellion
finally broke out in action throughout all the nation in Pal­
estine and led to the wars which culminated in the destruc­
tion of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. Even that did not cure them
of this desire for freedom for sometime later they again re­
belled. Thus Jesus was talking in the midst of a nation which
regarded Rome as both a personal and a national foe. To the
Jew, Rome was indeed "your enemy" (Matt. 5:44). In Matt.
5:43 Jesus "alludes to Lev. 19:18, where love for 'your neigh­
bour' is enjoined, and where by 'neighbour' one's compatriot
is meant. Under the term 'enemy', by which Jesus put next,
must be understood primarily the racial enemy." (Heering,
29). However, your enemy would include either the im-
mediate personal enemy whom you have seen and the national enemy whom you may, or may not, have seen. Hearing further remarked that "this distinction between national and private foes has no point of contact with the Gospel (where does the New Testament thus distinguish them?). Even linguistically it has none; echthros is used in the New Testament and in the Septuagint both for the personal and for the national foe; polemos is entirely wanting from the New Testament. We have already heard how Weiss in his Commentary remarks that in Matt. 5:44 not only the public foe is meant, although the antithesis to Lev. 19:18 brings that meaning to mind first." (35). C. J. Cadoux said, in harmony with this, that "it is worth remarking that the word used for enemies (in Lk. 6:27) besides being used for private and personal enemies, is also used in the Septuagint, the N. T., and elsewhere, for national foes (Gen. 14:20; xlix. 8; Exod. 15:6; Lev. 26:7, 8, 17; 1 Sam. 4:3, etc.,; Lk. 1:71, 74; 19:43; also Origin, Cels ii. 30 viii. 69)" (1:28).

One might try to justify killing his religious enemies because the passage does not say thou shalt not kill religious enemies. But it does not say love just your personal enemies—it says "your enemies" so it covers all of your enemies.

(13) It was for the early disciples only, who were too weak to resist. Where did Jesus say If you can resist successfully, resist; if not, don't. What wisdom! And from above! This reminds us of the teacher who, after talking about the golden rule and turning the other cheek said: "Now, Junior," she said, "what would you do supposing a boy hit you?" "How big a boy are you supposing?" demanded Junior.

Christ's early disciples did exist in a large enough number to have caused their persecutors considerable trouble. When attacked in Jerusalem (Acts 7&8) they numbered well over five thousand men. Other Jews had attempted to rebel against Rome with less numbers; but the Christians did not endeavor to strike back at Jewish persecutors or later
against the Roman persecutors when the church was very large. (Acts 5:36-37; 21:38).

(14) *It refers to religious, not secular or political, matters.* The Jews did not distinguish between secular and sacred and religious and political as we do today. Then, too, were the cloak, the law, the eye for an eye, the two miles, the other cheek, religious matters or were they a part of ordinary life? This idea divides life up into compartments and says that religion has one compartment but that it must not spill over in any manner into any of the other compartments of life. Does not the religion of Christ and its principles regulate us in all our activities? Are we ever allowed to violate its principles? (Col. 3:12-17). This philosophy tells the crooked politician, the money-grabber and the ruthless dealer that he can regulate his conduct in those realms by any set of principles, just so he acknowledges Christ’s authority in religious matters. As Falstaff said to Prince Hal, it is not wrong for a man to work at his vocation. Falstaff’s vocation was stealing. The foolishness of this argument is illustrated in Ballou’s statement: “That is, while attending purely to religious duties, and propagating Christianity by divinely appointed means, they must suffer all manner of personal abuse, insult, outrage, persecution and violence, without offering the least resistance, either by individual force of arms or prosecutions at law.” “But as men of the world, politicians, merchants, tradesmen, money-getters, etc., they are at full liberty to follow the dictates of worldly expediency, and to resist even unto death all who threaten their lives, liberty or property.” (34).

(15) *It cannot teach non-retaliation for it would violate Matt. 5:18-20.* This attempts to involve Jesus in a contradiction, for he had just said, (Matt. 5:38-), that he was abrogating what Moses had enforced. If He does contradict Himself why “isn’t it as much for non-resistance as against it”? If the above interpretation of 5:18-20 is taken, the entire law of Moses is bound on us. When shall we start killing
false prophets? offering animal sacrifices? worshiping in Jerusalem? keeping the sabbath?

Matt. 5:18-20 simply points out that nothing was to pass away until it had fulfilled the mission, the purpose, for which it had been given. It, the law of Moses, did serve its purpose and it has passed away and we today are under the New Covenant which came through Christ. "Many have emerged from the shadow into the substance from types and figures into the reality. Others have been lost in the letter, * more than preserved in the spirit. All have done their work, or are still doing it in the essence of Christianity." (Ballou, 36.) Christians who know the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament never make this objection.

(16) **It does not apply to us.** Shall we discard all teaching in the Gospels? (Such as John 17:20, etc.) Jesus was speaking of some of the things to which Moses said that the people were to harken (Deut. 18:15-19). Christ expressly declared that this was a part of the new covenant (Matt. 5:21-38). This is a part of the doctrine the Spirit brought to the apostles' remembrance (John 14:26; 16:7). Jesus said this applied to all who hear it and that those who ignore it shall crash (Matt. 7:24). Does the golden rule apply to us? (Matt. 7:12). Even if Matt. 5:38-48 is not binding on us its principle is repeated and bound on us elsewhere (Rom. 12:14; 1 Thess. 5:15,22; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:9). Those who teach that it is not binding are least in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 5:19).

(17) **It binds such a spirit and not the “letter of the law”.** Surely we must obey the spirit of His teaching, and obey the teaching from the heart, but the letter contains the spirit. Objectors often ignore both. Follow the spirit of this teaching, and you will never be accused of willfully killing your enemy. For "if in our Lord's view the right spirit issues in a ‘letter of this kind, how can a ‘letter' of a
diametrically opposite kind be consonant with the same spirit" (Cadoux, 1:24). The spirit, as much as the letter, binds returning good for evil.

(18) It applies to a perfect society, to the millennium, and not to our present sinful society. In a perfect society there would be no wrongs to which to submit. If in the present state there are injustices and enemies the teaching applies now (ibid., p. 24). We must now do more than others (Matt. 5:41, 47). Jesus said that “my kingdom is not of this world” (John 18:36), but he did not say that “my kingdom is not for this world” (G. J. Heering, 34). The kingdom is not of this world, therefore Christians do not react to the enemy with either the same spirit or actions as those react who are in the kingdoms of this world. However, since His kingdom is in the world we find that one of the difficulties presented to the Christian is the problem of living a Christian life in an unchristian world. Does the objector imply that as long as the world is as it is that we must accept its principles? If so, then this objection may be convenient but it is not Christian. Christ has not told us to postpone the Christian life until everyone is willing to live it.

Although we are not in a perfect society these are the principles of the perfect society and in order for that society to begin to be formed in us and to make its presence increasingly known in the world, Christians must get the spirit of that perfect society in them. The better world, this side of heaven, will not come until men undergo the moral and spiritual change which Christ works in a man. As Ballou states, the “principles, dispositions and moral obligations of men” in a so-called millennium would not be “essentially different from what the New Testament requires them to be now” (175). If heaven were now brought to earth the “gospel just as it stands, would be sufficient to guide and govern” men (177). We cannot wait until a perfect society comes, we must now give striking evidence that we are now “partakers of the divine nature,” sons of God, who are endeavor-
ing to be a prepared people who may finally enter heaven, that prepared place for a prepared people. These teachings not merely constitute the ideal but they are also the “method of attaining that ideal” (Maegregor, 46).

(19) Matt 5:38 abrogated a tradition, and not the law of Moses on the taking of vengeance. Christ gave no indication that he was just correcting an abuse which was forbidden by the law of Moses also. He did not quote from glosses made by men for his quotation exactly expressed the Mosaical law on vengeance taking.

(20) The portion about loving our enemies is not to be literally followed for no one believes that Matt. 5:42 is literal. Any limitation set on any particular passage of Scripture by another passage of Scripture is to be accepted. We find no limitation to the doctrine that the Christian must love his enemies and do good to those who persecute him. However, we do know that 5:42 does not teach us to blind ourselves to the condition, and thus the real need, of the man who makes a request of us (2 Thess. 3:10-12). We are to try to help any and all who need or request our help. However, we must not over look two facts: First, 5:42 says to give but it does not bind us to giving the exact thing that the individual asks for; second, acting from the principle of parental love, of the love of God for the just and the unjust (5:47-48), we must give to an individual what he needs and not necessarily what he thinks that he needs. (Matt. 7:9-12). Every request reveals a need though the need may not really be the thing which is requested. If a son, thinking that he was asking for bread, was to ask for a stone; or thinking he was asking for fish, was to ask for a serpent; we would give him what he actually needed but not the serpent or stone which he requested. We must study the individual case and see what is the good gift that the person needs (Matt. 7:11). What he may need, instead of a handout, is a chance to work and provide for himself; or some counseling on living within one's budget. Whatever his request re-
veals *that he really lacks* should be granted and no man should be turned away empty handed if it is in our power to help him.

(21) **It would be insane to follow it.** Why is this way so insane, and the war madness which has so cursed mankind regarded as sane? It is doubtless true that much of the New Testament appears insane to those who do not have the mind of Christ. If we are to be called insane for trying to follow this then what about Christ who gave it and the early Christians who followed it? We are glad that our sanity is to be measured by God and not by man. Was it insanity in some early Christians who endeavored to teach their enemies even while tortured? Is the way of redemptive love insane and the way of destructive violence sane? Is the way of the cross, which has won so many victories, insane?

(22) **It was interim-ethics only.** Some objectors maintain that Christ thought that the world was immediately to come to an end and that these mortal principles were for that period of time between the time that he was teaching and the fast approaching end of the world. Thus, now that the world has gone on for centuries instead of concluding, the teaching does not apply. However, this accuses Jesus of a mistaken view of the future and thus with basing his teaching on a foundation which proved false. It further overlooks the fact that in so far as each individual is concerned his world, and thus the world for him, is apt to come to an end at any time. And thus even if this was interim-ethics it would be needful to apply them in the interim between now and the time when the world ends for us. Then, too, it is true that a world which fails to heed His teaching is doomed to come to a disastrous end, for the sermon on the mount is followed by the crash which reports those who hear but heed not (Matt. 7:24).

Even if it were interim-ethics it would cost us no more to follow it than it cost the early Christians; and why should we be excused from the cross which they bore? However, it
cannot be proved that Jesus had such a view of the future. Furthermore, this principle of returning good for evil was not based on the coming end of the world but on the nature of God (Matt. 5:45-48). It had no reference to any particular view of the future (Cadoux, I:44-45). If it was conceded that it was “interim-ethics” it would still be true that Jesus taught Christian non-resistance.

(23) Christ did not thus deal with the Pharisees in Matt. 23. However, Christ spoke not to be vindictive but to try to awake their hardened hearts, so that they might not be condemned, as well as to strip them of their credit with the people that the people might not be led into the same hypocrisies. Thus it was an effort to awaken all to the evil which existed and it was done with the purpose of redemptive love, of trying to bring them to repentance. Matthew 23:37 reveals the pathos with which Christ held forth his arms of love unto these people. Christ did deal with them according to the principle of redemptive love for He went to the cross for their sins and while on that cross he did not curse them; instead he prayed that God would forgive them. And on Pentecost the gospel of forgiveness was preached to some of the very people who witnessed the crucifixion and those who were willing to accept the Saviour were forgiven (Acts 2:37-38). Surely we can see the difference “between the sternest rebuke and recourse to physical violence” (Macgregor, 49).

(24) Does not Matt. 5:4 refer to such “drafted” services as that of being a soldier and fighting for one’s country? If so, it would be an argument for Christians today, in any country conquered by the dictators, to serve as a soldier in their armies if the dictators required it. This is evident from the fact that the people to whom these words immediately went forth were Jews who were under a foreign pagan dictator who required certain services and tribute from them. They would have been forced to keep their own people in subjection to Rome.

However, the passage has no such application for the
Jews were not required by the Romans to serve in the Roman army. They exacted no such service from the Jews and no such service was under consideration in this passage. Cadoux further argues that "it is clear that military service as distinct from general state-labour, is not here in question: for (1) the technical term here used referred originally to the postal systems of the Persian Empire, the *aggaros* not being a soldier or recruiting officer, but the king's mounted courier; (2) instances of its later usage always seem to refer to forced labour or service in general, not to service as a soldier (footnote: they 'impressed' Simon to carry a cross, Mt. 27:32. See the article 'angaria' in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities: 'The Roman angaria . . . included the maintenance and supply, not only of horses, but of ships and messengers, in forwarding both letters and burdens.' The Lexicons give no hint that the word was used for impressing soldiers; and (3) the Jews were in any case exempt from service in the Roman legions, so that if, as seems probable, the Roman 'angaria' is here referred to, military service proper cannot be what is contemplated." (Cadoux, 32). The argument here referred to might well justify such labor as is given, at their own expense of room and board and without compensation, by conscientious objectors in Civilian Public Service Camps but it cannot be used to justify military service in the Roman army or any other army.

(25) *In conclusion:* "Your Father loves his enemies, blesses those that curse him and does good to them that hate him. Else the sun would not shine as it does on the evil, nor the rain distil on the unjust, nor salvation descend from heaven for the lost. Imbibe the spirit of your Father. Imitate his goodness to the unthankful and evil." (Ballou, 41). You are not to imitate God as Judge, but God as the Savior. You must rise higher than the publicans, who would limit such love to their brethren only. Instead of hitting back, instead of returning evil for evil, of inflicting what may seem to be
the penal and just retaliation, you must pray for, and actively endeavor to rescue the sinner and the enemies, from the clutches of the sin which bind his own soul as in a harsh slavery. Instead of raising objections and so-called difficulties, why not use your intellect to discover ways that you may actually apply, in all of your dealings, the principle of returning good for evil. This is the only principle that can bring peace to a sin cursed earth and we shall wait in vain if we wait, before we apply this principle, until there are no bad men and nothing to avenge. It is only through loving the enemy, and if necessary taking the sword into our own heart instead of putting it into his, that we can perform a redemptive act. If we kill him, that is not a redemptive act and it is an evasion of our Christian responsibility. (Richards, 69). There may be many difficulties in discharging this responsibility but they no more abrogate that responsibility than difficulties abrogate any other scriptural teaching.

In order to act from the distinctive Christian principle of love we must no more go back to the Old Testament level of love than to the publican and gentile level. We must go beyond them for “if we arrive but at the same measure, that of the ancients, we shall stand without that threshold” of the kingdom which Christ ushered in (Chrysostom). No other system of religion, not even the Old Testament, ever inculcated such a complete principle of non-retaliation and no other has given us the high standard of such love—the love of Christ. This love is what is new about Christianity. And it is the greatest of the Christian principles (1 Cor. 13:1-13). When we say that one should not use the Old Testament principles, which were a part of the shadow, to limit the New Testament which is the substance, we do not cast any more reflection on the Old Testament than Christ did when he brought in the New. The Old Testament was a forerunner but “do not thou then require their excellency now, when their use is past: but then, when the time was calling for them.” (Chrysostom).
III. Christians Must Forgive Their Enemies

"Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful". "For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again" (Lk. 6:36, 38). If we pray with an unforgiving heart, a heart which seeks revenge, we call down a curse on ourselves (Matt. 6:14-15). We must forgive if we want to be forgiven.

We must realize that God will do to us as we want to do to others. When we hate and seek revenge we ask God to measure the same to us. If we always demand justice from others, for their transgressions against us, we are asking God to so deal with us. When we do as we are done by and thus return evil for evil we are asking God to exact full justice of us. But He teaches us to treat each person as a potential Christian and this we cannot do if we kill a person.

The spirit of forgiveness, of having it always in our hearts, is to be applied to enemies. And we must not do anything which would prevent their seeking forgiveness; instead we must manifest such a spirit to them. This is the known Christian attitude for Christ said to "love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you... if ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? for even sinners love those that love them. And if ye do good to them that do good to you, what thanks have ye? for even sinners do the same." (Lk. 6:27-33). We must forgive as God has forgiven us. How has He done it? While we were enemies Christ died for us (Rom. 5:6-10). We must thus love and forgive in order to be on the Christian level instead of the sinner level. Too many Christians argue for war with the same conception of the enemy that the world has.

Most of Christ’s audience, when the above was spoken, was composed of Jews whose great enemy was Rome. To such Christ said “Love”, “Forgive”, if you want God to forgive you.
We shall beat them, then forgive them, some say. In other words, we shall give them a bigger dose of their own medicine than they give us, we shall make them suffer as they have made us suffer, and then we shall forgive them. How do we know that we shall then be in a forgiving spirit? Do we want God to thus forgive us? Then, too, those who try to exact full justice ought to know that when this is done they are foolish to talk about forgiving. To “make them pay” and then forgive them is to talk in contradictory terms. Forgiveness foregoes an effort to force the enemy to make a so-called just settlement. God thus deals with us through the cross. How can we imagine that we are merciful even as our Father is, when we kill our enemy (Lk. 6:36)? Did Christ thus love us (John 3:16; 15:12). The enemy is to be the subject of love and kindness just as if He had not injured us. We must not be like the unmerciful servant (Matt. 18:23-35). We must manifest our sincere desire for forgiveness by forgiving others. If we exercise no mercy to the fellow who is guilty, if we plan to avenge ourselves, we make it impossible for God to forgive us and we manifest our insincerity. Why plead for forgiveness when we are not willing to forgive? We want every Christian to search his soul with the question: Do I want God to deal with me as I am endeavoring to deal with a foreign soldier, a person of another race, or a dictator?

Love and forgiveness must be exercised in order to be vitalized and actualized. An emotion unexpressed grows weaker. Acts contrary to love do not beget love in those who do them. Good will and forgiveness die within us unless our subsequent actions are loving. Killing a man and thus being an active agent in bringing sorrow to his loved ones is certainly not an expression of Christian love. The loving of our own only is not an expression of Christian love (Lk. 6:32-33; Matt. 5:44-48; Gregg: 210). Unless our actions toward our enemies are conceived by love for them they are not Christian actions. And since love dies, if unexpressed
in some manner; how much more so will it perish if our expressions are those of hate, violence and a desire to be avenged?

The attitude of parental love must guide our actions toward even our enemies. No parent could rear a child without forgiving seventy times seven. No Christian can imitate God's perfect circle of love unless he loves both foe and friend (Matt. 5:44-48; Lk. 6:32, 33, 36). The perfect circle is broken when we do good to our friends and evil to our enemies, as war dictates.

Love, however, does not do precisely the same act for every individual for the need of individuals differ. However, all actions toward all must be conceived by, and be expressions of love. Intelligence, in the service of love and not of vengeance, will determine what actions will be the most effective in redeeming the object of that love.

IV Jesus' Servants Do Not Wage War (John 18:36)

One of the reasons Christ did not permit his servants to rescue Him, their Savior who was soon to be crowned king, from His enemies was that His servants do not fight due to the nature of His kingdom and thus due to their nature. It was not only a sufficient reason why they did not fight the Jews or the Romans but also why they should not fight anyone. For Christ's servants to fight to protect their kingdom against other kingdoms would be out of harmony with the origin and nature of His kingdom (2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:17; John 18:36).

The kingdom of heaven is within us, as much as we are in it, in the sense that its principles must direct our conduct. We must experience a new birth to enter it, and in it we act differently from the world (Rom. 6:1-14, 17-19; John 3:1-10; Col. 3:9-10; 3:15-). We thus seek the things which are above (Col. 3:1-4). Since the kingdom is a part of us, its spirit must be manifested in all of our actions (cf. Matt. 15:18). Its nature is our nature. Our actions must
never contradict its spirit, and it must work a change in all our relationships (cf. Col. 3:21; Eph. 5:1, 22:6-9). Unless Christianity is a part time affair, instead of a life, we are Christ's servants at all times. There is no time when we can afford to have any other principles regulate our conduct. Thus there is no time when we should fight. Who will affirm that at some time we are not servants of Christ? Even when working for others we are to do it as unto Him (Col. 3:21-). If there is a time when we are not His servants, then at that time no demand of the gospel is binding upon us. Such a contention, of course, would carnalize the Christian.

Jesus made specific reference to wars. When a king is seized, his servants usually war against the enemy. Christ explained here why His servants had not followed such a procedure. Armed defense was out of harmony with their nature. Christ spoke not of single individuals but of "armed engagement between hostile kingdoms." Who will affirm that although we cannot fight for His kingdom we can for those of the world (Boles, 24). Even those who affirm that we can fight for governments usually end up by contradicting Jesus in that they justify fighting by saying they are protecting Christian principles. Thus they affirm that it is a "religious war"; the very kind of war which they usually say that a Christian should not fight since it would be a war for the kingdom of heaven and Jesus said that for it we must not wage war. Why shouldn't these individuals be consistent and call for an armed crusade to stamp out heretics and other enemies of the gospel? They should either do that or surrender their position. If they are unwilling to surrender their position they should at least refrain from justifying participation on the basis that it is a war which is necessary to maintain Christian principles. They should simply say that it is just a war to defend earthly government and that it has no bearing on the kingdom of Christ for wars cannot be fought for it.
But, one objects, doesn't this verse authorize us to fight as citizens of worldly governments? No, Jesus here simply states that if His disciples were of the world they would act like the world. The reason they did not was due to the nature of the kingdom. "He simply stated without approval or disapproval a universally recognized fact that the servants of earthly kingdoms fight for their governments." (Fudge, 13). And since our nature is not different from that of the kingdom of Christ, since we are servants of Christ at all times, we cannot fight. All acts must be "as unto the Lord" (Col. 3:22-24). If we fight we would have to do it as unto the Lord. If we maintain, on the other hand, that it is not for the protection of the kingdom of Christ, then we admit that we engage in something which is contrary to the interest of the kingdom and the nature of Christians. Regardless of how you view it, His servants should not fight. Those who use the latter argument to justify Christians fighting often forget that it works with as much force in one nation as in another.

V. SHALL THE CHRISTIAN SANCTION THE PRINCIPLE SYMBOLIZED BY SWORD? (Matt. 26:52)

Shall the Christian get on the level of his attacker and fight them with the weapon which they have selected? Shall we leave the settlement of the issue, of the right, to the decision rendered by the sword? Shall we meet sword with the sword?

Peter thought that he had the right, if any man had it, to defend a friend with the sword so he endeavored to so defend Jesus. "Then saith Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword in its place (its sheath, John 18:11): for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. 26:52). He gave two other reasons also (Matt. 26:53-56; John 18:36). We do not know why Peter had a sword. Perhaps it was one referred to in the statement concerning "two swords". However, we do know that when Peter tried to
use it Christ told him to put it up. Three reasons were given. They were sufficient to stay Peter's hand and from that day on—in spite of later persecutions—we find no attempt by Peter, or other Christians, to defend themselves or others with the sword. (1 Pet. 4:16).

It has been argued that Jesus refused to let them fight because the odds were against them. No such idea is even intimated. It is further argued that since someone must see that others perish by the sword that "they" had no reference to Peter and to other righteous executors of justice. However, if the "they" referred to the attackers only (Matt. 26:47, 55), then Peter and other Christians should have seen to it that these criminals died by the sword. But they did not. They did not do it when Rome used the sword on Jerusalem in the days of vengeance (Lk. 21:20; Rom. 13:6-7). Although the odds were then against the Jews the Christians did not use the sword to punish these people. God overruled a sinful nation—Rome—to punish a sinful people. The sword by which they perished was not in the hands of Christians.

The statement concerning "perishing" did not apply to the attackers only. It was a defensive sword, in a just cause, which Christ put up. Christ also had reference to Peter for he gave it as a reason why Peter should put up his own sword. The way some interpret it, it would be a reason why Peter should use it. "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. 26:52).

Jesus does not necessarily mean that every individual sword user shall die by the sword, any more than every individual is drawn to Christ on the basis of John 12:32. Those who live by violence shall meet with violence here, as well as with the sword of God's judgment hereafter.

Glanville thought that Jesus here expressed two judgments: (a) the sword perishes; (b) the users of the sword
perish with it. "With" does not necessarily mean "by the means of", although it does often mean that. It may also carry the meaning of "in company with" (Lk. 22:52). Men see the sword as an instrument of success but Jesus saw through it as a "symbol of impermanence, a type of the things that pass away." He exposed its "essential deceitfulness" and revealed that its nature is decay and death. What it does it can undo. What it establishes it can disestablish. The instrument of conquerors has been the means of their undoing sooner or later. And yet men regard the sword as the surest guarantee of success and security. In spite of this history has confirmed Jesus' judgment on those who build by, and that which is built by, the sword. Their work is impermanent and the man whose life is built on it has wasted his time. Since we are identified, in this world, with the work to which we give ourselves, the man who gives his life to a work of impermanence may be said, in "so far at least as this world is concerned", to "perish". To those who seek a purposeful life this is indeed a heavy judgement—"that his life's work has proved to hold within itself the seeds of its own decay: that it had been as well, in fact (in so far as doing a permanent work is concerned, JDB), if that man had never been born." If the dead who once fought with the sword for a warless world, a world of goodness and forgiveness, were to come back today they would see that in so far as really permanently establishing such a world is concerned, their efforts were in vain. Their other work may live on but that which was based on the sword does not. Peter, for example, is remembered not for his desire to use the sword but for his gospel work. Perhaps all warriors, if they could come back, would wish to devote all their labor to work that endureth. Their work as fighting men, founded on violence, was subject to violence. In other words the life of violence is wasted. However, that work which they did which was not based on violence may survive.

Christ, like us, had a work to do. He repudiated the
sword and refused to found His kingdom on violence. The sword would have introduced an element of decay into His kingdom which would have destroyed it as it destroyed Caesar's. Christ refused the sword and His kingdom did not, as some perhaps feared, perish. It is increasing while other kingdoms, built by the sword, are decreasing and perishing with the sword. They rise and fall.

Jesus' repudiation of the sword is a judgment on all who use it. His work is permanent; that based on violence is "a mere temporality—to have been doing something which by its very nature, will demand to be done over and over again." Has not the way of war been exactly that? Any quality of permanence which is attached to the results of war will be attached to those things which have been brought in which differs from the sword. Any permanent results will flow from the introduction of spirituality, love, forgiveness, faith in God and fraternity; and not those things directly accomplished by the sword. The work of war is at naught unless another element is introduced.

And thus we say that although we may not see every individual perish who uses the sword, yet all work and institutions which are founded on it are subject to destruction by violence. Christ wanted His kingdom to endure forever, thus He refused the sword with its nature of decay and death (Lipscomb, 68). Pressense well said that "he who is resolved to suffer and to die for God cannot be vanquished. His noble endurance is also an ineffaceable disgrace to his persecutors, and every fresh victim to their rage makes persecution more detested. There is, then, no graver mistake than for a persecuted people to offer material as well as moral resistance; this is to subject themselves to the chances of strength, to the risks of a struggle of which the issue is always uncertain. He who takes the sword deserves to perish by the sword, for he implicitly admits the right of the strongest. Moral resistance, on the contrary, knows no chances, no risks. It is link-
ed to an immortal principle, and destined to certain triumph.” (1:40-41).

VI. THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT OF WAR

Unless the spirit of Christ in Christians today produces the acts of war and the spirit of war, it is impossible to harmonize the spirit and acts of war with those of a Christian. Which statement, in each of the following pairs of statements, is in harmony with Christ’s teaching? Blessed are the merciful or “have no mercy on the enemy” (Stalin)? He died to make men free or he killed to make men free? Love your enemies or hate them? Do good to those who despitefully use you or strike those who strike you? Good for evil or bomb for bomb and more if possible? Spiritual weapons (2 Cor. 10:5; Eph. 6:14) or carnal weapons? Children of God or “angels of hell”? War not after the flesh (Eph. 6:12) or shed blood and kill? Jas. 4:1; Gal. 5:24 or indulge and inflame them? Swords to plowshares or plowshares to swords? Isa. 11:9; 65:25 or hurt and destroy? John 18:36 or fight? Matt. 26:52 or draw and use it? Eye for an eye (Matt. 5:38) or no eye for an eye? Rom. 12:17-21, avenge not or avenge? Mk. 8:34 or inflict suffering as well as bear it? Do as you want to be done by (Matt. 7:12) or do as you have been done by? Poor in spirit or proud in spirit and nationalism? Meek or resentful? Peacemakers or warlike? Persecuted for righteousness sake or avenge oneself? Try to kill or to save those who reject and oppose the Christ (Lk. 9:51-56)? Use instruments of redemptive love to redeem man or instruments of vengeance to destroy man?

The following experiments will convince one of the full force of the impact of the spirit of Christ against the spirit of war. (1) Contrast a description of the most deadly and efficient soldier with the New Testament description of the noblest Christian. (2) Pray for the essential nature of war in Jesus’ name. (3) See if Christian teaching would be accepted by the army as good pre-fight instruction.
(1) A prominent columnist described a commando as an individual who has been taught “in the ruthless forms of murder and attack. They are,” he said, “turned and ground to a fine edge, too, in their hate. They hate more than any other men in the world.” Notice newspaper and war books for descriptions of fighting men in action and ask: Is a description of the most efficient soldier in the world also the description of the noblest type of Christian? If Christians have the authority of Christ to kill they have, by virtue of that fact, the authority to become the most efficient killers in the world. A Christian ought not to do anything in which it would be wrong for him to excel.

(2) Christians should be able to pray concerning their activities and to do their work as unto the Lord. The essential acts of war, those acts which are inseparably connected with war, should be the object of Christian prayers if they are to constitute a part of the actions of a Christian. Should Christian lips pray Mark Twain’s war prayer, which was penned in satire? “O Lord our God, help us to tear their soldiers to bloody shreds with our shells; help us to cover their smiling fields with the pale forms of their patriot dead; help us to drown the thunder of the guns with the cries of the wounded, writhing in pain; help us to lay waste their humble homes with a hurricane of fire; help us to wring the hearts of their unoffending widows with unavailing grief; help us to turn them out roofless with their little children to wander unfriended through wastes of their desolate land in rags and hunger and thirst, sport of the sun-flames of summer and the icy winds of winter, broken in spirit, worn with travail, imploring Thee for the refuge of the grave and denied it; for our sakes, who adore Thee, Lord, blast their hopes, blight their lives, protract their bitter pilgrimage, make heavy their steps, water their way with tears, stain the white snow with the blood of their wounded feet! We ask of One ho is the Spirit of love, and who is the ever-faithful refuge and friend of all that are sore beset, and seek His
aid with humble and contrite hearts. Grant our prayer, O Lord, and Thine shall be the praise and honor and glory now and ever. Amen.” (Richards) Shall we add: “Lord may they suffer, tenfold over, all the anguish which they have caused us and others, and Lord help us personally to see to it that they so suffer. Bless our propaganda and blast theirs, nurture our spirit of hate and vengeance that we may be more efficient in this work. Sanctify thou every means which we find useful in destroying and deceiving our enemies. Overlook any spiritual and moral lapses which, Lord, are an inevitable product of modern war. We pray in the name of gentle Jesus who on a Roman Cross, placed there by hate, prayed: Forgive them for they know not what they do. And forgive us Lord even as we forgive those who trespass against us. In the name of the Savior who died for men of all races, Amen. If thus praying for the instruments and acts of war seems to gag in your Christian throat, perhaps you can sing a song written by William T. Polk.

“Jesus Lover of my Soul,
Help me drill a deadly hole
In my foe man’s heart or face,
Loins or any vital place,
Abide with me, and do not pass
Till I have filled his lungs with gas.”

If you think that this is blasphemy, and if you cannot sing it with the spirit and the understanding (1 Cor. 14:15), then why prostitute your body to such acts which are an essential part of modern war. If it is blasphemy to speak it as a sincere prayer song, then why is it right to do it? to actually perform such acts?

(3) No army, that I know of, teaches the Beatitudes as an essential part of the development of an efficient soldier. The sermon on the mount will make a noble Christian. Will it make an efficient soldier? Will it cultivate the spirit of the acts of war? Nowhere does the word of God, which furnishes us to every good work (2 Tim. 3:16-17) furnish us
with the spirit and the acts which are involved in the raining down of destruction upon an enemy. And since the Christian is a personality, and not an automaton, how can the spirit of war and the spirit of Christ animate the same individual at the same time. One spirit must be laid aside if the other spirit is to reign in an individual’s heart.

VII. OF WHAT SPIRIT ARE YOU? (Lk. 9:51-56)

Christ rebuked the disciples who wanted to call down fire out of heaven, as Elias did, to consume the Samaritans. He “said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save (them)” (Lk. 9:51-56).

They did not understand the nature of Christ’s mission and of His teaching and thus they felt that Christ’s disciples were justified in taking Old Testament examples of the destruction of life to support them in similar actions. To save, to convert, to change others and not to destroy them is the Christian’s goal. If we cannot convert them with Christian means we have no other weapons to use on them for Christ does not allow us to crush enemies.

It is noticeable that Christ rebuked them, instead of rebuking the Samaritans. The disciples profited by this rebuke and later we find that John, who had wanted to destroy them, had a part in their conversion (Acts 8:1, 4, 14). He learned what it was to be persecuted and scourged and yet to love (Acts 3:1; 4:3; 5:18, 40; Rev. 1). He learned to rejoice that he was counted worthy to suffer shame for Christ, instead of depending on the Old Testament for instruction as to how to treat the enemies of the will of God (Acts 5:18, 41).

This is not to say that Jesus denied that the severity of God had been revealed in Elias’ actions or that it is absent from the New Testament. However, we do maintain on the authority of Christ that there is a difference between the spirit of the servants of God in the Old Testament and the
children of God in the New Testament. God's children are reconcilers and not executors of God's just judgments on the earth. Let us wait continually on the ministry of reconciliation—of man to God and thus of man to man—and leave the execution of judgment to God (Rom. 12:19), and to whatever agents or channels through which He may be pleased to work. But that He is not pleased to so work through Christians is certain.

VIII. PETER AND THE WAR QUESTION

What did Peter, who once lifted the sword to protect Jesus, say about the sword after Pentecost and the coming of the Spirit?

Peter preached the gospel of forgiveness to those who had crucified the Christ (Acts 2:17; 3:11). He made no effort to destroy Christ's enemies, although he said that unbelievers would be cut off (Acts 3:23). He left all vengeance taking to the Just Judge. He made no effort to protect himself or the brethren when persecution came (Acts 4:1-3, 17, 21; 5:40). Instead of striking back he rejoiced that he was "counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name" (Acts 5:42). Christians must suffer, if necessary, but not return evil for evil; instead give a blessing (1 Pet. 2:19-23; 3:9; 4:13-19). He told Christians, suffering under Roman persecution, to remain in submission to Rome. He did not advocate rebellion against the pagan, persecuting dictator. (1 Pet. 2:13-23.) He did this in spite of the fact that the state was punishing doers of good instead of doers of evil. What this scripture taught a Christian to render to a government it taught him to render to a government which was pagan and oppressive.

There is no example in the conduct of Peter where he drew the sword, after Pentecost, to defend either himself or another. Neither did he ask another to do it for him. Peter did not execute Ananias (Acts 5). "The death of those persons is not represented as the act of the apostles, or as in
any manner procured or occasioned by them. It is recorded as the visitation of God, without any curse, imprecation or wish of men.” We do not know that Peter knew that Ananias would die. And the wife was given an opportunity to either show her innocency or repent. She did neither and Peter knew, from what had happened to Ananias, that she would perish for her deception. If this example justifies Christians in taking life it justifies the destruction of hypocrites and sinners in the church by members of the church. We do not dispute the power or the right of God to terminate life. We simply say that He has not given Christians authority to do it and that this is not an example of a Christian taking life.

IX. NATIONAL WARS DIVIDED THE CHURCH

What the NT sanctions for a Christian in one country it sanctions for a Christian in another, and in every other, country with reference to his government. If Christians may go to war for their governments—and all may if one may—serious division is wrought in the church and Christians fight Christians. Christ condemned such division and maintained that His disciples would be known by their love for one another (John 17:20; op. 1 Cor. 1:10-12; Eph. 4:1-6; 1 Cor. 12:12-25). We must love the brethren, wherever they are, as Christ loved us (John 13:34-35; 15:12). When one member suffers, the entire body suffers (1 Cor. 12:26). Unless the body of Christ is that of a mad man it will not inflict suffering on itself. Instead of hurting one another Christians must love one another as God has loved us (Rom. 5:8; 1 John 4:10-11; John 15:13). Thus we shall work no ill to our neighbor, (Rom. 13:10), and much less to our brother.

The church is universal, not national, and Christians in all countries are members of the same body. Unless they can conceive of God and Christ at war with one another they must not war with one another but manifest love and unity (John 17:20). We should no more shoot a Christian in another country than one in our home congregation. National
wars are an instrument of the evil one to destroy the unity of the church and to discontinue the love of the brethren (Heb. 13:1).

If Christians are supposed to go to war all Christians must be on one side. The church must declare war against a common foe instead of having a part of the church fight against what another part fights for. How could we hate and kill our brother (1 John 3:14-18)? Why should some reason that the church cannot war against a common foe but that nationalism is permitted to line Christians by the side of unbelievers to fight against other Christians who are also so arrayed? No, the international character of the church and the fact that what the Bible teaches about allegiance to one government it teaches about all, these things forbid Christian participation in national wars.
Chapter IV

The Use of the Old Testament to Justify War for the Christian

We do not deny that God used Israel as an agent of vengeance and that they were authorized to take an eye for an eye. God doeth as He willeth and it is not ours to sit in judgment on Him. Sufficient it is for us to know and do His will for Christians. I do not know why God used Israel in war and yet has not so commanded the Church. I know He so used His church then, and I know that He does not so use His church today. He has the right to say when a man’s sins have forfeited his right to live and He has the right to terminate that individual life, or that nation, by the agent and in the manner that He sees fit. Perhaps He used Israel as such an agent because His covenant was a national covenant with a physical nation while His covenant today is international and it is with a spiritual kingdom. Or it may be because Israel’s was a covenant of law and justice, while Christians do not have the sword because their covenant is one of grace and mercy. It may be because they were on a lower level than the Christian dispensation is on. Regardless of why He has done it we know the church has been forbidden the sword.

Israel was God’s church. If the Christian finds a sanction for war because of Israel’s conduct, we must remember that the sanction would be for the church to wage war. The universal church would have to fight against a common foe and Christians in some, or perhaps all, countries would have to ignore Rom. 13:1-6 and rise in armed rebellion.

It has been objected that “thou shalt not kill” in the Old Testament did not mean that Israel was not to execute evildoers or go to war. However, unless that command
had express exceptions made by God, it forbade all killing. But God made exceptions for the Jews in plain passages addressed to them. Where is there an example of such a plain exception in the NT for the Christian? Those who request scripture which proves that “Thou shall not kill” does not have the exceptions in the NT that it had in the Old Testament, are asked to read Matt. 5:37-48 where Christ expressly abrogated for His disciples what Moses had authorized to the Jews (Cf. Rom. 12:14-21). We must go beyond Judaism to enter the kingdom. However, if it does have the same limitations we have no right to bring over just two of those limitations—the execution of criminals and the waging of war. There is no just reason why all are not to be brought over into the new covenant if any are brought over. What follows? (a) God’s church went to war in the OT; therefore it should in the NT. His nation is the church (1 Pet. 2:9; cf. Acts 7:34, 38, 45). (b) The church must execute capital punishment (Num. 35:9-21); kill adulterers (Deut. 22:22-24); disobedient and hardened sons (Deut. 21:21; Lev. 20:9; Ex. 21:17; Matt. 15:3-6); idolaters, false prophets, those who practice wizardry and those who blaspheme (Lev. 22:2; 20:27; 24:16; Num. 15:35; Deut. 13:1-11; 1 Kings 13:2). Explain why, in the light of such passages as Matt. 5:38-48, Christians do not follow these examples and you have explained why they do not follow the other two exceptions to “Thou shalt not kill”.

If it is maintained, as Foy E. Wallace, Jr., has maintained that the civil governments now perform the “same functions” as when church and state were united, we point out that the church would then be authorized to call in the civil government to do all of the above things for her.

If the example of the Jews is still insisted on, we shall call your attention to the fact that, in so far as the people in Canaan were able to see it, the Jews waged a war of aggression against them (Josh. 8:25-26; 10:40; 11:23). They did it at the command of God who has the right to decide when
a people’s sins have forfeited their right to a land. If some dictators heard preachers argue for Christians going to war because the Jews did, they might feel justified in taking as their text “Go in to possess the land” (Josh. 1:11). Then, too, the same argument could be made for a war to extermination as well as the saving of unmarried women—who were not to be mistreated (1 Sam. 15:3; Deut. 7:2; 13:12-16; 20:16-17; Num. 31:17; 31:18). If it is objected that these things are not brought into the Christian dispensation, we ask: Who introduced the sword for the Christian into this dispensation?

We do not throw away the Old Testament because we maintain that it is not binding on Christians. We find in it God’s attitude toward obedience and disobedience but we do not find commands to the Christian (Cf. 1 Cor. 10:6-12). We learn from Christ, not Moses (Deut. 18:15-19; Acts 3:23; Matt. 17:1-8; Heb. 1:1, 2; 3:1-6, 7:11, 12, 18, 19, 22; 10:1, 2; Gal. 3:19, 23, 25; Lk. 24:44; Eph. 3:4, 5; 2 Cor. 3:5-8, 10:10-15; Acts 26:22, 23; 15:24, 29; 13:39; 3:2, 24; John 5:45-47; Lk. 16:16; John 1:6-8, 15, 17, 18; Lk. 7:28). There is no room for the New Testament unless the first one has become old.

It is realized that OT wars are referred to without condemnation in the NT (Acts 7:24; 7:45; 18:19). Why not, God commanded them. However, He has not so commanded the Christian nation. But if this argument makes war permissible for the Christian this is not the only thing that is permissible by the same reasoning. The NT refers to the following without giving them an express condemnation in the same passage: (a) Concubinage (Gal. 4:22); (b) a harlot whose faith was praised (Ias. 2:25; Heb. 11:31); (c) law for stoning of adulterers (John 8:3-); (d) Levirate marriage (Matt. 22:25-); (e) stoning of rebellious sons (Matt. 15:3-6; Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9). Shall we make the same penalties follow disobedience and continued rebellion, which followed in the OT, because the commandment
to obey parents is used in the NT (Eph. 6:1). Of course, it will be maintained that these things are not in the new covenant. Agreed. And it must be further agreed that Christ abrogated the law of vengeance in so far as His disciples are concerned (Matt. 5:37-48).

Some argue that principles are eternal with God and thus the NT has the same limitations to “thou shalt not kill” that the OT has. This same argument is used by some to bring over various other OT institutions and commandments. Principles may be eternal with God but does not bind Him to using the same methods or same agents in all dispensations. It is foolish to say that because a certain thing was bound on God’s people in one dispensation that it is therefore bound on God’s people in all dispensations.

I. GENESIS 9:6

If this passage is binding on Christians because it was given before the giving of the law, we must also bind sacrifices and circumcision (Gen. 8:20; 12:7; 17:11). They were all incorporated in the law of Moses and are no more binding than any other part of the Mosaic law unless they are incorporated for Christians in the NT.

One person objected that unless we are bound by this, we do not have the authority to eat meats. He was mistaken (Rom. 14; 1 Tim. 4).

This passage does not designate the avenger. It is likely that the next of kin did it. Are we thereby authorized in so avenging ourselves? In fact, we ask: What has this whole passage got to do with Christians going to war to kill? The NT is clear in stating that though God may use such agents as pagan governments, fire, scourges and so forth, that He does not so use the Christians (Rom. 12:19). We cannot follow Gen. 9:6 without violating Rom. 12:19; 13:4, 6.

Individuals who use this passage generally confuse war activities with police activities. We shall deal with the dif-
ference between the two in an article in one of the religious papers. However, we do not believe that either is for the Christian. Gen. 9:6 does not say that God has appointed any particular nation to be a "third party" to rain down destruction indiscriminately upon a nation which contains both the innocent and the guilty. It says nothing about the Christian as an agent of vengeance. So why should we go back there to get our attitude toward national enemies when Christ wants us to hear him (Matt. 5:38-48; 7:24).

II. PLOWSHARES INTO SWORDS FOR CHRISTIANS (Joel 3:9)

If this passage is symbolic of the spiritual struggle of the church or of punishment for her sins, it does not refer to Christians bearing the sword for either the church or a nation. If it has a literal application it still does not place the sword in Christian hands. The nations, or Gentiles, who make the war are distinguished from God's people (Joel 3:1, 2, 3, 7, 9). Because they had sinned and oppressed God's people He said that I "will return your recompense upon your own head ... Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; Prepare war ..." (Joel 3:7, 9). The heathen were to so prepare (3:11). God was to call them into judgment and His Children were to be freed (3:14-20). There is not one word about God's people using the sword or even a suggestion that they were to join with the Gentiles in fighting their wars.
CHAPTER V

The Use of the New Testament to Justify War for the Christian

I. THE SILENCE OF THE SCRIPTURE

It is argued that since the Bible does not say that “Thou shalt not kill to defend thy country from an aggressor,” that it is right for Christians to do it. However, the NT clearly indicates that Christ refused to teach that it was right for this to be done, for he told the Jews to pay tribute to a pagan dictator, and He refused to instruct His disciples to defend their native land against Caesar (Lk. 21:20; Cf. “The Things that are Caesar’s”). Jesus also told his disciples not to take revenge and to do good unto enemies (Rom. 12:19; Lk. 6:27). The term used for enemies “is also used in the Septuagint, and the New Testament and elsewhere, for national foes.” (Cadoux, I:23; Gen. 14:20; 49:8; Exod. 15:6; Lev. 26:7, 8, 17; I Sam. 4:3; Lk. 1:71, 74; 19:43; also Origin Cels., II.30, viii. 69).

(1) The question of military service was not a pressing one for the early Christians for the “Roman State knew no universal military service, and possessed only an army that was very small in comparison with the population, and it was recruited voluntarily. The positive spirit of the Gospel and the Christian renunciation of ‘this world’ together resulted in its becoming obvious to the first Christian community that ‘a Christian might not voluntarily become a soldier’.” (Heering, 42.)

(2) Christ’s way of dealing with men, with even evil men and enemies, was not like the military way of war (Nichols, 186). In following His way, we are cut off from the military way of dealing with enemies.
(3) The so-called argument from the silence of the Scripture proves many, many other things as legitimate for the Christian. The NT does not say: (a) "Thou shalt not sell munitions to Japan to help her in her war with China and to prepare (a few years back) for war with the U. S. (b) It does not say that Christians should refuse to act as an agent of a government in fomenting trouble in another country to start a civil war. (c) It does not say that a Christian should not run a brothel if it is licensed by a government. (d) Christ did not say: "Thou shalt not engage in the aggressive wars of the Roman dictators". (e) Christ did not instruct one of his followers not to be a dictator in the realm of civil government. He did not condemn in so many words Caesar's conquest of Palestine. Shall we justify Christians in becoming Hitlers and in conquering other countries as representatives of a dictatorship? (f) If the NT does not condemn Christians killing in wartime, it does not condemn them killing in either a war of defense or of aggression. The argument from silence would work equally well in a dictatorship for the NT does not say: "Thou shalt not engage in a war of aggression". (g) Does the NT condemn Christians for engaging in a liquor traffic as a governmental agent? (h) Does the NT expressly say that Christians should not engage in wars of conquest to make slaves? Rome got slaves in that manner (Geer, 78). If Christians were supposed to fight for Rome, they did this. (i) The NT does not say: Thou shalt not employ dishonest means if your company commands you to do it as their agent. (j) Philadelphia, Laodicea and Ephesus had temples to Augustus but no NT writing addressed to the churches in Asia Minor said: "Thou shalt not worship Caesar" (Hardy, 72). (k) Romans often tried slaves by torture (Tacitus, Vol. I. 86 Annals, 3.14.22.23.50.67; 4.29.45; 6.47; cp. 11.22; Suetonius, p. 167). (l) Suicide was prevalent and honorable in the Roman world (Tacitus, Annals, 3.15.50; 4.19-.30.35.45; 5.7; 6.9.14.18.23.27.29.39.40.48.49; 11.3.5.38; 12.59). The NT does not say: "Thou shalt not commit suicide." It is not recorded that Paul told the jailor that it
was wrong (Acts 16:27-28). However, the spirit inculcated by Christ makes it repugnant to the Christian conscience. (m) Galiatorial combat to death for the amusement of the crowd was not unknown in Rome (Tacitus, Annals, 12.56.57; Ramsay, 358; Smith and Cheetham, 1:728-729). NT did not say that “Thou shalt not be, or train or hire, a gladiator”. But the early church was against it and the Christian would not participate in it. (n) Dueling was once honorable and legal. Pascal, in The Provincial Letters, shows the types of arguments, which are quite like the “war arguments”, used by men to support the practice. Who today would sanction duels on the basis that the NT does not say: “Thou shalt not duel to protect your honor”? (o) Infanticide was neither unknown or unlawful among some of the heathen in Christ’s day (Westbury-Jones, 307-309, 318-319). Children were, in some instances, sacrificed to pagan gods (313). Abortion was common. Does the NT say of these things, in so many words, “Thou shalt not”? Yet, we know the Christian conscience has not sanctioned them. (p) Rome was very severe with some vanquished races (Allen, 233-234; Tacitus). The silence of the NT does not mean that Christ approved it.

(4) Christ did not give a million specific rules for a million particular situations; in general he stated principles. The spirit He creates within us should lead us to enlist intelligence in the service of love in applying those principles. The principle of Matt. 5:38-48 is enough to forbid the spirit and acts of war to Christians.

(5) The NT does not authorize the Christian to kill and thus the “burden of proof falls upon the one who affirms that Christians may or should engage in war” to kill (Boles, 46). It must be demonstrated that the spirit and act of killing are in harmony with the love, the spirit and acts fostered by Christ.

We have shown that the argument from silence proves
far too much. Elsewhere we have shown that the Bible is not as silent on the subject as some have thought.

II. THE SOLDIERS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

We shall examine the references to soldiers in the New Testament which have been used to sanction Christians killing in wartime.

THE CENTURION

The centurion who believed in Christ’s power to heal (Matt. 8:5-10). It is obvious that regardless of what one thinks of the work of a soldier, there are many splendid qualities among soldiers. One may commend their loyalty and their willingness to be sacrificed without thereby approving their calling. Jesus’ commendation of the centurion’s faith in Christ’s power to heal does not imply that He approved the Roman army of occupation and all for which it stood. If it does the soldiers of a dictator have the full approval of Christ, since if this approves the military calling it approves it as it then existed under Caesar. This man, according to Luke (Lk. 7:1-10), “was not even present in person, and in any case was not a candidate for discipleship.” (Cadoux, 1:33.) His faith, not his calling, was commended. The commendation of Rahab’s faith did not approve her former calling (Jas. 2:25). We ask: Did Jesus’ failure to condemn, in this particular place, the pagan oath, the army of occupation, the worship of the Emperor and wars of conquest, prove that these things were all right?

THE PRAETORIAN

The praetorian guard (Phil. 1:12,13). MacKnight translated it: “For my bonds, on account of Christ, are become manifest in the whole palace, and in all other places.” He commented that “in Rome, the praetorium was the place where the praetor determined causes. More commonly, however, it signified a place without the city, where the praetorian cohorts or regiments of guards were lodged.” Cadoux has said that “various opinions have been held as to the
meaning of———here; but, even assuming that it means the Praetorian Guard, that would not mean that some of the soldiers in it became Christians, but only that it became known to all of them that Paul was in prison because he was a Christian and not for any political offence.” (II:121).

THE CASE OF CORNELIUS

(1) The argument based on Cornelius is based on the silence of the Scripture. We must go to the place where the Bible speaks, not to where it is silent, to learn the Christian attitude on a particular subject. We maintain that the silence here cannot override the teaching of the NT which makes both the spirit and the acts of killing contrary to the Christian spirit. The argument from silence would prove that it was right for the Jewish priests, who were converted, to continue in all functions of priesthood, or for a converted sorcerer to continue his sorcery (Acts 6:7; 8:13). Elsewhere we have shown how dangerous this type of argument is. It would prove that it was right for Christians to practice infanticide, for a Christian to fight for a pagan dictator in a war of aggression and to be a member of an army of occupation for a dictator, and to persecute a conquered people, or Christians; for the Roman army was such an instrument in Caesar’s hands. It would approve the Roman army life which we have elsewhere described.

(2) We do not know what Cornelius did, after his conversion, with reference to the Roman army. He may, or may not, have left it. The Bible does not say, so we won’t either. However, we are quite certain that the early church was against Christians killing and that the NT does not authorize Christians to kill (Cadoux, I). About this the Bible is not silent. We hardly see how he could have stayed in the Roman army without, if he had lived, violating Christ’s instruction concerning the conduct of Christians at the time of the Jewish wars (Lk. 21:20-).

(3) Why did God hear Cornelius’ prayer while he was
still in the army? (Acts 10:1-). This question has been asked, but who would affirm that it was done in order to sanction the life of the Roman soldier for the Christian? We might as well asked: Why did God answer his prayer in this dispensation when it was not in the name of Christ? Did the fact that He did, sanction Cornelius’ condition as an alien to Christ’s church? (Acts 11:14). He was a non-Christian, in a “time of ignorance” (Acts 17:30), and from his pre-Christian conduct we can draw no conclusion for Christian conduct.

(4) It has been objected that Cornelius could not have partaken of any of the paganism in the Roman army because that was contrary to the law of Moses and God did not hear the prayer of those who did not hear the law (Prov. 28:9). Cornelius could hardly have escaped some contamination with idolatry for it was inextricably interwoven with Roman army life. Then, too, the Law said that one must be circumcised, keep the Sabbath (how could that be done in Caesar’s army?) abstain from unclean foods, etc., but Cornelius did not do those things for the brethren later rebuked Peter for eating with an uncircumcised Gentile (Acts 11:3). Shall we argue from these that, on the basis of Prov. 28:9, God did not hear his prayers; or that since He did, that Cornelius must have done all the things commanded by the law? We knew that he did do these things and we know that God heard his prayers.

It is also well to observe that those who argue for Christians killing on the basis of “public” vengeance, could well argue that no Bible teaching concerning worship of God was applicable to a Christian who was a soldier in the Roman army. If a Christian in the Roman army was released, according to the argument of some, from Christian conduct toward his fellowman, why should he not be released from Christian conduct toward God? The logic which teaches the war annuls our Christian relationship to a part of humanity, also teaches that war annuls our Christian rela-
tionship to God. Thus if some of the brethren would follow their own logic they could disregard all the difficulties brought up for a Christian in the Roman army by saying: Christian teaching does not apply to an individual who is an agent of vengeance for a government.

It is true that Cornelius was a devout man. This term was used by the Jews to describe those Gentiles who, although they did not actually become Jewish proselytes, did accept certain of the Jewish teachings. Thus Cornelius lived on a sub-Jewish level even though he was devout. How can his sub-Jewish conduct be an example for Christians unless it is enforced in the NT? It was possible to be devout and yet be wrong for devout simply means “reverential”. A pagan may be devout; an idolator may be very religious (Acts 17:22); devout persons helped crucify Christ (Acts 2:5, 23); devout women stirred up persecution against the Christians (Acts 13:50) and devout Greeks obeyed the gospel (Acts 17:4, 17). “Devoutness” is included in being right, but a person may be devout and do many things which are contrary to Christianity.

**Erastus the Chamberlain (Rom. 16:23)**

If Erastus was the present, instead of a former chamberlain of the city of Corinth, it would prove that he was the treasurer but it would not prove that war is right for the Christian, for he was not an agent of vengeance. Furthermore, if he was the city treasurer, who received and distributed money “at all occasions of public expenses” (Gill, VIII:593), he would have been involved in a participation in idolatry which was repugnant to the Christian conscience. His position would involve him, in some way, with the public games and other public religious festivals in Corinth.

It has been argued with force that Erastus was simply the “steward for the church in the city”. The context is concerning religious matters and this position is more in harmony with what we know of Erastus and of the relation of
The government to the church (Lipscomb, 110). (1) "Some writers report that he held this same position in the church at Jerusalem at an earlier period." (2) The Romans, who regarded Christians as "haters of mankind" and as atheists, would hardly have tolerated such an active Christian. (3) Erastus' missionary activities were not consistent with an office in Corinth which would have required constant attendance. He was with Paul on a missionary journey and after a time went with Timothy into Macedonia (Acts 19:21). "We know not how long they remained on the Macedonian mission, but doubtless some time, as their trip seems to have been to supplement an intended visit of Paul which was, for the time, delayed. Macedonia was from three to five hundred miles both from Ephesus and Corinth." (4) "So the case is this then. It is doubtful if Erastus had been a citizen of Corinth up to this time, but if he was, he had been absent with Paul two or more years, on a missionary tour through Asia and Macedonia. He reaches Corinth and within three months after his arrival Paul calls him treasurer of the city. Does any one believe that after a two years' absence on a missionary tour preaching, he arrived at home and in this prominent city was so soon made its treasurer?" (5) Thomas Scott thought that Erastus was called chamberlain "because that had been his office in time past." This would be similar to calling a man judge after he had retired or his term expired. (5) In 2 Tim. 4:20 Paul "giving an account of those who had been his companions in labor, said: 'Erastus abode at Corinth.' This would hardly have been told if Corinth had been his original home, but it indicates that after traveling around as a missionary, he made his final stopping place at Corinth." (Lipscomb, 112).

**The Philippian Jailor**

The jailor has been given as an example of an individual who was a sword bearer after he became a Christian (Acts 16:23,27,34,36). He was referred to as the jailor, a few hours after his conversion, by pagans who were not
aware of the fact that he was a Christian. Certainly he had had no time as yet to resign his position even if he had intended to do it on that day. He could hardly just walk out without advising the authorities. Furthermore, he could have waited until the necessary steps for release were taken and still not have been necessarily involved in executions in the meantime.

This babe in Christ, just converted from heathenism, may have taken some time to grasp the implication of Christian teaching as it focused on his position. If it had taken him several months to see it, it would not have taken him as long to realize it as it did Peter to grasp the full meaning of the great commission (Acts 10:13), or many of the Christians to see the relationship of the law of Moses to them. But their conduct during that time of immaturity is no pattern for us.

The entire later life of the jailor is a blank to us so we do not know whether he used the sword or placed Christians in stocks after this time (Acts 16:24). Why not argue that he was the jailor and that a part of his job had been, and continued to be, to chastise Christians and put them in stocks? However, it is likely that the opposition to Christians extended to him also (Acts 16:19).

The argument that proves he continued as a sword bearer proves: First, that it was right for him to continue in all functions of his office; second, it was right to use the sword for all purposes for which he had believed it sanctioned before his conversion. So, first, did he place other Christians fast in stocks? Second, did he still believe it right to use the sword for suicide? He had intended to use it to kill himself. That is the only use mentioned in connection with him (Acts 16:27). Paul did not say it was wrong. He said it was unnecessary (16:28) (Perhaps because it was useless to appeal to a pagan on the basis that it was wrong). The jailor was responsible for his prisoners and if they escaped he was subject to their penalty (Cp. Acts 12:19). Suicide
rather than dishonor was a custom sanctioned by the pagans. The Scriptures in the NT do not say: "Thou shalt not commit suicide". Shall we argue that the jailor thought that such was right, that he started to do it, that Paul did not say it was wrong, that he continued to carry the sword and that therefore all uses of the sword which he had believed were approved, and which were not condemned in the record given by Luke, are approved for the Christian. This argument is even stronger than that made by some brethren for war from this case. Shall we take that stand or shall we not say that suicide is contrary to the spirit of the Christ. If this case sanctions the sword it sanctions suicide; this cannot be gainsaid.

SAINTS IN CAESAR'S HOUSEHOLD (Phil. 4:22)

The argument based on this passage is a most presumptuous one from the silence of the Scriptures. We are absolutely ignorant as to who they were and what position they occupied. When Paul wrote Philippians around 61-62 A.D. the household of Nero was composed of a large number of people; in various departments which ranged from nobles to slaves. "The departments in the household were divided and sub-divided, the offices were numberless. The 'tasters,' for instance, constituted a separate class of servants under their own chief; even the pet dog has a functionary assigned to him" (Spence, 36). James MacKnight conjectured that "among the emperor's domestics there were Jewish slaves, who having heard the apostle, or some other person, preach the gospel at Rome, had embraced the Christian faith." If slaves or Jews they were not subject to military service. Of the entire household, "we cannot affirm that any of them, except the soldiers, were involved by their official positions in coercive or punitive functions." (Cadoux, II:115).

III. CHRIST CAST A SWORD ON THE EARTH (Matt. 10:34)

If this sanctioned war it would arm the church and lead Christians to fight their parents or children (Matt. 10:34-39). However, all that it means is that Christ chal-
lenged the existing order. Those who accepted Him were divided from those who rejected Him and opposed His followers. Strife, as well as division, followed when the enemies of Christians used the sword on them (Matt. 24:9; 1 Pet. 2:21-2; Rom. 12:14,17-21; Matt. 10:17-23). We know that Christ did not give Christians the carnal sword for He had said that they were to be as sheep in the midst of wolves and that they were to be as harmless as doves and that they were to flee when persecuted (Matt. 10:23). Jesus cast a fire on the earth but that does not authorize us in burning out our neighbor's barn (Lk. 12:49). From Luke's account we see that the sword was also a symbol for "division" (Lk. 12:51).

IV. THE PROPHECIES OF WAR

The prophecies of war no more justify Christians killing than prophecies of apostasy justify apostasy (1 Tim. 4:1-; 2 Thess. 2; 2 Tim. 3:1-13); or than Jesus statement that ye always have the poor with you, justifies us in paying low wages to keep some people poor. The cross was predicted, Peter's denial was predicted, but these did not justify Christian participation in these things (Matt. 26:54-56; 18:6-7; 24:10,11). In one prediction of a war Christ told his disciples to flee (Matt. 23:36; cp. Lk. 21:20-). Wars shall continue as long as men are sinful and at war with God and His will. But the presence of sin is not a justification for Christian participation.

V. THE SCOURGE OF SMALL CORDS (John 2:13-17)

This could not possibly sanction war. At the most it would permit the use of a scourge of small cords on only those religious individuals who turn the gospel into a means of merchandise. If it sanctioned any war it would be a religious war. However, we agree with Foy E. Wallace, Jr. that the whip was not used on the members of the temple (Bible Banner (Sept., 1942, p. 3). Jesus’ action, in so far as the men are concerned, is described by the same word "ek-
hallo”, which literally means “to cast out”. It is used in such places as Mk 1:12; 5:40; Matt. 9:38; 7:4; 12:35; 13:52; Lk. 10:35; John 10:35. “Here therefore it need mean no more than an authoritative dismissal. (Cadoux, I:35). The only Gospel which mentions the scourge “is the only one that mentions the cattle”. “A careful reading of the Greek makes it clear that the scourge of cords was used for the beasts and not for the men (note the R. V. translation of John 2:15-)”. Goodspeed translated it: “And he made a lash out of rope, and drove them all, sheep and cattle, out of the Temple . . .” “Making a scourge of cords, he drove them all, sheep and cattle together, out of the Temple . . .”. (James Moffatt). If the “all” included men as well as animals, there would have been no men of this group left for Jesus to tell to take the other material out. But men remained for after Jesus had driven the “all” out with the scourge, he told some dealers to take their money and tables out. The place they were then in was the temple—“His father’s house”. This proves that the “all” meant the animals, and not men. If Jesus had relied on physical force he would have been overcome for he was vastly outnumbered. However, it was Christ’s moral authority, the knowledge of the men that they were wrong and their fear of the crowd which must have led them to obey Him. So this does not look like a fist fight, much less carnal war.

VI. WARS IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION

If this approves killing in war by Christians, it proves many other things also. (a) The particular wars in Revelation, if they are not symbols setting forth spiritual struggles, must be identified by Christians; they must fight these wars as a church. All Christians in all nations should arise against the common foe. Thus it does not sanction national wars. This would lead Christians to violate Rom. 13; 1 Pet. 2:14- and take up arms against their own governments in some countries. (b) If Revelation establishes war for Christians it establishes war for the church. The church must, on this
argument, become an armed camp and fight against “the
nations” and help Christ rule them, (Rev. 19:15), for John
saw “the kings of the earth gathered against God’s army
19:19).

The wars in Revelation are waged either by the angels
of the Lord, with the Lord leading them, or by non-Christians
or they are to be interpreted in a spiritual sense in so far
as Christian conduct is concerned. Christ fought with the
sword which proceeded out of His mouth (Rev. 1:16; 2:12,
16 19:21, 15), and with the help of such agents as angels,
horses, scourges, earthquakes and so forth (Rev. 6:2, 4, 8;
8:5,7,8,10,11; 9:3,4,5,10,14,15,17,18 (note: it was “by
these”, not by Christians); 11:5,6,13; 14:9,10,19; 15:1;
16:2,6,8,14,18,21; 18:1,7,8; 19:14; 17:1,6,14; 18:4,5,6,
20,21; 19:11,13,14,19,20,21; 20:8,10,15). In any case
superhuman powers fought on the side of God and men on
the side of the devil.

The weapons which the Christians carried were spiri­
tual (Rev. 7:14; 12:11). However, if the sword was placed
in their hands the rest of the weapons, such as scourges,
earthquakes, plagues, hail, fire and brimstone, were to be
used by the Christians (Rev. 2:26-27; 6:8; 8:5,7,8,11,12;
9:3,4,5,10,17,18,20; 11:6; 14:9,10; 15:1,6,7; 16:1,2,3,12,
18,21; 17:1,6; 18:2,4,6,7,8,21; 20:2,10,15).

The use to which this argument puts Revelation would
justify the church in taking up arms and the firebrand
against apostates (Rev. 2:20-23; 16:6). If Babylon is the
apostate church the Lord’s church should judge and destroy
her with fire and plagues (Rev. 18:1,6-8). The nations
watched this although they did not do it themselves (Rev. 18:
9-10). The symbolism of Revelation (16:15; cf. Matt. 10:
16; 2 Pet. 3:10) would also approve of Christians being
thieves; that is, if one used the same argument on this bit
of symbolism as do some on the “war symbolism”.

Revelation, we know, pictures Christians as suffering persecution and as leaving vengeance to God (Rom. 12:19; Rev. 2:10; 6:9-10; 12:17; 13:7; 14:10; 15:7; 16:1; 17:6, 14; 18:5,6,20; 19:2, 11, 14,21; 20:9-10). It is also noticeable that “among all these pictures of war, in Revelation, appears continually the figure of the Lamb led to the slaughter” (Heering, 31; Rev. 5:9,6,12).

“History proves that the military Jesus Christ redivivus of apocalyptic never in the (course of the) first three centuries turned the Christians into warlike revolutionaries” (quoted from Harnack by Cadoux, I:184). If the early church had had the same attitude on vengeance, protection of their property, rights and lives, that many brethren have today they would have used such symbolism as that found in Revelation in order to justify them in punishing persecutors and in declaring war (when they became stronger) on pagan Rome. They did not have that attitude and thus they did not do it.

VII. The Two Swords (Lk. 22:36-38)

(1) The disciples were slow in comprehending the spiritual nature of Christ’s kingdom. Some of them had a warlike spirit (Lk. 9:51-). They recognized that Jesus was in danger and they did not want him to suffer (Matt. 16:21; John 11:16). Apprehension of such dangers may have led Peter to get a sword.

(2) If this is an authorization for Christians to kill it does not imply that it is right for them to fight in national wars. Instead, it would teach that Christians should go out, to preach the gospel, fully armed and ready to strike those who interfered with their work. While preaching forgiveness of sins, the forgiveness of injuries, the love of enemies, and the love of God; they should also be ready with the sword to strike those who interfered with their rights. This would make the church an armed camp and require it to carry weapons regardless of the laws of the land. But the Christ-
ians did not strike the persecutors; this is evident from the New Testament and early church history.

(3) It may be that Jesus simply called for a “war like readiness to defend the gospel at all costs”. “The obvious fact that two swords were not enough to defend twelve men is sufficient of itself to rule out a literal interpretation; but to get a satisfactory sense of any other line is almost equally difficult. The interpretation adopted by Harnack, viz. that the sword was meant metaphorically to represent the steadfast defence of the gospel under the persecution which was about to befall the disciples, is possibly the best within our reach at present.” (C. J. Cadoux, II:52-53.)

It has been suggested that Jesus “possibly meant, as Goodspeed translates, ‘Enough of this.’ (Scott-Craig, 41.) “Young’s Analytical Concordance says of this matter, ‘It is enough—that is, enough has been said on the subject (for Jesus saddened at the paltry ideas of the disciples breaks off in this way the conversation; the Jews when a companion uttered anything absurd, were wont to use the phrase, “Let it suffice thee” Deut. 3:26” (Ketcherside, 18). If Jesus ironically says, “enough of this”, he was closing the conversation in which the disciples had misunderstood the meaning of his statement.

(4) If, when Jesus said “enough”, he had reference to the two swords it is obvious that two were not enough to defend them. Thus the defense of their lives with the sword could not have been the object of Jesus’ remark in Lk. 22:36. If he had had literal swords in mind, for the defense of his disciples, he would have instructed them to add to their supply instead of saying “It is enough”.

The following facts make it evident that Jesus did not mean for his disciples to use the carnal sword. (a) Christ would not let them use it. Three reasons were given. (Lk. 22:49-51; Matt. 26:52,54; John 18:36). (b) It is evident from the rest of the NT that the Christians did not use the
sword to defend themselves. There are many situations in which they were persecuted and in which they should have used it if it was permissible. But there is no place where they did use it. This should make it evident that the early church did not understand that this passage gave them the carnal sword. (c) It is also evident that it was not for a defensive war against the Romans for Christ did not encourage such, neither did his disciples fight the Romans (Rom. 13:1-; John 18:36; Lk. 21:20-22). (d) It was not used to put down the rebellion of the Jews against Rome. It is evident from history and from Lk. 21:20-22 that they did not join the Romans in fighting the Jews. What purpose, then, could the two swords serve if he had literal swords in mind? They were enough for what?

(5) If Christ had reference to literal swords, then His purpose can be found in what actually happened. In Genesis 22 we know that God did not intend for Abraham to slay his son. How do we know? We know what God purposed from what God actually did in the case. The same holds true here. We know that Jesus did not mean that they should kill in self-defense, or in defense of another, by what actually happened. Peter and the disciples got a vivid object lesson when Peter drew the sword—to put it to the use for which he thought that it was intended—and Jesus told him to put it up. Nowhere has Jesus commanded Peter, or us, to take it again. Jesus healed the one whom he smote (Lk.22:49-51). Christ gave him three reasons for putting the sword away (John 18:11; 18:36; Matt. 26:52).

We believe, with Ballou, that it was employed on that "memorable occasion as a significant emblem of injurious resistance, for the purpose of inculcating non-resistance." And that it was effective for that purpose is evident from the fact that the apostles and early Christians did not use the sword to protect themselves. As Erasmus said, "why did the martyrs never use that defense?" (Erasmus Against War, p. 46). Ambrose said: "O Lord! why commandest thou me to
buy a sword, who forbiddest me to smite with it? Why com-
mandest thou me to have it, whom thou prohibiest to draw
it? Unless perhaps a defence be prepared, not a necessary
revenge; and that I may seem to have been able to revenge,
but that I would not.” (quoted by Barclay, 522-523).

In conclusion let us observe that if any cause was good
and just, this one was. Why draw it for a lesser cause if
three reasons were given why it should not be drawn for
this cause? Christ objected to its use not merely because of
the special circumstances surrounding his death, but also be-
cause of two general principles (Matt. 26:52; John 18:36).
It was not just a reason why they should not fight then, but
why they should not fight at all. And there is no hint, as
some have conjectured, that Christ told them not to fight
because they were small in number and the odds were against
them. *When the Lord said put it up, who dares to say for
Christians to unsheathe it?*

VIII. JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE SOLDIER

(1) *John the Baptist was under the law* (Matt. 11:11-14). “It is not Jesus who speaks, but his forerunner, John,
still wholly Israelite, of whom Jesus bore witness, ‘He that
is but little in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he’
(Mt. 11:11).” John said that he must decrease and Christ
increase. He was a forerunner of Christ and not the founder
of the Kingdom of heaven.

(2) John’s instructions to the soldiers are no more in-
struction for Christian conduct than is Christ’s command in
Luke 17:4 for the lepers to show themselves to the priests.
The old law was still in force when John gave his instruc-
tions; he lived and died under the law of Moses which per-
mitted the taking of vengeance.

(3) These soldiers were likely members of the army
of occupation which Caesar had placed over this conquered
territory. Thus, if this is advice to Christians it would be
permissible for Christians in Japan to help keep conquered
territory in submission—even if they came into our own land. Shall we say that John approved Caesar's actions in conquering Palestine?

(4) "Not to use violence or deceit against any; which being removed, let any tell how soldiers can war? For are not craft, violence, and injustice three properties of war, and the natural consequences of battles?" (Robert Barclay, 520).

(5) John did not tell them it was wrong to worship the emperor or to engage in the pagan rites which were bound up with Roman army life.

(6) If the Christ and the apostles have forbidden both the spirit and the acts of war to the Christian, no conversation of John the Baptist, who was under the law, makes killing legal for the Christian. And we believe that we have presented the evidence that Christ forbade both the spirit and acts of war to Christians.

(7) Is the Jewish priesthood approved for Christians because John did not tell priests to cease from their functions? (John 1:19).

(8) Is infant baptism authorized because Jews were not told that infants should not be baptized?

(9) Jews practiced polygamy. Is such right because John did not condemn it?

IX. THE MILITARY METAPHORS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

A metaphor may emphatically set forth some similarity between two things without necessarily approving everything in the realm from which the metaphor is drawn (Cp. Gal. 4:22-). With reference to the military metaphor we make the following observations. First, if it endorsed military life for the Christian it endorsed the military life of Paul's day which we have elsewhere described. Second,
Whatever the military metaphor proves for the army, other metaphors prove concerning the actions from which they are drawn.

(1) The metaphors drawn from the race course (1 Cor. 9:24; Gal. 2:2; 5:7; Phil. 2:13, 16; Heb. 12:1). Some brethren in the early centuries used such metaphors to justify their attending the games at the stadiums where heathen rites were performed and were gladiators fought men and beasts in death struggles (Pressense, IV:465). The place “where the athletes contended was called the stadium. The Isthmian, one of the four sacred games, being celebrated in the territory of Corinth, the apostle, in writing to the Corinthians, very properly used arguments taken from these games.” (MacKnight on 1 Cor. 9:24). Various games were sacred to different gods and the prizes in the races were often made of the leaves of trees which were sacred to these various gods. Contestants swore at the altar of Jupiter not to make a “breach of the laws of the sacred games” (MacKnight). Suetonius referred to the “Olympic solemnities” (276). Hardy mentioned “games in honour of the deified emperors” (72). Smith and Cheetham also referred to the association of pagan idolatry with the races (1:729).

(2) Does Paul’s reference to boxing place his approval on the brutality which was associated with boxing among the Romans? (1 Cor. 9:26).

(3) If the “war similes” and parables approve war, other metaphors and parables approve house-breaking, stealing and the scourging of slaves (Matt. 24:42-44; Lk. 11:21; Rev. 16:15; 2 Pet. 3:10; Mk. 3:27; Lk. 14:31; 17:7-10). Under such reasoning the scriptures also justify us in being snakes in the grass and robbers (Cp. Matt. 10:16 with Gen. 3; 2 Cor. 11:8).

In spite of the use of such metaphors we know that the early church did not place its approval on stealing, the pagan games and war. In speaking of the persecution of the early Christians Geer said that “probably more important
in rousing public antipathy was the refusal of Christians to take part, even as spectators, in public games and festivals, all of which were connected with religion." (141). Then too, we must not overlook the fact that the use of such metaphors was not confined to Christian writers (Cadoux, II:188). Furthermore, those who do not believe in killing also use them. Ira Y. Rice, Jr., for example, edits a paper called the Christian Soldier.

Paul must have realized that some brethren would misunderstand his use of the military metaphor for he reminded the brethren, more than once, that he was not talking about carnal warfare (2 Cor. 10:3; 6:7; Eph. 6:12).

The militarist can find no comfort in the military metaphors. Even if they did prove war for the Christian they would support Christians arming to fight as an army of the church and not as a soldier of a worldly government.

X. THE THINGS THAT ARE CAESARS (Matt. 22:15-21)

In reality there is no Caesar today for there is no world ruler such as he was. Furthermore, we have no Caesar for this Caesar was a foreign conqueror, a dictator, who had extended his pagan rule over Palestine. However, for the sake of discussion we shall use the term Caesar in the sense of "the powers that be" (Rom. 13:1-7).

(1) The relationship of the Jews to the Romans at this time was that of a subject people to a conqueror. Mommsen pointed out that in A.D. 6 Judæa was a province of Rome in which a military force was stationed. It was supported, partially at least, by tribute money exacted from the Jews by the Romans (II:185-186). In other words, they were forced to support an army of occupation. Under the Emperor Augustus, bloody Herod, who had men murdered on the slightest suspicion, ruled and enraged the populace by his misdeeds and by such actions as that of building "the circus and theatre in Jerusalem itself, as well as the temples of the imperial worship in the Jewish towns". He even in-
introduced a golden eagle into the temple in Jerusalem. The first two things were regarded "as summons to blaspheme God" and the last "led to a popular insurrection, to which the eagle fell a sacrifice, and thereupon doubtless the devotees as well, who tore it down." (Mommsen: 181). After the death of Herod, Archelaus began his rule with the slaughter of a number of patriotic Jews. Varus "had to call out the legions and to restore quiet with the sword" (183-184).

Revolts were led by such men as Judas the Galilean. There were many who looked upon the paying of tribute to an "alien and idolatrous power" as disobedience to the kingship of God. They "bound themselves together not to wait in quiet submission for the hope of Messianic redemption but to secure delivery from the Roman yoke by resort to force." (Allen: 228-229). Such were the Zealots. Tribute was both oppressive and godless in their way of thinking and no cost was too great to be paid to get rid of Roman dictatorship (Mommsen: 19-191).

(2) The question of the Jews did not deal with military service. First, the question itself was in connection with tribute, not military service (Matt. 22:17). Second, the Jews were exempt from military service (Cadoux, I:41). The question was the test question of Jewish patriotism (Westbury-Jones, 48-49). Was it lawful for them to submit to the rule of a dictator, a foreign conqueror, who had extended his sway over Palestine and the people of God? Since this was the question, it is foolish to use this passage to try to support killing for Caesar.

(3) The dilemma in which the Jews attempted to involve Jesus. If Jesus said, "No", the Herodians would have reported him to Caesar as a political rebel and have thus gotten rid of him. If he said, "Yes", the Pharisees would have endeavored to destroy Jesus' influence with the multitudes by telling them that he was an enemy of their country for he advocated submission to Caesar.
(4) Is the image of Caesar on man? Jesus said that the money had the image of Caesar on it and that therefore it belonged to him (Matt. 22:19-21). He did not say that they belonged to Caesar as agents of vengeance. God’s image is on man, and body and spirit belong to Him (Gen. 1:27; Jas. 3:9; 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:34; Rom. 12:1). Give to Caesar what is his—the money, and give to God what is his—yourselves. The emphasis in this passage is not what some think it to be for they seem to think that Christ came to tell us of Caesar’s claim on us. Not so, He came that men might know how to render to God that which belongs to Him (Heering: 37). Jesus denied the supreme authority to the state which the Emperor claimed, and which the soldier’s oath in that day acknowledged. Christ contested the imperial claim to the “absolute submission of the reason, will, and life” from its subjects (Pressensé, II:75). Thus Christ denied to Caesar the fundamental principle on which a dictator ruled and on which an army operated—the principle of absolute obedience of the inferior to his superior in rank. Christ, on the other hand, denied to the Jews His sanction of armed resistance to that pagan dictator.

A modern analogy will help us get the full force of Jesus’ answer. This reply was given to a conquered race. The patriots of a conquered race today would not have their patriotism fed if Jesus told them, as he told the Jews, “To render unto the conqueror the things that are his and unto God the things that are God’s”. Jesus answer was, and is opposite to that which the nationalist generally seeks (Cf. Milne: 76).

(5) In another place Christ demanded that His disciples disobey Caesar rather than deny Him (Matt. 10:17, 28-33). Isn’t a refusal “to disobey his ethical teaching at Caesar’s bidding” but “a natural extension of this precept”? (Cadoux, I:41). A denial in conduct is just as much at fault, and perhaps more so, as a verbal denial.

(6) We have heard the argument that if it is right to
pay taxes it is also right to do what we are fairly sure that the taxes will be used for. This overlooks the fact that we are commanded to pay taxes to Caesar, but we are not commanded to carry the sword for him. It also ignores the fact that “to part with one's property at the demand of another person does not make one responsible for all the person's doings, nor does it imply a readiness to obey any and every command that that person may feel he has a right to issue.” (Cadoux, I:41). It is one thing to deliver up money to a government, which has the power to take all your property, and it is another thing to surrender our will and body to every bidding.

If the payment of taxes implicates us in the deeds for which others use the taxes, Jesus was implicated in the following deeds of Caesar for He said to pay tribute. (a) Caesar gave immoral parties (Suetonius). (b) Caesar supported a pagan, idolatrous religion. (c) He persecuted minorities, and after A. D. 64, tax money supported soldiers who persecuted Christians. (d) Caesar engaged in aggressive wars which took away the freedom of others and made some of them slaves. (e) Caesar was a dictator. Should Christians say that such are right because we pay taxes at the command of Jesus and Paul?

Since all Christians do not live as citizens of a democracy, they would be forced to fight against democracy if the argument from “tribute to Caesar” supports Christians killing. It teaches that Christians in occupied countries should pay the taxes exacted. Shall we take the argument of some brethren and say that if they pay taxes that they ought also to fight for their conqueror? What it proves in a free country it proves in an occupied country, for the country in which Jesus spoke these words was an occupied country.

We must remember that we are responsible for our actions, our intentions, and not for every use to which the taxes or the results of our efforts may be put by another.
God requires us to pay taxes, but He does not require us to do acts, at the bidding of another, which are contrary to Christian conduct. Doubtless a refusal to fight will bring charges of a lack of patriotism, of a lack of love for our country. Was Jesus unpatriotic and of no value to His countrymen because he said for them to pay taxes, not to revolt, to the foreign conqueror?

XI. Do We Have the Authority to Imitate God As the Judge?

Although we do not have the wisdom, knowledge, justice or mercy of God, there are some who have justified the destruction of their enemies, the “wicked”, because God exercises the power of Judge. The NT, however, states that Christians are not to do it, but instead to leave it to God (Rom. 12:19; Rev. 6:9-10; 18:8; 18:20; 19:2; 20:9). One reason we are not to take vengeance is because God will take care of it (Rom. 12:17; 16:20; Jas. 4:12). It is no more of a puzzle why Christians are not agent of vengeance than it is a puzzle as to why the church is not such an agent; or that Christ was not an agent of vengeance while on earth (John 12:47). He refused to pass and execute the death sentence (John 8:1). He prophesied Jerusalem’s destruction but He did not do it Himself while on earth or tell Christians to do it (Lk. 21:20). He sorrowed over them and His mission was to save, not destroy (Matt. 23:37; Lk. 9:51). Explain why God did not use Christ, while on earth, as an agent of vengeance and you may have explained why He does not so use Christians or the church. Any “tangles” in which you endeavor to trap the Christian for not executing vengeance will also entrap Jesus because He would not take vengeance while on earth.

The NT nowhere holds up God as Judge for our imitation (Matt. 5:44-48; 10:24-25; Lk. 6:36; Matt. 7:11; 1 Pet. 2:21). If we are to imitate Him as Judge we should now render to every man according to his work (Rev. 2:23;
22:12), and "take care of" heretics and sinners and apostates. We have as much right to do this today as we have to maintain that God as Judge is the pattern for our conduct now in our treatment of enemies. We have, however, neither the command nor the insight, knowledge or power necessary to be such a Judge. Nowhere does Jesus bid "his followers (to) punish the guilty, as their heavenly Father punishes the guilty" (Cadoux, III:89). Christians may recognize that the deeds of certain men deserve certain consequences. However, we have no authority to do anything to the sinner except try to convert him to Christ, or, failing in this, to leave him alone. God has no more made us the executor of our political and national enemies than he has made us such executors of the enemies of the church.

When God executes justice on men it is usually the fruit of their own thought (Jer. 6:18-). This is indeed the "wrath of God". "That 'wrath' for Paul does mean this working out of the law of cause and effect is suggested most clearly when he writes: 'After thy hardness and impenitent heart thou treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his works' (Rom. 2:5-). And the further truth, noted above, that the retribution, though in a sense Divine punishment, may in itself involve sin, appears when Paul, immediately after his reference to the revelation of 'wrath of God', adds the words 'wherefore God gave them up in the lust of their hearts unto uncleanness'. (Rom. 1:18,24). It is worth nothing here, with reference to our own particular problem, that both the effect of law in general and the punitive action of the civil magistrate in particular are defined as 'wrath'; that is to say, so far as the law is the instrument of God and the civil magistrate His agent, they are so, not as agents of His immediate personal will, but because through both alike the working out of the inexorable principle of retribution is illustrated." (cf. Rom. 4:15; 13:4) (Macgregor, 76). God may use what-
ever agents and forces which He ordains but He has not ordained Christians as agents of "wrath" (Cp. Rom. 13:5-6; Rev. 18:7-8; 16:6-7; 15:1,7; 16:1; 16:21 for examples of some agents of "wrath").
CHAPTER VI

The Teaching and Conduct of Paul

Paul neither used nor taught any other Christian to use the sword. This is evident from both his conduct and his teaching.

I. THE TEACHING OF PAUL

Paul taught Christians to return good for evil to everyone (Rom. 12:14,17; 1 Thess. 5:15). They were not to take vengeance (Rom. 12:18-21). They were not to conform to the world (Rom. 12:1-2). We do so conform if we learn from the enemy to take his weapons and fight his kind of warfare. We conform to the world when we treat enemies as does the world. Our weapons are not carnal although those of the world are carnal (2 Cor. 10:3-4). Paul told no Christian to use the sword to defend the faith or his rights. In persecution they were to suffer and “commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator.” (1 Pet. 4:19). Paul said: suffer and entreat (1 Cor. 4:12-13). In so far as the cause or perpetuation of contention is concerned it is not to be in us but we are to be at peace (Rom. 12:18). When men will not be at peace with us we are not to fight them but to do them good (Rom. 12:19,20). Their evil is to be no occasion for your paying them in like coin.

Paul taught that God overruled the “powers that be” and used them as agents of vengeance (Rom. 13:1-7). Other agents have been plagues, scourges, etc. (Rev. 15-18). Nero had no thought of being overruled by God but Paul said that God did overrule him as an agent of wrath. He forbade Christians to be the wrath. He even told them not to seek justice before a pagan court when wronged by a brother (1 Cor. 6:1-8). When a Christian does that or does another person an evil for an evil, he has violated Paul’s teaching (Rom. 12:18-).
II. THE CONDUCT OF PAUL

He fought no fight, after conversion, other than the fight of faith (2 Tim. 4:7). He did not administer vengeance to others. He did not complain against his persecutor “in order to procure his punishment” (Ballou, 51). His conduct was not infallible but it does not violate his teaching concerning enemies (1 Cor. 4:12, 16, 31). Even while a prisoner Paul took the course which prevented all violence and he did not ask for any vengeance (Acts 28:19). Let us notice the portion of his conduct which is used to justify war.

(1) Paul did not inflict blindness on a man who opposed his teaching (Acts 13:9-10). If he did it was though the express instruction of God and it applied to that one case for it was not done elsewhere. If he did, then it is an example as to how we are to treat enemies of the gospel. Since we do not have miraculous powers we should use something like acid, I suppose. However, Paul did not do it himself. He simply announced that the Lord’s hand was to be on that individual (Acts 13:11).

(2) Paul asked for a public release in Acts 16:37. They had been falsely accused and illegally beaten and without a public release an impression against the gospel, which could be removed by a public release, might have been left in the mind of the people. Paul did not want to leave silently like a condemned prisoner who had made a jail-break. All he asked was a public release. He did not threaten or try to kill or prosecute those who had beaten him. He asked them to do the right thing and after stating the facts he left it to them. An example, in which no redress was asked, cannot confirm war for Christians.

(3) The captain in Jerusalem thought that Paul was a criminal but he rescued him from the mob in order to keep down riots and rebellions (Acts 22:31-). There was no violence for the mob left off beating Paul when they saw the soldiers. Rome had to exercise special care over the city.
especially during the feasts. Many people, often armed, then
gathered there and the captain was afraid the uproar might
issue in an uprising (Gill, VIII:352) (Cf. Josephus). Paul
did not try to kill the mob, he did not call the military, he
did not ask the soldiers to punish the mob, he did not ask
for redress (Acts 28:19). He was not consulted as to whether
the soldiers should take him into custody. Neither flight,
protest or force on his part could have prevented it.

(4) Paul was born a citizen. He did not become one
just to be protected in such instances. (Acts 22:25). He let
the fact of his citizenship be known, he did not threaten
them, he did not strike them. He let them know that in beating him they would violate their own law. From 16:36 and
Acts 28:19 we know that he would not have asked for vengeance. According to Cicero it was unlawful to bind and to beat the Roman citizen. The Valerian law made it unlawful
to condemn a Roman citizen without a hearing (Gill, 359).
Paul thus prevented them from adding transgression to transgression.

(5) Paul had the captain informed of the plot to kill
Paul (Acts 23:12-25). The nephew asked the captain not
to send Paul before the council for certain Jews were ready
to slay him while he was on the way. The captain formulated
and executed a plan which avoided all bloodshed. Let us
examine this case closely as some have said that Paul "prayed"
the authorities to provide protection and that "in answer
to his petition the government assigned him two hundred
soldiers, etc."

First, the term "prayed" is translated "asked" in the
American Standard Version.

Second, Paul did not ask for an armed force to protect
him. He had been placed, without his being consulted,
under military guard when the captain took him from the
mob.

Third, Paul proposed no plan. The nephew simply
asked that Paul be not taken before the council. Paul was
the prisoner not the planner of the actions of the captain.
The captain formulated a plan which avoided all bloodshed.
It did not result in the violence which would have resulted
if the information had not been taken to the captain. Even
while he thought Paul was a criminal the captain had taken
Paul to prevent an uproar (Acts 21:33, 38). Certainly the
captain would not want to take him where he would know
that Paul, whom he now recognized as a Roman citizen,
would be attacked. Later the captain lied when he said that
he had rescued Paul from the mob because he (Paul) was
a Roman (Acts 23:37).

Fourth, Tertullus lied when he said that great violence
had been used by Lysias (Acts 24:7; 21:32-33).

Fifth, Paul did not appeal to the captain on the basis
of his citizenship. “Paul the prisoner” asked that the nephew
be sent to the captain (Acts 23:18).

Sixth, Paul was not in charge of the situation so what
could he demand or permit as a prisoner? He simply sub­
mitted to the requirements of the captain and these did not
call on Paul to violate any Christian teaching. Let us notice
that Paul could not get out of this situation by saying: “Let
me die”. Paul was already a prisoner and a citizen. Roman
law, not Paul, held the captain accountable for what happen­
ed. Thus if Paul’s blood had been shed it would not have
stopped there. Others would have suffered.

Seventh, Paul did not kill anyone or ask anyone to kill
for him.

Eighth, he did not ask for vengeance on the plotters

Ninth, Paul taught Christians to consider the welfare
of others. If he had failed to report the plot it is likely that
not only Paul but also soldiers, the plotters, the captain and
innocent Jews would have suffered. We can understand the
seriousness of the condition if we remember that Jerusalem was then seething with rebellion and that within about ten years after this Jerusalem was destroyed as a result of the open rebellion of the Jews. The captain, when he had first taken Paul, thought that Paul was a leader of sedition (Acts 21:31, 38). If Paul had been sent to the council, without the captain being aware of the plot, the captain would have regarded the attack on Paul as also an attack on the soldiers who would have been sent with prisoner Paul. Paul was the captain's prisoner and the captain would not have sent the prisoner unaccompanied from the castle to the temple. Paul would have gone under armed guard just as surely as he was under such a guard while in prison and later while being sent to Felix. Thus if the Jews had attacked Paul, Paul's blood alone would not have been shed. The soldiers would have fought the Jews and some on both sides have likely been slain. The captain would have received shame and blame for having permitted a citizen to be slain (Gill, 366). In fact the Vulgate Latin version adds to Acts 23:24, "for he was afraid lest the Jews should take him (Paul) by force and kill him, and afterwards he should bear the reproach, as if he had took money" (Gill, 365). If the plot had gone on successfully the captain might have interpreted it as rebellion, since it would have also involved attack on soldiers as well as on a citizen, and he might have dealt severely with the Jews. In the army, for example, when officers could not find the guilty party every tenth man was sometimes selected and killed. Then, too, the Romans had been known to utterly destroy a town and a people that had rebelled. In fact, Jerusalem was later destroyed with thousands killed and thousands sold into slavery. P. Quintilius Varus, who before this was governor of Syria, had "burnt to the ground the town of Sepphoris (near Nazareth)", which was the scene of a revolt around 4 B. C. Varus had "marched through the country crucifying as many as 2000 Jews." (Allen, 228-229).
In view of the entire situation, Paul’s conduct was the only conduct that was consistent with his teaching to return good for evil, to be interested in the welfare of others, and with his conviction on Christians executing wrath on enemies. Where it is to the welfare of the gospel and of others to avoid trouble, Christians should do so. Paul’s silence would have led to bloodshed, this we know. We also know that his conduct helped to prevent all bloodshed. What more could a c. o. do?

(6) Paul appealed to Caesar (Acts 25:7). He did not appeal to him for protection or to execute vengeance. It is beside the point to say that “Paul knew that the court of Caesar was maintained by the sword and (that) he called upon that court to protect him.” Paul knew that the court in which he then stood was a part of Caesar’s system and that regardless of whether he went to Jerusalem or to Rome that he would be in the custody of the soldiers. Thus Paul was again in a position where he could either keep silent (or consent to go to Jerusalem) and go where bloodshed would be involved or to go where he was confident that there would be no bloodshed. With these alternatives, what c. o. could have refused to appeal to Caesar. Paul had been declared guiltless but after a long time his trial and release was still pending. He knew that Jerusalem was no place for an impartial trial. Festus could hardly send Paul into the hands of the Jews without Paul’s consent for Paul was a Roman. Paul said that if he “must be further tried, he claimed his privilege to appear before a higher and more impartial court—to go to Rome.” He appealed on the basis of his innocence (Acts 25:10, 11). He did not threaten Festus but simply reminded him that Festus could not legally deliver Paul to the Jews. (Acts 25:11). Paul did not threaten Festus or say that he wanted Caesar to punish Paul’s persecutors (Acts 28:19). He had the privilege as to whether or not it would be Rome or Jerusalem. Paul said, let Caesar render the decision as to my case (Acts 25:19). In fact, Paul
was then before Caesar's court in that the court he was then in was "a Roman court of judicature, and because Festus, who filled it, personated Caesar himself" (Gill, 375). Paul was unwilling to give his permission to have his case turned over to the Jews. He was then "standing before Caesar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou also very well knowest." (Acts 25:10). It was either to go to Caesar or to Jerusalem and it was right for Paul to inform his judge of the law which the judge himself claimed to follow. In fact, I find Paul making a very successful and intelligent effort to follow Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12:14,17-21; 1 Pet. 2:21, after having been dragged into a difficult situation.

Certain it is that Paul's teaching and conduct furnish no encouragement for the Christian going to war. Paul did request an impartial trial but he did not request vengeance. He did not withhold the truth but he did not threaten his keepers if they failed to follow the truth. Both his teaching and his conduct guide Christians to return good for evil.

Note: In Acts 23:10 the captain commanded the use of force if necessary. However, Paul had nothing to do with this. He was not consulted, neither did he call for it.
The Golden Rule Goes to War

Does the Golden Rule sanction an individual in killing another and his family, while at the same time he does not want the other man to kill him or his?

I. THE DUTY TO OUR LOVED ONES

The argument for war which is based on the Golden Rule is twofold.

(1) We have the right to sacrifice ourselves, to turn our own cheek, but not to sacrifice another gr to turn their check. We must turn our cheek to the enemy and endure suffering while we endeavor to destroy him in an effort to protect our loved ones. After the strife is over, after war has hardened one, after so many enemies have been totally destroyed and the rest conquered, we are to love and forgive the enemy (Cf. L. Boettner, 29).

This rending of the Rule overlooks the manner in which Christ turned his other cheek and it further forgets that armistice will not bring back the spirit of forgiving love. It makes the Rule read as follows: Do unto others what you would have them to do to you—unless they do something to you which you do not like and then it is right to do to them what they have done, or plan to do, to you. Do it in a greater measure in order to assure their destruction. He aims at your destruction, so destroy him. The “others” of the Golden Rule does not apply to any person who attacks you. This attitude would justify a missionary in telling heathens that he will not indulge in head hunting if they will not.

(2) You must help others to destroy their enemies if you want them to help you destroy yours. This idea overlooks the fact that the c. o. does not ask another person to
kill for him. This allows the attitude and actions of the
enemy to be the pattern of our actions. However, the way
the Golden Rule reads it states that we must not bomb them
and their babies if we do not want them to bomb ours—even if they did help start it and deliver the first bombs. When we bayonet him is it possible we are doing to him
what we want him to do to us?

II. The Answer To This Use of the Golden Rule

(1) The cry that we must make war on our enemies in
order to defend the weak is often misleading. We have re-
ferred to this elsewhere.

(2) This use of the Rule ignores a very important prin-
ciple. It also tries to prejudice the case against the pacifist
by representing him as a miserable and ungrateful person
who does not endeavor to defend the weak. Those who use
this argument overlook the fact that they praise, other
situations, actions which are analogous to those of the paci-
fist. There are some things which are more precious than
our families. Non-pacifists admit that there are situations
where it would be wrong and cowardly for an individual to
use all available means to spare his family. Some of these
people have argued that the people of the occupied coun-
tries do not want their children fed by the Allies because
think that it will minister aid to Germany. Such is hardly
the case, but this has been one argument used by non-paci-
fists against feeding Allies in occupied countries. In the
Dieppe raid some soldier’s were under orders to kill one
of their own experts rather than let him fall into enemy
hands (Reader’s Digest, June, 1943, p. 127) “Yank” Levy
said that one should kill his best friend if necessary to get
every officers, (Guerrilla Warfare, 77).

The sacrifice of one’s family on the behalf of a “great
cause” is approved by the most ardent militarist. The man
who refused to betray military secrets to the enemy, even
though the refusal costs the life of his family, is praised.
Family takes second place when a great cause is at stake. Non-pacifists approved the actions of the woman in one of the Balkan countries who in Feb., 1943, turned her gun on her own wounded comrades rather than see them fall into the hands of the Germans. Gracie Fields, over the radio, commended her heroic courage and offered not one word about the duty to defend the weak! The individuals who went into the Roman army swore to hold Caesar's safety above the welfare of their own family. Christians have praised Abraham's faith and his willingness to offer his child.

There are many non-pacifists who have not rushed in with every means possible to defend the weak. They have seen innocent women suffer without raising a hand--either because they thought it inexpedient or none of their business. And yet, some of these individuals would condemn the pacifists!

Christians recognize that there are some things more important than the lives of their loved ones. To save one's physical life at the cost of a denial of Christ forever would be too great, they would say. Why should they think that it is strange that we should refuse, likewise, to make an ethical denial of the way of the cross—the way of redemptive love which is willing to suffer at the hands of the enemy in an effort to redeem the enemy. We believe that it would be treachery to the cause for which we stand if we did sacrifice our enemies instead of returning good for evil. Although they may not agree with us on this, they must agree that as long as we believe it would be a denial of the way of the cross that we must not violate it.

Thus it is seen that if the pacifist is to be condemned on this score that the non-pacifist also must come under an equal condemnation. At least all of the non-pacifist except those who would preserve their physical lives at all cost.

(3) The defence of the weak is not the main issue in
most wars. Political, economic and nationalistic reasons, not an insult or injury to any one's wife, generally start wars. Appeals to defend the weak keep them going. And during the strife the weak and the women may suffer at the hands of the enemy or at the hands of their friends. They may even feel it necessary to bomb them.

(4) The question has been stated in such a way as to throw the pacifist in a light in which he really does not stand. It is not, "Ought we to defend the weak." It is, "How ought Christians to defend them" (Cf. C. J. Cadoux III:118). We should endeavor to work for the highest, and the eternal, interest of both friend and foe. It is our right and duty to use those means which we believe to be consistent with the aim and with Christian principles. Another may decide how he is to protect his way of life but Christ has decided for the Christian how they must protect His way of life.

It must be further noticed that the question is "Should we inflict suffering on another", and not "Should we endure suffering".

(5) There is no absolute certainty, in any particular case, that one can defend the weak. Neither the way of Christian love nor that of carnal warfare will guarantee protection. We do believe that the way of love will be more effective in the long run than the way of war. Christ's cross has done more to protect the weak and to protect the virtue of women than all the swords of the Caesars. Where this way has been used it has been shown to be effective although it does not, of course, give one hundred per cent protection. There would be many more cases of its effectiveness if it had received one one-hundredth as much of a trial as the way of violence has received. The Quakers and others have found that the further away from the weapons of violence that non-violence gets the more it is apt to succeed (Cadoux, III 108, 118; Ballou).

(6) This use of the Golden Rule visualizes only one-
half of the suffering. It sees only that suffering which the enemy has inflicted on him and not that which he inflicts on the enemy. It is hateful to be bombed but it is hateful also that one should bomb another. We should not allow our emotional reaction to only one side of the suffering determine our actions. When we do so we operate on the level of the publicans and sinners and not on the distinctively Christian level (Matt. 5:47-48; Lk. 6:32, 33, 35). Thus to consider just one side—our side—is not to consider the situation from the Christian standpoint.

(7) The standard for right conduct is not changed because we are tempted to do for another what we should not do for ourselves. “Right conduct regarding others can (not) be allowed to involve a radically different ethical standard from that required for right conduct regarding ourselves” (Cadoux, III 121). We are told to love our neighbor as ourselves but not to love them to the extent that we shelve Christian weapons and kill for him (Matt. 22:39). We must not love ourselves that much. “It would, indeed, be strange if the good we seek for other persons were something totally different from the good we seek for ourselves.” (121).

If we accept an ethical policy whose only defence is that such and such a course is necessary to defend the physical life of another, we have adopted a dangerous position. Such a policy would justify a war of conquest under the plea that we needed it to get adequate supplies to insure the safety of our family and nation. It would justify a girl entering into prostitution in the time of depression in order to support her mother, although she would not do it just to support herself. If we accept the positions advocated by some we would find ourselves under at least three different set of principles: (a) When we are acting for ourselves; (b) when we are acting for the government; (c) and when we are endeavoring to defend a person who is dear to us.

(8) Christians are under the authority of Christ. Since we are “under orders” we are not free to choose just any
weapons of resistance which may be at hand. Christ has limited us to the weapons of redeeming love. The soldier of the world has much greater right and reason to question the decisions of his commander than the Christian has to question those of Christ. What He has taken away we do not have the right to restore.

(9) Christ did not tell us, by word or example, to defend others with the sword. "The problem of the defence of others is never explicitly touched on by Jesus; presumably he regarded it as covered by what he said regarding personal conduct in general." (Cadoux III 8,). Christ did not authorize, or permit, the sword to be used by his disciples to protect a third party. Peter was commanded to put up his sword when he drew it to defend another (Matt. 26:51-52). Christ did not try to rescue John the Baptist by force or to punish his executor (Mk. 1:14; 6:14-29; Lk. 3:19; 13:31). He did not use force on Pilate for killing the Galileans (Lk. 13:1). He did not curse the traitor or strike the captor (Matt. 26:50; Mk. 10:42-45; John 18:22; Lk. 23:34). He prayed for his enemies who had placed him on the cross. He did not use physical violence to get men to do good or to get them to refrain from evil. Although he took no precautions to defend his followers while he was on earth, or to arm them after his ascension; we know that in the long run His way of gentleness and love brought them greater protection than the ways of war. He protects us from the hate and harm that the use of violence brings to the user. In addition, the growing power of goodness and love, which finds its origin and strength in Him, works for the elimination of foes, not through their liquidation but through their conversion.

(10) In concluding this aspect of the argument let us ask: Does the Golden Rule ever have an enemy as its object? Did Christ limit its application to those who do us good? If so, where? If he has not done so then we must want the enemy to kill us or we could not follow the Rule and kill
him and his children. For otherwise, how could the Rule authorize us to do those identical brutal acts which we condemn in enemy and from which we want to redeem them?

III. THE ARGUMENT THAT IT IS A "GOLDEN RULE DUTY" TO THE COUNTRY

We receive protections and blessings from the country and therefore we should fight for it when it calls on us. This argument makes an appeal to our sentiment of gratitude instead of to Bible teaching. Christ wants us to be grateful but that does not mean that gratitude should blind us to the need for obedience to him in all things.

(1) We acknowledge our debt and shall endeavor to render service in return. However, we do not demand that the government take the sword to defend us for we are willing to trust to the power of redemptive love. As the Quaker said, "Sir, I have asked no man to fight for me." Since we do not feel justified in taking the sword to defend ourselves we do not believe that the defense of our government furnishes us with such justification.

As Charles De Vault said: "If a man saves your life you owe him your life, but do you owe him your principles your soul?" The Christian owes his life and soul to Christ, and he must not be ungrateful and fail to obey Him.

(2) This argument applies with equal force to Christians living in any other country which has shown them favors and which has a police force and army. It would justify Christians in one country in the slaughter of brethren in another country—all because the kindnesses of the respective governments involved them in a debt of gratitude which could only be discharged through their taking the carnal sword. It would have led the Christians in A.D. 70 to fight for either the Jews or the Romans, but Christ told them to get away from the war (Lk. 21:20-).

(3) We shall endeavor to give our best to the country and to all the world. The best is to be found in distinctly
Christian service and not in war service. We shall endeavor to do the truly Christian service for the country. We refrain from war because we believe that such is our Christian duty and we believe that in the long run we can render better and more lasting service to the country and humanity. "The fact that my contribution looks socially insignificant is owing solely to there being so few of us: but that proves nothing against the quality of the contribution." (Cadoux, III 179).

Christ has not made us sword-bearers for the country but he has made us to be the salt of the earth. The power of righteous life does spread good will and thus protects others as well as secures the favor of God (Matt. 5:13; Gen 18:23-33). Non-Christians who are often unwilling to thus contribute to Christianity profit by our contributions. I do not refrain from service to the State but I do believe that the way of the c. o. is the way to raise the level of humanity to that of the heavenly and that is my best contribution. (Richards, 86).

If the State closes all avenues of service to me, except the military one, then I must follow the "do nothing" policy. When the only thing that a captured soldier can do is to betray his cause, it is honorable to follow this "do nothing" policy—if it is permissible to call it "do nothing". (101.)

(4) The country has bestowed blessings on us, but God has bestowed blessings on the country. The country should show its gratitude through obedience to God and through unselfishness in sharing these blessings with earth's down trodden. As yet there is not much evidence of real obedience to God on the part of multitudes, or of unselfish sharing of His blessings with all of mankind that is in need. Because our blessings, even those which we receive from the country, ultimately go back to God, we believe that our supreme allegiance is to Him and that therefore we must not go contrary to His teachings concerning Christian conduct.

(5) It should not be overlooked that we suffer, as well as profit, because of what others do. The severe burdens of
the way of violence often fall on us and our children. "Not the pacifist, but war, is the parasite." (Gregg, 218).

(6) Gratitude for what another has done for us must not blind us to our Christian obligations. We shall present a few examples of this. We cannot ignore John 17:20- and take up a national religion in order to promote national unity in wartime. A denominationalist may save your life, help you debate an atheist, maintain a conscientious objectors camp, exercise a wholesome influence for morality in the community; but that would not bind you to help him defend unscriptural doctrines. A religious paper may have been good to us but that does not obligate us, by Matt. 7:12, to defend it in all things and by all means. In France, one might drive over a road which was partially built with money from tax on liquor or legalized prostitution but that would not bind one to participate in those things. If I lived in Germany and Hitler was kind to me, I would not be bound to use the sword for him. The early Christians "were at first regarded as a sect of the Jews, and as such, tolerated, or if ill-treated by their co-religionists, protected. (xii). Since they shared in the privileges and exemptions which the Jews's had secured were they thereby bound to fight for the Jews (Lk. 21:21). "A Christian church missionary who recently returned from Japan informed us that Sarah (Andrews, a missionary of the church) was allowed to carry on her work without restrictions; and, when she had completed a translation she was then on she would consider her work in Japan finished, and would return to America."

(Christian Leader, Jan. 5, 1943). Since her work is carried on at their permission, are we to conclude that she should act contrary to Christian principles if so requested? If we were captured by gangsters, on whom we had to depend for food, life and shelter, we would not be bound to condone or cooperate in doing what we believe to be wrong.

The point is clear that we should not let gratitude cause us to act contrary to Christian ethics. There are some girls
who are so grateful for the sacrifice that “the boys” are making that they, in an outburst of patriotic gratitude, feel bound to do something for them and thus they become “charity girls”. Surely favors which another has bestowed upon us cannot free us from Christian obligations.

We reject this interpretation of the golden rule. It permits the enemy to decide what weapons we shall use. To allow this is “simply to surrender the pass”, and to permit the enemy to dictate to us.

IV. "YOU WANT ANOTHER TO DO YOUR FIGHTING?"

The very fact that we teach against Christians going to war is an indication that we not only do not believe in fighting but that we do not want them to fight with swords either for us or for another. And yet we are accused of hypocrisy and it is said that the conscientious objectors “want to be defended (they may deny it, but it is true) yet will not offer to help in that defense.” This indeed professes an insight into our hearts which we ourselves do not have and it labels us as deceivers or deceived.

Our decision does not ask anyone to fight for us. Every individual has the right and duty to make an individual decision, as we have made. Furthermore, our decision does not force anyone to fight for us. Although Christ requires us to render certain services when they are required (Matt. 5:42) we do not force anyone to fight or release them to fight, by refusing to fight and through doing what we can for humanity in harmony with Christ’s teaching. Our decision does not make another man’s decision for him in this matter. Regardless of our decision his decision is not changed, when and if he thinks and decides. Whether we work in a hospital as a civilian, run away, go to jail, go to a Civilian Public Service Camp, or even drop dead; the other people have to make and execute their own decisions. We must try to do what we believe is best and right for the Christian and our doing this does not prevent him from deciding to do what he believes is right.
CHAPTER VIII

“The Powers That Be”

The setting of this passage is significant. Paul told the Christians not to avenge themselves but to deal with their enemies on the principle of Christian love (Rom. 12:14, 17-21). In 13:10 Paul said that “Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law.” “It literally reads: ‘He that loveth the other (ton heteron) hath fulfilled the law.’ That is, anybody and everybody, whether in one part of the world or another, is to be the object of our love.” (M. C. Kurfees, *The Bible Banner*, Oct. 1942, p. 13) Paul’s teaching concerning governments in general, and the Roman government in particular, is found in between these passages.

Hostile heathen dictators, servants of sin and the devil (Rom. 6:16, Rev. 2:10), then ruled and they had no intention of favoring Christians or of doing God’s will. Paul did not commend their work for Christian imitation. He did not tell Christians in one verse not to do something and then authorize them to do it in the next verse. In fact, the question with some Christians was not should they agents of vengeance for the government, but whether they should obey the government at all. (cp. Matt. 22:17). Paul said submit and pay taxes. God, he said, in some manner worked even through Rome. The “he” of Rom. 13:4 no more referred to Christians than the “Caesar” in Matt. 22:17-21 taught that the Jews were the Caesar who received the tribute. The two parties were not identical. The Christian was one party and the government another.

I. THE ROMAN RULERS WERE PAGAN DICTATORS

Rome was not benevolent democracy but a pagan dictatorship. Therefore, no one should write on Rom. 13 as if it
were written under a democracy with that type of government in mind. It was not for, by, or of the people.

The dictators often came to power through deceit and violence. Julius Caesar was dictator around 44 B. C.; Augustus from 27 B. C.—A. D. 14; Tiberius from A. D. 14-37; Caligula from 41-54 A. D.; Nero from 54-68 A. D.; Galba from June 68-Jan. 69; Otho from A. D. 69; Jan. 15-April 16; Vitellius to Dec. 22, A. D. 69; Vespasian from 69-70 A. D.; Titus from 79-81 A. D.; and Domitian from 81-96 A. D. (Suetonius, xiv). We shall show what type of men some of them were.

While in exile, prior to his rise to power, Tiberius had “meditated nothing so much as plans of future vengeance, clandestine pleasures, and arts of dissimulation.” (Tacitus, Annals, Vol. I:8). He had some good qualities but in the main he seems to have been an inhuman monster who often squandered money in lavish parties and in search of new forms of vices (Suetonius, 157-160). He was so mean that it was said that, in her heart, his mother could not have loved him. “Wine doth he loathe, because that now of blood he hath a thirst, He drinketh that as greedily, as wine he did at first.” (Suetonius, 169). People were often tried by torture and his personal enemies met violent death (171). Those whom he feared or hated were declared to be enemies of the state and then put to death (165-169, Tacitus, Annals, I: 94). Rome rejoiced at his death (Suetonius, 178).

Caligula’s cruel “disposition and villainous nature” took delight in brutalities and immoralities (Suetonius, 186). Cruel sports in the amphitheatre fascinated him and wild costly parties were his delight (Myers, 127-128).

Claudius “was fascinated by bloody sights; he enjoyed seeing men fight for their lives against wild beasts or hacking one another.” (George Jennison, Animals . . ., 68-69; Suetonius, Div. Claud. 21,1; 34, 2; Dio Lx. 13, Myers, 129).
Gaius was a mean licentious man, as were many of the others (Suetonius, 200, 195, 196, 312, 374, 367, 311).

Nero was the emperor when Paul wrote Romans 13. Through intrigue his mother cleared a bloody path to the throne, which was the lawful right of another. Further sin was the punishment for her sins and when Nero thought that she was in his way he had her, who had had so many slain for him, put to death after several unsuccessful attempts (Suetonius, 285; Henderson, 122-123. He later had his aunt slain (Suetonius, 286). He divorced Octavia and married Poppaea. Then he had Octavia slain (Henderson, 145, 147). He was a monster of unnatural vices who squandered money at sordid banquets (Henderson, 236; Merivale, VII:8-9; Suetonius, 279). Under him “the dagger and poison were in constant demand” for deeds of deceit (Myers, 129). Men were thrown to the beast; in fact, “soldier and poet, philosopher and noble, empress and slave-girl, all pass death’s gate at the Emperor’s bidding.” (Henderson, 147-148). At times he roamed the streets, disguised and protected by soldiers, and played the thug and “waylaid the passerby, stabbed them, robbed them, stripped them, hurled them into the sewers. They haunted inns and houses of ill-fame, pillaged shops, forced their way into houses, insulted ladies of high rank and noble youth.” (Henderson, 114; Suetonius, 278). In A. D. 64 he made Christians scapegoats and persecuted them. Tacitus writes as follows: “But all human efforts, all the lavish gifts of the emperor, and the propitiation of the gods, did not banish the sinister belief that the conflagration was the result of an order. Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only
in Judaea, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular. Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle, and was exhibiting a show in the circus, while he mingled with the people in the dress of a charioteer or stood aloft on a car. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, as it seemed, for the public good, but to glut one man’s cruelty, and they were being destroyed.” (Annals, 15.44.)

This then in the man under whose government Paul wrote. Later in writing of the same government Peter said to submit and suffer without retaliation (1 Pet. 2:13; 4:16). If it is right for Christians to fight in any army today against any government, it was more than right that they should fight against such a persecuting government. They did not, however; instead they followed the doctrine in Rom. 13. If this passage meant that Christian should carry the sword for Nero it means they can carry it for any government under which they now live. Furthermore, if they could carry the sword for such a ruler, why couldn’t they (by the same logic) be such rulers?

II. “ORDAINED OF GOD”

If church and state are institutions of God to the same degree, and in the same sense, there would be no limits to the extent of our obedience to the will of those who establish a particular state. If rulers are ordained of God as were the apostles there is no escape from the above conclusion.
If such is the case it is hard to understand why their conduct has been generally so different from God’s revealed will.

(1) It must not be overlooked that God has not always approved of the action of certain agents, which He has in some manner overruled, and thus He has not commended their actions or made them a guide for the conduct of His voluntary servants. Joseph’s brethren did wrong when they sold him into slavery but Joseph said that “it was not you that sent me hither, but God” (Gen. 37:35; 45:7). They indeed meant it for bad “but God meant it for good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive.” (Gen. 50:20). Would it have been right to cooperate with those who sold Joseph into slavery? God overruled, but that did not justify the brethren for their wicked act. Assyria was “the rod of mine anger, the staff in their hand is mine indignation! I will send him against an hypocritical nation.” But his actions were wicked nevertheless, “he meant not so, it is in his heart to destroy”, so God later punished the fruit of his heart (Isa. 10:5-13). Nebuchadnezzar was “my servant” and God brought him against the land but God later punished him for his iniquity (Jer. 25:9; 30:11; 25:12; cf. 50:25). Sin was used to punish sin but that did not make it any less sin. God simply, in some manner, overruled. Cyrus was God’s “shepherd” but that did not make him, just because he was overruled, God’s conscious moral servant (Isa. 44:28-45:6). Pharaoh was in some manner used of God but he was not a model for the conduct of God’s children (Ex. 5:2; 9:16; Rom. 9:17). Pagan Rome, the power under whom Rom. 13 was written, was no more a conscious servant of God than any of the above. Christ himself condemned the principle of authority which existed in all of them (Mk. 10:42-45). And “we cannot for a moment regard these ‘powers’ as approved of God, nor those tyrant monsters as his conscious ‘ministers,’ the oracles and conscientious doers of his will. And yet, in the general sense, the great providential sense, all Paul says of them is true. Nor is his declaration
of this truth useless or unimportant. It is necessary for the comfort, support and right conduct of Christians amid the uproar, tumult and apparent confusion of government affairs. They must see by faith the hand of their Father guiding the helm of events, restraining the wrath of man, and overruling the most powerful agencies of human society for good.” (Ballou, 86-87) (Cp. Psa. 66:10).

(2) God has ordained means to punish evil men, as long as evil men exist, but that does not argue that Christians are to do the punishing. If we choose to serve God we shall be used as sanctified agents of salvation; if we do not voluntarily serve him, we may become agents of wrath whose reward is wrath. When men choose evil, God uses the evil to punish them (Isa. 66:3; Prov. 1:29-31; Jer. 6:19; Rom. 1:18,26). “In other words, God ordains that men shall have the institutions that they choose in preference to his appointments, and that they shall reap the results of their choosing. The result always is punishment, and if the evil course is persisted in, their final destruction (cf. 1 Sam. 8:9,11,12). But these institutions ordained to punish the sins and iniquities of his children, were God’s ordinances for this purpose, and they were good for the end for which they were established—the punishment of rebellion. They were not necessarily good for his children, nor were they, because ordinances of God, necessarily legitimate institutions for the affiliation and fellowship of God’s children.” (Lipscomb, 29-30). Tophet, a place of destruction, was ordained of God; the wicked are God’s sword and even the wrath of man shall praise Him (Isa. 30:33; Prov. 16:4; Rom. 13:4; Psa. 17:13; 76:10; Rom. 8:28). Hell is ordained of God to punish “the obdurately rebellious. In punishing the rebellious, it is a terror to evil works and a minister of good to the children of God. It ministers good to them by discouraging sin and weaning them away from sin. In the same sense, the devil is the servant or minister of God to execute wrath and vengeance on the enemies of God. The devil is the chief
and leader of all rebels against God. God so overrules his rebellion as to make his domain, his home, a fit place for the punishment of the perversely rebellious. God uses the devil as his servant, his minister to inflict punishment on all those who are finally impenitent. God so overrules that the devil while inflicting punishment on other rebels, himself, as the chiefest sinner, suffers the fullest measure, the most excruciating torments of his home of the damned. (Lipscomb, 38). Sin begets more sin and prepares punishment for sinners. Such institutions shall continue as long as men are in rebellion against God and they were ordained for such purposes and are good for these purposes, but not for Christian imitation. We cannot do the work of the prince of this world, this world which is evil, without violating Christian principles (Gal. 1:4; Eph. 2:2; Rom. 6:16; Lk. 4:5; Rom. 1:21; John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; Matt. 6:21). Such unconscious, overruled, rebellious servants of God did not become righteous because their actions were overruled by God to some good end.

(3) All brethren admit that the governments, which God overrules, have a nature and a mission which differs radically from that of the church. Either this is true or we should combine the two. However, the truth of it is illustrated in the difference between Rome and the church. We must not forget that the things which supremely qualify a Christian for the work of the church also disqualify him for being really efficient in performing a work of vengeance. This is recognized by even the world since for centuries it at least tacitly has been recognized that preachers and priests, men of God ministering in sacred things, should not dip their hands in the blood of national enemies. Each work calls for and cultivates a spirit which is in harmony with the nature of the work. Compare the most efficient killer with the best Christian. Just as far away from the nature of the church and its work as are governments and their work; just so far are they away from what a Christian should do. Christians
must be of the same nature as the kingdom of God and they strive to develop but one nature; the nature of the kingdom which animates their entire life. Its nature became the Christian's nature when he was born again in order to enter the kingdom (John 3:5). Its principles must be in him in order for him to be in it. The nature of the kingdom is such that those who share it do not fight (John 18:36). Thus we maintain that the Christian nature is not fitted for a work of vengeance; literally, he has no heart for it.

III. WHAT ROMANS THIRTEEN BINDS ON ONE CHRISTIAN IN ONE COUNTRY IT BINDS ON ALL CHRISTIANS IN ALL COUNTRIES

Submission to a benevolent government is not the teaching of this passage. It teaches submission to any government under which a Christian lives. (Rom. 13:1). All governments today operate under the same type of “ordination” that pagan Rome operated under. A treatise setting forth the duty of a Christian in England to his government would, if translated into Japanese, set forth the duty of the Christian in Japan to his government. What the Bible bound on Christians with relationship to governments was bound on Christians under a pagan dictatorship. If it authorized Christians to fight, or if it commanded them to fight, it commanded them to fight for Rome or for any other government under which they lived for “everyone must obey the authorities that are over him, for no authority can exist without the permission of God; the existing authorities have been established by him, . . .” (Goodspeed's translation of Rom. 13:1). (Cf. John 19:10-11). If this passage teaches that Christians should kill for their governments it teaches that they should kill other Christians from other countries if they meet them during a national war. And thus it would come to pass that the church which is one body, and which does not have the authority to kill even the outsiders, would be authorized to inflict wounds on its body. (1 Cor. 12:12-27).
Romans thirteen forbids a Christian engaging in a war of rebellion. Christians were told to submit to Rome even after she persecuted Christians. Christians in an occupied country, which had been subdued by a pagan foreign dictator, were forbidden to rebell against their conqueror. In fact, Jesus told the Jews to pay tribute to Caesar. If paying taxes and submitting to a government means that we are duty bound to fight for it, then Christians in occupied countries, in all ages of the history of the church, should fight for the government which extended its sway over them. Any dictator is just as much the “power that exists” for a conquered people as was Rome.

IV. THERE ARE NO OUTLAW GOVERNMENTS

The theory that the scriptures teach that there are “outlaw” governments, which are not embraced in Romans 13, is false. Thus it still stands that if one Christian is authorized to fight for his government, every Christian is so authorized. Furthermore, it means that if a Christian lifts up a sword against any government that he lifts it up against a power ordained of God. That the New Testament does not teach the theory of “outlaw nations” which some brethren advocate, is clear from the following. First, God in some manner overrules all of them (Dan. 2:21, 37; 4:17, 25; Acts 17:26; Rom. 13:1). “there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1; 1 Pet. 2:13). Second, the NT teaching concerning human governments was written under a pagan dictatorship in which the dictators rose to power through deceit and violence. If Nero’s government was not an “outlaw” government, then no government can be “outlaw”. Third, Nero’s government was no more conscious of a “divine mission” than the most pagan government today. Fourth, even the wicked may constitute “God’s sword” (Psa. 17:13; Jer. 25:8-14; Isa. 10:5-13). Fifth, Christians were not permitted to declare that the government which persecuted them was “outlaw” and thus to be opposed by force of arms (1 Pet.
Sixth, even when Rome stepped beyond Rom. 13:4 Jesus did not say that she was an “outlaw” government (John 19:10-11). Seventh, history shows that nations of the earth are selfish and sinful, though to varying extents. Then, too, as John Baille—who is not a pacifist—recently pointed out: the war does not appear “in the simple guise of a struggle between good and evil”. Our society suffers from the same spiritual sickness which the German society suffers from, although it has reached a more acute stage there (The Christian Century, 1943, p. 355). Both have been in the process of casting away Christian mooring. And God may not love our disorder and sins more than any other disorder. And certain it is that we are never “wholly on God’s side”. “Is our cause every completely coincident with his? Are the things we desire to defend every quite the things he desires to defend, and are the things we desire to destroy ever quite the things he desires to destroy?” (Baille, 354). The hands of more than one nation, and the heart of more than one people, have stains of sin (Engelbrecht, 243-248; 261-262; 264-276; Bart. De Ligt, The Conquest of Violence).

V. WHERE IS THE AUTHORITY FOR CHRISTIANS TO FIGHT ANY CIVIL GOVERNMENT?

In the light of the above such authority cannot be produced.

VI. DID GOD DIRECTLY APPoint THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT?

It is obvious to anyone who studies the New Testament, and the Roman government in the light of its teaching, that Rome, and “the powers that be,” were not directly ordained of God as were the apostles and the church. All powers that exist are ordained of God only in the sense that they are permitted to exist in the general providence of God and that they are in some manner overruled, to some extent at least. To illustrate the principle which we have in mind, we refer to sin. “The general explanation is that in these texts God’s
to sin. "The general explanation is that in these tests God's agency is indicated in popular language without discriminating between the remote occasion and the immediate efficient cause. The same usage prevails in popular language everywhere and always. It is commonly said that a revival of religion hardens the hearts of those who go through it without accepting Christ as he is offered in the gospel." This language is understood. "It must also be remembered that the habit of philosophical thought was never conspicuous among the Israelites. It is precisely in respect to this that Paul contrasts them with the Greeks (1 Cor. 1:22-24). They were wont to refer every event to God, without troubling themselves with exact philosophical definitions and distinctions. The Lord thundereth in the heavens. (Psa. 29.) The same is a peculiarity of other Semitic peoples to this day. This usage of language is common in the Bible on other subjects. 'The Lord plagued the people because they made the calf with Aaron made.' Paul says that our sinful passions are by the law. He afterwards explains that the law is not the cause but only the occasion of our own sinful action. (Ex. 32:35; Rom. 7:5-12). An act cannot be sin if there is no law. The prophets are habitually said to do what they foretell that God will do. (Gen. 27:37; 25:23; Isa. 6:9, 10). The same action ascribed immediately to God in one passage is sometimes ascribed elsewhere to some other agency." Thus the language of the scripture is not always the language of philosophical definitions. God is sometimes said to do simply what He permitted to come to pass through the exercise of the free will of men. Thus Rom. 13 need not imply any immediate and direct connection between God and Rome or any other government, or revelation of God to Rome.

VII. THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE USE TO WHICH TAXES ARE PUT

There is a difference between parting with one's goods at the demand of another and the giving of our bodies to
unchristian deeds. We cannot control our property as we can our personality. A government can take all of our property by force or any other means that she desired. The c. o. has no carnal sword to prevent it. This indicates that there is a difference between paying taxes at the demand of a government and being personally responsible for the uses to which the money is put.

The NT teaches that Christians should pay taxes to their government. If this means that we may as well do the things for which some of the taxes will go, as it is to pay the taxes; then the following follows. Christ endorsed: (a) Roman militarism for He said pay tribute and taxes. (b) Pagan religions which tax money helped support. (c) Wild parties on which Caesar squandered some tax money. (d) Bribes to which other tax money sometimes went. (e) Extortion of tax collectors and governors (Allen, 237-). (g) Covetousness of such men as Vespasian who levied heavy taxes (Suetonius, 350). (h) Nero’s murdering schemes for which he paid the murderers. (i) Caesar’s wars of aggressions in which people were enslaved. (j) Execution of Christians by Rome’s paid executioners.

In the light of the above who will affirm that Christians may as well do the above as to pay taxes to a pagan dictator? No one who believes the Bible, will affirm that a Christian ought to refuse to pay taxes to whatever government he lives under.

VIII. Ye Pay Taxes “also” (Rom. 13:6)

No Christian, who is informed, maintains that the only duty to a government is to pay taxes. There are a multitude of laws, in any country, to which a Christian may submit without violating the faith. Hence the “also” here means that we are to submit to them and “also” pay taxes. “Wherefore it is necessary for you to be subject, not only on account of wrath, but also on account of conscience. For this reason therefore pay ye taxes also to them” (MacKnight).
IX. ROME REGARDED THE CHRISTIANS AS DISLOYAL

Although Christians submitted to Rome and paid taxes, Rome regarded them as disloyal. First, Christians refused to render the absolute submission of reason, will and life which Caesar demanded (Pressense, II:75). Second, in refusing to worship Caesar and Rome the Christians repudiated one of the important bonds of political and religious unity of the Empire. “The Roman religion, the worship of the gods of Rome, has been accurately described as “the expression of Roman patriotism, the bond of Roman unity, and the pledge of Roman prosperity”” (Spence, 115; Myers, 141; Hardy, 72). Christians were regarded as atheists, for they said that the pagan gods were not gods, and this was regarded as an insult to the gods and an invitation to them to punish Rome. Third, Christianity made an exclusive claim and was intolerant of all other faiths. Fourth, Christians belonged to a kingdom which was destined to spread and which gave them an allegiance higher than allegiance to Rome (Dan. 2:35,44). For these, and perhaps other, reasons Christians were regarded as disloyal and the sword hung, for a long time, close to their necks. However, Christians were really acting for the highest good of humanity when they refused to compromise their faith.

X. CHRISTIANS WERE LOYAL TO A PERSECUTING GOVERNMENT

Although Christians refused to obey all of Caesar’s orders, Caesar had no reason to be afraid of armed rebellion on their part. Instead they paid their taxes and prayed for the good of the Emperor and Empire (Spence, 178, 316; Rom. 13:1-)). In A.D. 64 Nero killed many Christians in Rome in order to divert suspicion from himself, to amuse the populace and to satiate his bloodlust (Spence, 52). They were “put to death with grievous torments” (Suetonius, 270). After this it was criminal to be a Christian and “the general persecution of Christians was established as a per-
permanent police measure” (Spence, 54; Hardy, 55). Christians were often put to death, but sometimes they were banished as was John to the isle of Patmos.

The attitude of the church concerning submission to a government did not change because the government was a persecuting power. “What Paul wrote (Rom. 13) in a period of comparative quietness in A.D. 58, Peter repeats a few years later (1 Pet. 2:13-; 4:16-), circa A.D. 65-66, in the days of one of the most cruel persecutions that perhaps ever weighted upon the church; while John, who after Peter and Paul had passed away, somewhere about A.D. 67-68 (possibly martyred by Rome, JDB), was regarded by the Church as its most honoured and influential leader, in his Gospel—probably put out in the latter years of the first century—when giving the account of the trial of Jesus Christ before Pilate, quotes one of the sayings of his Master addressed to the Roman magistrate; in which the Lord clearly states that the power of the Imperial ruler was given to him from above—that is, from God (John 19:11);” (Spence, 46-47).

Christians did not have the same spirit that some brethren have today for they did not take up arms to defend their life, liberty and pursuit of happiness against a pagan persecuting government. I know of no example in the early history of the church where they drew the sword against Rome. Clement, who wrote during a time of persecution, voiced submission to the Emperor (Spence, 68-69). Polycarp, put to death in the second century, wrote to Christians during persecutions and told them to “pray for kings, and powers, and princes, and for them that persecute you and hate you.” (88). This committed their “souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator” (Pet. 4:19). This all reveals that the church in the first centuries did not hold to the doctrine held by some today who justify Christians in killing enemies.

XI. THE ARMY IN ROME AND CIVIL REBELLION

Christians did not participate in the numerous civil re-
bellions (Spence, 316). However, the army frequently made and unmade Emperors. If it was right for the Christians to serve in the Roman army it was very likely, if not unavoidable, that they would have become involved—some on one side and some on another—in civil war.

XII. CHRISTIANS KILLING THEIR BRETHREN

A magistrate swore obedience to the laws. When he left office he swore that he had not wilfully violated the laws (Ramsay, 180). After A. D. 64 the magistrates frequently had, as one of their duties, the persecution of Christians. If Christians were either magistrates or soldiers they were sworn to do such a thing. They would thus have to be untrue to their oath or violate Christian love. Of course, it would be just as “right”, if right it is, for a Christian then to kill one of his brethren in his home congregation at the government’s command as it would be to kill a Christian in another nation. The body of Christ would thus inflict suffering on itself (Cf. 1 Cor. 12:12-26).

XIII. FIGHT FOR THE POWER OF THE PAPACY

A government, not a particular common citizen, decides who and when it should fight. Since there are no “outlaw” nations, if it is a Christian’s duty to fight at the command of his government, it would be right for a Christian to fight for the spread of Roman Catholicism. For an example where the Papacy used its influence on one nation to fight against another, a Protestant, nation, see the case of Pope Sixtus V and Philip of Spain who sent the Armada against England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth (Ranke, II: 111-117). Thus the theory of some brethren on the Christian’s submission to a government, if their theory is NT teaching, would force a Christian to fight for the domination of the Roman Catholic Church if his government ordered such a war.

XIV. SHALL WE COMBINE CHURCH AND STATE?

Some who say that the “they” in Rev. 20:4 does not mean “us”, contend that the “he” in Rom. 13:4 means “us”
that is, they say that Rom. 13 teaches that we, Christians, should bear the sword. If when Paul wrote concerning “the powers that be” he meant to say that Christians were to do the things which he said governments did, then we have a combination of church and state. Christians would be thus authorized to do that agent’s work. Its work becomes our work. Why not extend the argument and maintain that since Rome was in some manner an agent of God for good, and since Christians could do her work that therefore it would be right for Rome to step in and preach the gospel for the church or in cooperation with it. If Christians are supposed to do the work that God overrules governments to do, then why shouldn’t they do the work that God has ordained for the church? If the Christian does not have to become “worldly” to do that work, why should they have to become Christian in order to do our work? If our relation to them sanctions killing for us then their relationship to us sanctions their preaching the gospel. If we should put down political and national enemies, why shouldn’t we ask the government to put down the spiritual enemies of the church. If not, why not?

XV. ARE CHRISTIANS AUTHORIZED TO FIGHT FOR ALL OF GOD’S “AGENTS”?

Those who argue that we should bear the sword because the government is in some sense an agent of God, forget that the argument involves them in serious difficulties which they themselves would reject even though their logic involves them in serious difficulties. We deny that it is right for Christians to bear the sword because the government does. First, God overruled the actions of those who crucified Christ, and good has come to the world through His cross, but that does not mean that it was right for Christ’s disciples to do it (Cf. John 18:11; 19:11; Matt. 26:56; Acts 2:23). Second, Christians did not bear the sword against Jerusalem when she rebelled against Rome (Lk. 21:20). Third, this argument would sanction Christians in proceed-
ing against the enemies of the church with fire, scourges, plagues, earthquakes, etc. (Rev. 2:23; 2:27; 6:4; 4:16; 8:5,7,8,10,11,12; 9:2,3,4,5,10,14,17; 11:5,6,13; 14:10-19; 15:1; 16:2,6,7,18; 18:1,6,7,8,9). Why not assist all of these in destroying the church's enemies? The logic of some brethren so argues. Fourth, this logic would force us to assist the beast of the book of Revelation (13:2,3,4,5,7, 14,15). Authority was “given” to him. “Moffatt’s note in 13:7 in Expositor’s Greek Text: ‘The beast’s world-wide authority goes back to the dragon’s commission (verse 2) but ultimately to the divine permission (so in 5). There is a providence higher even than the beast’” (Cadoux, I:212). Fifth, it would justify Christians in chastising the church (Rev. 3:19; Heb. 12:5-7). Plagues and persecutions have been means, at one time or another, of chastisement. Sixth, God overruled false prophets to test His people (Deut. 13:3). But that did not sanctify the false prophet or imply that God’s Children should have helped him.

It is our position that although God may overrule certain men and things to the accomplishment of some good, that that does not mean that the actions of these men are a fit pattern for Christian conduct.

XVI. Christians Use the Sword On Heretics?

The logic of some Christians would sanction the use of the sword on heretics. Notice how “war arguments” easily become “inquisition arguments”. In fact, soon after the church as a whole took up the sword they also took it up against heretics. Those interested in this point should see the article on the Inquisition in the Catholic Encyclopedia (Vol. 8; p. 26-). Those who go to war because the Jew’s did should also punish heretics with the sword. Heresy is an evil (Gal. 5:20) and the government and Christians are to use the sword on evildoers (Rom. 13:4). God punished evildoers and said that the rebellious would be destroyed (Gal. 5:12; Acts 3:23; cf. Deut. 18:19; Acts 5:1; 13:11; 2 Cor. 19:6; Rev. 2:20-23; 19:15-19). The state derives good from
the leaven of the gospel and therefore an attack on the doctrine of the church is an attack on the good of the state. In fact, as the church grows religious divisions creates political dissension. Thus to extend the good, heretics should be persecuted. Another argument for war is that civil government takes the judicial aspect of the civil and religious government of the OT. Foy E. Wallace, Jr. said that “it remains true that the civil government must perform the same functions performed when they (church and state, JDB) were together and which Paul says in Romans 13 are ordained of God.” (Bible Banner, July 1942, p. 3). If this is right then the church should call in the state to execute false prophets, etc. (Acts 7:34,38,45; Numb. 35:9-21; 15:35; Deut. 22:22-24; 13:1-11; 21:21; Lev. 20:9; 22:2; 20:27; 24:16; Ex. 21: 17; 1 Kings 13:2; Matt. 15:3-6). These were all functions of the government of Israel. However, we know Christ abrogated the law of vengeance for his people (Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12: 17-21). There was no revelation to Rome as there was to Israel. Rome, and all powers of Rom. 13, should be compared to Assyria and Nebuchadrezzar (Isa. 10; Jer. 25:8-13) and not to Israel’s government.

It is thus seen that some of the “war arguments” justify the principle of the Inquisition. However, we know that the apostles and church did not execute heretics or ask the government to do it. This indicates that these modern theories are not in the NT.

For a full exposure of the error of those who justify the persecution of heretics see Robert Barclay, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, (457-).

XVII. SHALL CHRISTIANS KILL THE CHASTISER?

God does chastise even his people (Heb. 12:5-13; Rev. 3:10). There are some who say that this war is a chastisement for our sins and yet they often argue for Christians killing. If they are right in the first statement, why do they argue that we should kill agents ordained of God to chastise us for our sinfulness!
XVIII. "The Divine Mission of Civil Government"

It has been argued that the mission of the government is not to punish those evils which relate to a failure to obey the doctrine which "relates exclusively to God and to the subject of obedience". Instead, it is to punish the "evil that challenges inalienable rights divinely bestowed upon mankind." If a government commanded us to punish the first type of evildoers we should refuse. If it calls on us to punish the second type we should obey for that is a command to help it carry out its divine mission and thus it is equal to a command from God.

If this classification of "evils" was correct it would not prove that it was right for Christians to kill. It would simply prove that God overruled the Roman government, and others, to punish certain types of evil. It is furthermore true that God has used fire, scourges, diseases and earthquakes—according to Revelation—to punish both types of evil. It proves nothing as to what Christians are to do. Hell is ordained of God to punish evildoers but that does not prove that Christians are to give sinners a foretaste of it. Then, too, in the NT teaching concerning God working through governments the government is always one party and the Christian another. The two are never identified as one. In fact, God overruled Rome to do what He forbade Christians to do (Rom. 12:19; 13:1).

It may be further proved that Christians were not authorized to fight to protect "inalienable rights". These were challenged by all the persecutions directed against the church which deprived the Christians of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the Christian life. But Christians did not take up arms to defend these rights. Peter said take it patiently and do not retaliate. Paul said the same (Rom. 12:17; 1 Pet. 2:19; 4:16). This shows that they did not have the idea that it was right for Christians to fight for these rights. If they had the above theory they should have punished persecutors when the government refused to do it;
and the government when the government sanctioned persecution.

The classification of evil into the above divisions is not very convincing. All violation of principles, or obedience to them, which relate to man's obedience to God will affect, sooner or later, man's relationship to man. Where nothing is sacred nothing is safe and the sacredness enters life at the point of man's personal relationship to God. Thinking lust and rebellion to God's will soon leads to sin against man. The sin against God in Eden soon led to sin against man. He who challenges God will soon challenge his brother. The sin of the Nazis against man started with their sin against God. If Christians may kill evildoers they may kill all evildoers for sin against man is simply the fruit of the root which is sin against God. If we can destroy with swords the fruit we can use the sword on the root. Sin which challenges the inalienable rights of man starts with sin which challenges the inalienable right of God to rule over man.

XIX. How the Roman Rulers in Paul's Day Came to Power

The Roman rulers in Paul's day did not come to power through any due process of law. Tiberius, who succeeded Augustus, had come to the throne through deceit and violence (Suetonius, 147). He took "upon him the whole military command" and rose to the throne (Work of Tacitus, Vol. 1:10, Everyman's Library Edition). Lies, bribes and murders paved Nero's bloody way to the throne. He poisoned Britannicus, the lawful heir of the throne, around A.D. 55. This was just about the time Paul wrote Romans (Henderson, 41+, 64, 66). The military grew until it made or unmade Emperors at will. Myers said that "one of the most important acts of Augustus, in its influence upon following events, was the formation of the Praetorian Guard, which was designed for a sort of body-guard to the emperor. In the succeeding reign this body of soldiers, about 10,000 in number, was given a permanent camp alongside the city
walls. It soon became a formidable power in the state, and made and unmade emperors at will." (123). (cf. Myers, 131, 153; Suetonius, 352). This makes it evident that Romans thirteen has references to the governments that exist and not merely to those which have been established through due process of law.

XX. Did Paul Contradict Christ?

The revolt of Palestine against Roman rule in A. D. 66 was against the power of Rom. 13. If this passage bound Christians to bear Caesar's sword some Christians would have had to disobey Christ to obey Paul's (?) command to submit to Caesar even in carrying the sword. Christ said for His disciples to flee from Judaea, or if they were not in it they were to stay out of it, during the days of vengeance which came at the time of Jerusalem's destruction. If Cornelius was still in the army he would have had either to disobey Caesar's orders to march against Judaea and Jerusalem or he would have had to disobey Christ. The theory of some brethren on Rom. 13 would have bound Cornelius to have fought against Jerusalem. If Paul taught that theory some Christians would have had to disobey Christ to obey him. When we view Lk. 21:20 and Rom. 13 together we get another indication that Paul did not say that Christians were to bear the sword for Caesar.

XXI. The Dilemma Proposed by Stonestreet

"The doctrine that obedience to one of these powers (church and state, JDB) of God is the very antithesis of the other is untenable; and the assumption that God's power which is essential to civilization on earth is antagonistic to God's power which is essential to spiritual life here and hereafter, to the extent that it is believed, will contribute to the plea of infidels. God is not the author of confusion; hence, such doctrine has no counterpart in the Scriptures." (P. W. Stonestreet in letter, March 6, 1943).

(1) Jesus told His disciples not to use destructive vio-
lence in the service of law and justice (Matt. 5:38). This is sufficient for us in spite of the above “dilemma”. However, we shall show that the difficulty proposed by Stonestreet is not one which has been created by the c. o. position but by the Bible itself.

(2) God may be the author of things beyond our comprehension and power of reconciliation. How do you completely reconcile the doctrine of the foreknowledge of God (as taught in the Scriptures and testified to by the fulfillment of prophecy) and the freedom of man (as taught in the Bible and testified to by personal experience)? How do you reconcile the “determinate counsel” of God and the guilt of the crucifiers (Acts 2:23; 3:14,15,18,26). Shall we justify the crucifiers? reject the Bible on either one or both subjects on the basis that it is “confusion” and thus not in the NT? Or shall we face it as a problem which, although we can get some light on it, transcends our power to complete harmonize.

(3) God did not ordain civil government in the sense that He has the church for the church was directly informed of its mission and was conscious of it. Nero was neither. God overruled his actions just as He did those of Assyria and thus God overruled sin to punish sinners and to sift and awaken His children. Sin and more sin thus becomes the penalty of sin (Cf. Jer. 6:18; Rom. 1:18, 24). The governments of Rom. 13 were the antithesis of the church for the world lieth in the evil one (cf. Gal. 1:4). Rome was Pagan. The Bible states this antithesis (John 18:36; Dan. 2:35-44; Revelation).

(4) The basis on which Stonestreet tried to sanction war for the Christian is equally “strong and scriptural” when used to justify Christians preaching strong delusions (2 Thess. 3:10-12), helping people commit the sins which are a part of the “wrath” God inflicts on sinners in that He gives them up to the lust of their flesh as a punishment to them. These sins are a part of the “wrath” of God visited
on hardened sinners and according to Stonestreet we are to help administer the wrath of God (Cp. Rom. 1:18, 24, 28 with Rom. 12:19; 13:4).

(5) Shall we argue that the doctrine, that the kingdom of heaven was in antagonism to the Roman government, is untenable for both were agents of God and Paul said submit to Rome? Stonestreet's logic would involve this but the NT called for submission to an agent of God which, however, was an enemy of the church (Rom. 13; Dan. 2:44). Antagonism and submission!

(6) Christ's death was involved in the scheme of redemption (Rom. 3:23-). However, Judas and others were guilty of the blood of Christ (Acts 1:18; 2:23; Matt. 26:54-56; John 19:11; 17:12; 13:18). Shall we, because of our failure to completely reconcile the two, reject one or the other? Shall we argue, with Stonestreet's logic, that that which was necessary to salvation here and hereafter is either confusion or that the crucifiers were justified and that it would have been right for disciples to have helped them? Shall we argue that sinners were doing a good work for Christ's disciples and thus the disciples could cooperate?

(7) The difficulty which Stonestreet's theory seeks to avoid is quite evident in the case of Assyria to those who study Isa. 10:5, 12, 15. Assyria was none the less the sinner just because God, in some manner, used the sin of Assyria to punish the sin of Israel. Sin begets sin and becomes the punisher of sin. (Isa. 10:7, 13-14). The case of Babylon is also in point here. She was the cup of the wine of God's wrath and yet she was punished for her iniquity (Jer. 25:11, 15, 12). She was ordained of God as surely as was Rome and yet the very work which she did was a part of her iniquity.

(8) Shall we take Stonestreet's argument and maintain that because Paul's thorn in the flesh was overruled the thorn was any less of a minister of Satan or that it was
right for Christians to drive that thorn farther into his flesh? (2 Cor. 11:7).

(9) Hell is ordained for the devil and his angels (Cf. Matt. 25: 41). It is essential for the existence of heaven for unless hardened sinners are segregated in eternity from the righteous, hell in the heart of sinners would ruin heaven. Shall we argue that Christians should “manage” hell or that they should give sinners a foretaste of hell on earth?

(10) The logic of Stonestreet furnishes an individual with the concrete to pave the road for a justification of the execution of heretics by the civil powers. It would be an excellent device in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church:

(a) Rulers are to punish evil—heretics and backsliders are evil. (b) God punished such in the OT both by Israel and by such nations as Assyria. The civil governments today perform the function that it did in Old Testament days when church and state were combined. (c) Rulers are to protect the good. The annihilation of false teachers will help preserve purity of doctrine and life. (d) Rulers are to protect the rights of others by keeping down heresies which divide the church and which keep others from the right to hear the full gospel from the church, in that these false teachers bind them in chains of error. (e) When Christians are numerous religious rebellion becomes a cause of political dissention and should be put down by the government. (f) This is right, because the sword is God’s power to punish evildoers and to say that it is not to be used in behalf of the church is to say, in Stonestreet’s logic, that God’s two powers are antagonistic, and thus such a doctrine is confusion and not in the NT. Why is not this argument just as scriptural and logical as that advanced by Stonestreet in the question. In fact, it is embraced in his logic although he may not be conscious of it.

(11) His logic overrides the prohibition of the NT to the Christian concerning vengeance (Rom. 12:19). His logic says that since it is right for God to avenge, and for Him
to overrule various agents in so doing (Cf. Rom. 13 and Rev.), that therefore it is right for the Christian. For certainly, the argument would run, it is not right for one of these agents to do something to maintain order and civilization and yet be wrong for the Christian and the church—God's other agents. To say it is right for the government to do it, as an agent of God, and wrong for the church, is to say that God's agents are antagonistic in that it is wrong for one to do what it is right for another. And thus the argument would run and give the sword into the hand of the church. But Paul and Christians were not to take vengeance, because God would take care of it.

(12) Rom. 13 is a charter for one government today as much as it is for another. Yet, civil governments today are, in many instances, very antagonistic to one another. Shall we discard Rom. 13:1 or sanction such antagonism as Christian?

(13) The entrance of sin into the world somehow necessitated the cross and thus it was in the purpose and plan of God for the salvation of man (Isa. 53; Matt. 26:54-56). The sin of Christ's persecutors was in some manner overruled to the accomplishment of the purpose of the cross. Since the cross was essential shall we argue, with Stone-street's logic, that Christ's disciples should have cooperated with Rome (John 19:11) and Judas (Matt. 26:54)? Or shall we take the scriptural position that there were some things involved in the sacrifice of Christ in which conscientious, willing, voluntary, good and faithful servants of God could not participate? We must either take that position or: (a) Commend Judas; or (b) deny the prophecies (Matt. 26:34).

(14) The problem of the foreknowledge of God and the freedom of man is also illustrated in Peter's case and his denial of Christ (Matt. 26:34). Celsus, an infidel, presented the problem here involved. "If He did as God predicted, then it must so happen, and those who did it were led into this impiety by Himself, the God." (Uihlorn, 299; of Pressense, II:483; Acts 4:28). We shall not here attempt to
solve this difficulty. In fact, a completely satisfactory explanation may be beyond us. It may be that since time does not exist for God as it does for us (2 Pet. 3:9), that all is spread out before Him in the eternal Now and He sees the beginning from the end. We do not know. However, we do not reject the fact of either prophecy or freedom. Neither do we reject NT teaching on God’s overruling of the wicked to accomplish some purposes, which still does not commend their actions to us for our cooperation. It is conclusive that there is some work, accomplished through the overruling of wicked men, that Christians must not engage in (Cf. Acts 4:26, 28). Thus the c. o. position is no more disposed of through our failure to work out a satisfactory theory to harmonize all apparently conflicting elements than is our failure to do the same thing for the atonement an annihilation of the NT doctrine of the atonement.

(15) Stonestreet’s logic would prove that it is right for the church to carry the sword, as did Israel. It would run thus: The sword is conducive to the spread of the spiritual and civilizing power of the church, or is not. If it is then it ought to be used by the church for the power of the gospel and the power of the sword (two of God’s powers) are not the very antithesis of each others; for that would be saying that two of God’s necessary powers are antagonistic. If it ought not to be used by the body, the church, it ought not to be used by members of the body. If it is contrary to the means and ends of the church it is contrary to the means and ends of Christians. It is contrary to the means and ends of the church, but not those of civil powers (Rom. 13), and thus we must admit that these powers are contradictory in so far as their being used by the same person is concerned. Stonestreet’s reasoning would lead us to place both powers in the hands of the church. Or, to say the least, it would justify the church in using civil governments to spread the spiritual and civilizing power of the church by means of the sword. It would really be better to leave the sword where
the NT left it: The Christians were expressly forbidden to do what God accomplished through overruling the powers that be (Rom. 12:19; 13:4-5).

In conclusion, let us emphasize that the two powers—church and state—do differ radically in: (a) Knowledge of their mission; (b) mission; (c) means and methods; and (d) nature (John 18:36; Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12:17-21; 13:17).
CHAPTER IX

Justifications for Christians Killing

I. WAR FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Even those who contend that this is not a war for the protection and spread of Christianity usually end their appeals with a paragraph stressing the necessity of fighting for religious freedom. The c. o. who believes that the Christian ought not to use unchristian means to secure a Christian end—religious freedom—is regarded as a traitor, by some, to Christianity. They forget that Christians are set free by the truth and that even chains cannot bind the gospel (John 8:32; 2 Pet. 2:9; 2 Tim. 2:9). We have been called unto liberty and the Son has made us free indeed (Gal. 5:13; John 8:36). Such freedom depends on obedience to the truth and not on a dictatorship or a democracy. There are multitudes today in America who are in religious bondages because they are entangled in error. And they can be brought out of bondage only through spiritual means. And to such a freedom of souls the c. o. has much to contribute. And who is to say that their contribution to both religious and political freedom has been unworthy of notice? Prof. James H. Tufts, who was not a pacifist, said “on the whole, ideas and discussion, the work and example of noble men and women, have been greater powers than war for the spread of liberty.” (The Real Business of Living, p. 467). Certainly the early church did not use swords to protect or to secure religious freedom and yet who would say that they did not make a greater contribution to human freedom than all the swords of Caesar? We must not minimize teaching and example as factors in bringing orderliness and freedom.

If we can fight for our religious freedom, we can for that of others. And thus we would take up arms to release adherents, especially the young, from bondage to false reli-
gions. But the incompatibility of Christians so doing is rec-
ognized by the Christian conscience which does not send out
missionaries armed to the gills. As H. T. Hodgkins said in
_The Christian Revolution_, "Raymond Lull, going out weap-
onless and possessed with the passion of redeeming love into
the Moslem world, is an infinitely more potent force for
securing the real ends of the church of Christ than the tens
of thousands who flocked under the banners of the Crusades.
His way is clear. To turn from it is to leave the world with-
out witness to the way of the Cross." (116). We shall lose
that witness if we allow the enemy to dictate to us and to
determine the kind of weapons that we shall use in the war
for religious freedom.

C. W. Sommer, who is not a c. o., has pointed out that
we get our freedoms sadly mixed when we think we shall
lose the freedom to worship God if this war is lost. Whether
under a dictatorship or not we are free if we are Christians.
"Even if the time shall come when to worship God means
dead, if we choose death, then we shall have had every-
thing—we shall have had religious freedom, for no men
nor government can take that away from us if we care to
retain it. And—we may die for our freedom, but—we shall
have had everything! So—after all our religious freedom is
up to us. No man can take it from us." "There are things
that no democracy can guarantee and no Hitler can take
away." (American Christian Review, 8-25-42, p. 16). This
is not to say that religious freedom is not easier to affirm in
a democracy than it is in a dictatorship. It is to say that if
we maintain faith in God that our spirits are free and our
faith beyond the reach of the aggressor.

II. WE MUST FIGHT TO MAINTAIN OUR IDEALS

We must fight for our ideals with weapons which are
constructed by and which nurture the ideals. "We may belie
our ideals by the very means we use to reach them."

Christ has not authorized Christians to use the sword to
defend our ideals. If they can be thus defended, why cannot we use war to spread them and thus take up arms against unbelievers? If Christians are authorized to thus fight it is strange that during all its persecution the early church never took up the sword to defend “religion and right”.

It is not possible to defend our ideals with the sword. Troops are trained to fight like the enemy fights, except to outdo him. Lieut. Gen Lesley J. McNair is reported in the Oakland Tribune (11-12-42) as follows: “there need be no pangs of conscience, for our enemies have lighted the way to faster, surer and crueler killing; they are past masters. We must hurry to catch up with them if we are to survive. Since killing is the object of our efforts, the sooner we get in the killing mood, the better and more skillful we shall be when the real test comes.” We must, it seems, get on his level and beat him at his own game in order to conquer him on this level. How does this defend Christian compassion, conscience, and love? The same paper on Nov. 20, 1942 quoted Roger Lapham, a member of the War Labor Board, as saying that we may have to “adopt the methods of totalitarianism, no matter how much we dislike it”. When we take the enemy’s methods his evil enters into us and our means spell defeat for our ideals. We all know the sexual excesses, increase in drunkenness, in smoking, in dishonesty and craving for gaiety which accompanies war. Philip Gibbs, in Ten Years After, spoke of the “craving for gaiety, that moral lassitude and indiscipline of spirit which overcame the victorious peoples.” (107). “I think now as I write of all the wild scenes I saw in Belgium and France and England during deliberation of the armistice and peace. They were not Christian in their general manifestation. It is true that the churches were thronged, that many prayers of thanksgiving were uttered, but in the streets of great cities and of small it was a Bacchanalia absolutely pagan.” (Gibbs, More That Must Be Told, 102). And we only have to read the papers to realize that war does not protect the virtue of wom-
Far better violation than the cooperation which now exists. Violation cannot destroy virtue but the war spirit can. As Richards said it was significant in England that “in time of war licensed prostitution and other sexual abominations associated with the Contagious Disease Acts invariably reappear under official sanction and control.” (43-44).

The way of the cross originated Christian ideals and the way of the cross and that alone can adequately defend and propagate them. Christian ideals can be defended, as Richards observed, only “as men are either false to them or faithful to them as the case may be” in all situations in peace and war (38).

III. WAR TO FREE ENSLAVED PEOPLES

Christians have taken too little interest in racial equalities within their own neighborhoods to lend much strength to this argument. Like most gentiles, they are too often merely concerned with a theory of white superiority which is in the same general family with some other racial theories which are troubling the world today. This argument is used also to justify civil and class wars.

Christ has not authorized Christians to fight with the sword to free people. The Roman of Jesus’s day had enslaved many nations. Le Maistre reckoned 60,000,000 in the Roman Empire. Zumphith estimated that in 5 B.C. the city of Rome had 650,000 slaves. To say the least, slaves were numerous. Where did Jesus authorize the use of the sword in their behalf? Where did the apostles advocate armed resistance by the slaves? Yet Christ did commission his disciples to fight with spiritual weapons against the evils which made slavery possible. We war against a lack of love, against hate, ignorance, superstition, greed, jealousy and violence which bind men in all sorts of chains. Freedom of soul is possible through the cross (Col. 2:13; Eph. 2:1-8). Bondage to fear, sin and death is destroyed by Him (Heb. 2:15). These weapons are mighty to free the soul and the body, as
history testifies (2 Cor. 10:3-5). Such warfare, for example, might bring to the negro a freedom which the Civil War itself could not accomplish. It would change our own attitude as well as that of others. It may be well to meditate on the fact that those Christians who have not been concerned about sending the gospel to the downtrodden of the world are merely mouthing words of hypocrisy or ignorance when they talk about using the sword to free the downtrodden of the world.

IV. WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF . . .

"But what if . . ." is often used to combat a scriptural argument. It assumes that the way of the cross is either easy or unsound. If a Christian is sure that a certain position is scriptural it is unbelief which objects: "But what if . . ." It is surely distressing that Christians, with reference to this question, are asking the same question that the unredeemed ask. "To thoughtful Christians nothing surely can be more disturbing than the fact that, when the church discusses war and peace, the questions which usually arise are not on fundamentals—such as our conception of God and His purpose for the world, the authority of Christ and the scope of His Kingdom, the nature of the church and her redemptive mission, the Christian conception of personality and the Christian method of overcoming evil—but on matters of political expediency, special instances and probably consequences: 'What would happen if . . .?' 'What should we do when . . .?' God as an active factor in the situation seems too often to be entirely left out." MacGregor was convinced that the church "has no right even to ask such questions, until she has first satisfied her conscience that she sees clearly what is the mind of Jesus Christ and whither His way leads. When she has done so she will follow the way, without undue concern that the world counts it quixotic, and in the faith that an act of obedience might well be answered by an outpouring of Divine Power which would change the whole world situation in ways we cannot even dream. If this be deemed incredible, what is there left for faith to cling to?" (135-136).
His sound conclusion was that "the Cross is the only true Christian reaction to evil."

For the sake of some we shall deal with this question. First, we do not boast, as did Peter, of what we shall do in a crisis. Second, regardless of what we do the way of redemptive love is not proven false by our actions. Is Christianity shown to be false by failures of Christians at times? We should manifest the faith of Abraham and believe that God can provide a way for us which will not involve a violation of His word even though it may involve sacrifice. We must not allow any other love to come between us and submission to God (Heb. 11:17-19). We preach about the faith of Abraham, why not try to imitate although it may involve our death, that of our wives and children.

There is little analogy between protecting one's mother from a crook and going to war. Do wars start with insults to mothers? Do they localize and punish the evil-doer? Does one shoot at random in a crowd or bomb a city in which they will likely hit mothers and babies? The average man on the other side, with perhaps no more guilt than you have, may think that he is protecting his mother. One c. o. in the last war showed the falsity of an analogy between war and protecting his mother from a crook, when he said: "I do not know, but I would not go to France and shoot your uncle".

The unfairness of this argument is revealed in the fact that the militarist, and all other individuals, endorse the very point that they condemn when trying to overthrow the c. o. They grant that there are some times when the safety of their own family ought not to be the final standard for their actions. We ask them: What if the only way you had to save your wife from rape were to betray valuable military information? Is physical life of our loved ones the most valuable thing to the Christian? As long as I consider taking the life of an enemy as a betrayal of the way of the cross, I should not do it. As long as I think that the way of war for the Christian is a betrayal of future generations (for
war will beget war and a new element, the way of the cross, must be introduced to break the vicious circle of death, I should not engage in it. Although I do not stand in harsh judgement on those who are of a different persuasion, they should at least grant that as long as I believe that the above is really what is at stake, I should not kill.

The militarist has no guarantee that his way will protect his mother. Think of what that protection did for families in 1914-1918. When we consider the human cost of war (cf. Homer Folks) we ask: Is that defense or destruction? The c. o. believes that his way of defending his family and humanity is less costly, and is more likely to secure permanent security, than the way of war. Regardless, however, of its effectiveness our real concern must be with: What way of dealing with evildoers has Christ bound on Christians. We must adopt no methods which are inconsistent with the principle of parental love for even the enemy. This might involve benevolent restraint, which does not inflame or crush, such as a mother exercises to keep a baby from jumping off her lap.

If the reader still wants to ask the c. o. a few “What ifs”, let him consider these: (a) What if Russia’s help was essential to win the war and she would not give it unless we renounce God? (b) What if it was to be a thirty year war and the only way to win it was for all women to have as many children as possible both within and without wedlock? (c) What if the only way to protect your family from a crook was to throw a bomb which would destroy you, your family, the enemy and the neighbors? Would you throw it? Would you say the cost was too great? If you would not throw it would that not lay you open to some of the charges brought against the c. o.?

V. War As the Defense of the Weak

Whatever this may have justified in the past, it does not justify modern war for the Christian. War is so destruc-
tive that as an effort to protect the weak it costs too much even if we forgot that Christ has called on us to fight for the weak with weapons of love. To defend the weak we must destroy both weak and strong. In *The Human Costs of the War*, Folks pointed out that the last war left ten million homeless (299); nine million soldiers killed (302); fifty million homes manless for the duration and forever (305); ten million empty cradles (305); spread of disease (311); starvation which warped the brains and bodies of little children; and a "mortgaged future", one installment of which has now come due. And today defense of the weak by the way of war spells destruction on a vast scale for even the victorious. To defend a city may insure its destruction. Time magazine estimated that "up to last summer 1,750,000 died of starvation, epidemic and air raids" in Leningrad (2-1-43, p. 33). Maurice Hindus estimated Russia's loss to day as 10,000,000 lives (Reader's Digest, April 1943, p. 47). Both sides drop bombs which do not always discriminate between soldiers, civilians, women and the weak. Thousands of non-Germans have and will die under non-German bombs. More thousands will die of starvation. The method of war forces allies to bomb former allies and to starve their children to death by such means as food blockades. Doubt is cast on the effectiveness of war in defending the weak of the world. And one of the pitiful thing about it is that Christians usually view war on the plane of the non-Christian—from the standpoint of what they suffer instead of that plus the standpoint of the suffering which war inflicts on the enemy (Matt. 5:47; Lk. 6:32, 33, 34).

We would like to register here our plea for some of the weak of the world. Why can not children in some occupied countries be fed now? Food has been sent to the starving in Greece. There is sufficient neutral shipping, South America can help supply the food, there are sufficient frozen funds in this country, and there are sufficient people to help do it (Herbert Hoover, "Feed the Starving Now, Col-
Prisoners of war can receive packages, why not starving children in countries other than Greece? What can we say to them after the war? What do we now say to Christ for not lifting our voice in their behalf? Write the Office of Foreign Relief, Washington, D. C. and let them know you are in favor of feeding these children.

Regardless of what the world does the Christian should follow Christ and at least have as much confidence in the way of the cross as the world has in the way of war. For a Christian to say that is not as effective, or more so, than the way of war is to say that the cross is a failure in saving and defending the weak and sinful of the world. Our efforts when devoted to the way of the cross, will tend to protect the weak of all the world.

VI. War As Self Defense

It has been asserted that God has never forbidden his children to destroy their enemies in self defense. If this is true then He has authorized His people as a group to fight the enemies who attack her. Since the church is international, and should not fight against itself, Christians should unite against any foe which attacks the church. The falsity of the assertion here considered is revealed in the fact that Christ forbade His people to destroy enemies who attacked them (Matt. 5:10,12,38,48; 1 Thess. 5:15; Rom. 12:14, 17-21; 1 Pet 2:19-; Lk. 21:20). In all His predictions that His disciples would suffer at the hands of non-christians He never hinted that they were to use the sword to defend themselves. That the church did not consider that Christians were thus armed is revealed in the fact that she did not use the sword against either Jewish or Roman persecutors (Acts 5; 6; 7; 8; 12:2, 3; 12:12; cp. 7:60; John 16:13). 1 Pet. 2:13; 4:16-). Unless Christians can find where Christ authorized it and the early church practiced it, they ought not to say that God has given Christians the sword to defend themselves. The fact that the early church did not practice such
means of self defense indicates that they had a different spirit from that many Christians today.

VII. War As The Lesser Of Two Evils

This argument assumes that war guarantees a protection of life and freedom and maintains that the cost of victory cannot be too severe either physically or spiritually. It assumes that the way of redeeming love is an evil. When we view the essential nature of war we ask: What is the other evil in the light of which war is the lesser evil for the Christian? Is a way of life which violates the spirit of the cross the lesser of two evils for the Christian? If Stephen had known this argument he could have used it to justify calling on Christians to fight. Herod possibly justified John's death in that manner. Jesus' death was thus justified (John 11:48-50). It would have "spared" the church its heroic age of refusal to adopt any part of the Roman state religion. In fact, one prefect told Appollonius that it was "far better for thee to live among us than to die a miserable death." (Hardy, 156).

The choice before Christians is not one of two evils. It is between the way of the cross and the way of the world (Lk. 6:32). There is always a way out that is Christian—the way of the cross. Let us believe God and try to act in the spirit of the cross.

VIII. War Is Impersonal

Although persons run the machines which fight wars some have said that the impersonal character of war justifies war for Christians. If this is true, then it is mitigated for all sides. However, war is not impersonal: What about the babies whose homes are bombed? Is the suffering less terrible because the bomber tears them apart with bombs from the heights rather than with his own hands? What is impersonal about the spirit of blood lust which war cultivates? What is impersonal about destruction which leaves loved ones heart heavy? What about seared souls? disillusion-
ment? the moral let down? the desire for revenge? is not this "impersonal" argument used to justify the ruthless methods of some businesses? The truth is that war is only impersonal for those who have no loved ones in it and who have no part in the work which sets forth the essential nature of war.

"When our action affects the very life of our fellow creatures so intimately and so disastrously as does our action in war, have we any right as Christians to act in this detached and impersonal way?" (Richards, 87). Furthermore, since Christ values personalities it is wrong for us "thus to depersonalize one's attitude to one's brother man." (MacGregor, 108).

IX. WAR AS DISCIPLINE

Some have tried to reduce the war question to: "Should Christians maintain, administer, enforce discipline?" Surely it is a long physical and ethical jump from spanking a child to killing a stranger in uniform. It is like the leap involved when one says that an elder may spank his child, therefore he can destroy a rebellious church member; or, that God chasteneth His church (Heb. 12:5-), therefore we or enemies of the church are to destroy it.

Where does the Bible justify a Christian in trying to exercise discipline by killing? In fact, there is no analogy between discipline that a Christian exercises, in the home for instance, and war: (a) Is war fought by one nation which controls a "child nation"? (b) Is guilt localized or are both innocent and guilty punished indiscriminately? (c) Is war administered in love? If so, why are hate and harshness stressed? (d) Does home discipline involve misleading propaganda? (e) Is the effort to correct and to convert or to crush? (f) Is it carried on in a high moral attitude? (g) Does it result in a spiritual change in the enemy or merely in submission—until he gets stronger—to your superior might? (h) Does it undermine the morality of the administrator? (i) Is there a constituted authority recog-
nized by the "family of nations?" (j) Have you disciplined a person when you have killed him? Have you not tried to wash your hands of him by washing them in his blood? (k) What Christian father deals with his child as war does with the enemy?

The church exercises discipline but does that give it the authority to kill? If the analogy makes it right for Christians to kill, why not for the church to destroy heretics? No, we have no such right. We must use means and seek ends which are conceived by Christian love. The early church realized this and it killed neither heretics nor persecutors.

X. CHRISTIANS AND A JUST WAR

The Scriptures do not say that we can fight either a just or an unjust war. The same scripture which binds us to obey our government, bound the early Christians in obedience to Rome. If it includes obedience in killing when applied to us, it did the same when applied to them. Since Rome waged wars for dictators it sanctioned unjust wars if it sanctioned any wars. Then, too, there is always guilt on both sides; wars cannot be carried on without forgetting the standards of justice and fair play; and war does not settle the issue as to the right. It simply settles who is strongest.

If a war was a judgment on the entire world for its sins, how could we make it a just war for one group?

Those who believe in Christians fighting "just wars", should ask themselves: Would I take up arms if I thought my government was waging an unjust war? Would I fight my own government? Consistency would force an individual to do it if he thought his government was wrong for he would then say that the other side was fighting a just war and that he ought to fight in such a war. And yet, Rom. 13 would stare him in the face.

"The Christian revolutionary will not then be driven by specious arguments into a destructive use of force that
is mere restraint of evil. He will not be misled by the idea that the outward victory of a 'just cause' is identical with the triumph of love and goodness. He will see that the larger ends demand a larger patience, and a greater confidence that God is working in the hearts of all (who will let him, JDB) and that His love cannot be finally overthrown. (Hodgkins, 116).

XI. CHRISTIANS AND A WAR TO END WARS

This argument cannot justify war for the Christian if Christ does not. He knew that wars would come but He never said for Christians to fight war to end war. We would be filled with joy if war did end with the close of this one but as long as men are not at peace with God, as long as war madness prevents the Christian settlement of national difficulties, then just so long will man be at blows with man. Already men are expressing the fears that unless the democracies and Russia come to a satisfactory understanding World War III will be inevitable (Cf. Oakland Tribune, 3-10-43, editorial page). War seems to begat war. Be that as it may, Christ has not authorized Christians to use the method of war to end war. We do believe, however, that Christ is leading us in the only war which will end war—the war against rebellion to God. The Christian faith can cure the world of war for it cures man who wages war. The Christian faith only can do it. Let Christians then, regardless of the way the world may go, wage total spiritual war against sin and entirely devote themselves to that war. If we don’t, who will?

XII. WHAT ELSE CAN YOU DO?

“What else can you do when the government requires it,” Christians often hopelessly ask. First, the government does not require you to kill or even to enter armed services. Second, your attitude says that you have already lost the liberty of decision and action. Third, in Germany you would fight for Hitler if such is your justification for Christians
going to war. Fourth, you have despaired of God and planned your actions on an atheistic attitude. Fifth, the early Christians did not have this attitude when called on to compromise their conscience. Sixth, find avenues of service where the actions will be in harmony with Christian principles. Insist on such in kindly manner. Seventh, no man can make you fight. Your will is still your own. What would you think of the man who betrayed important military secrets by saying: "What else could I do, the enemy demanded it or else". If all avenues of service are closed to you, do nothing and that in itself will be a testimony to the cross. Remember that the cross is the Christian's final answer to a world which demands that he come down to its level. Only thus can we elevate the world. Eighth, the attitude of despair is a virtual renunciation of Christ. If one so evades the Christian responsibility here, what would he do in other things under similar pressure? "Let the fear of God be more powerful than constraint: since, if thou art to bring forward such excuses, thou wilt keep none of the things which are enjoined." (Chrysostom on Matt. 5:34-).

As B. Frank Rhodes, Jr., said: such an attitude is "a subverting of the very foundation principles of Christianity—that man's soul is free, and that Jesus is Lord of all. This idea is, after all, a kind of materialism that has entered the church—'Men are nothing but machines and have no power of choice.'" Heroic exploits of some in occupied countries indicate that men have the power of choice—even if it involves death. And yet, "we Christians have a habitual respect for our doctrines, but when it comes to a question of actions, we ask, 'How far shall we go in following Christ?' Would the early church have grown as it did in the midst of a hostile world if the members had taken the attitude that many take today?" (20th Century Christian, March 1943, pp. 10-11).

XIII. ALL ARE INVOLVED, THEREFORE ALL MUST FIGHT

Even if the sins of all have contributed in part to this war, we cannot atone for our sins by killing enemies. The
primary purpose of the fighting soldier is not to sacrifice himself but to make the enemy die for his country.

We are not all at war. My will, mind and body are not at war. No declaration of war has been made by me. I am as much involved in the sins of the country in peacetime as I am now in war. Should I thus justify engaging in them? The relationship of the church to the world is not changed by war. If I cannot follow the way of the cross now, I cannot in peacetime. Should I go on a spree if everyone else was on one? (Cf. Richards, 103). It may be that I find it impossible to be the perfect Christian. However, that does not justify me in compromising and refusing to do my best to such a Christian.

The sins of a world at war are simply their past sins intensified and bearing fruit. Now if the way of the cross is out of place and impossible in war, then “What is the use of my trying to be a Christian in a world which contains so much evil?” (Nichols, 232).

As to the work Christians should do let us ask: What would I do in peacetime? Would I consider it right then? In so far as I can control the results of my work are they good? Or is its sole purpose that of destruction? Any product can be turned to an evil purpose by someone but we are not responsible, for example, for everything an individual does with the strength supplied by the food which we gave him or which he ate in our home. If we were, we could not feed anyone in our own family for they might do some evil; and according to the attitude of some we would be fully implicated in that evil because without the food which we gave him he would not have been able to live and do it. If you save a man’s life you are not responsible for everything he does after that. We should, on the argument of some, never feed a non-Christian for they teach false and unchristian doctrines. They do sinful things. And we might as well do them ourselves as feed one that does those things. However, we know that as Christians we may do any good deed
to a man and that if our heart is right, if we have a humanitarian purpose, then it is right. We are responsible for our motives, our attitudes and actions and not for every use to which someone may put the results of our actions. If we cannot find a service we can do a sinner, such as feed him, in wartime we cannot find any such service in peacetime.

This sort of "argument" would have involved Christians in the war in A. D. 66-70 (Cf. Lk. 21:20-) and it would justify war for Christians in all lands today.

XIV. WHAT IF EVERYONE TOOK THAT STAND?

If every Christian took this stand, as we wish they would, none would fight. If only a limited number took it they would have to suffer whatever came their way as a consequence. We would not take the stand if we did not also believe that it was right for us and unless we wanted them to do it. However, we do not advocate that those who bear the sword should lay it down until they are convinced that the way of the cross is better and is right for Christians. It should be taken only by those who are conscientious about it. But for those who are, they should so think and act that if others did what they do, war and other social evils would be impossible. "Is this or is it not the way of Christ?" (Hodgkins, 118).

Some argue that if the majority took the c. o. stand that the crooks would control society. This tries to put the c. o. in a bad light as it places this danger in the future and implies that such would be a result of our position. The facts are that society sanctions, both nationally and internationally, many things which are corrupt. Many are not concerned about this but they are concerned over the danger of the pacifist to society! They overlooked the fact that more than one way exists to deal with crooks and that more perfect techniques for the prevention and cure of the criminal mind may be developed. Furthermore, it is certain that war does help in the numerical increases of criminal minds.
Cadoux well deals with this accusation. First, the c.o. does not try to force his views on society. A pacifist dictator is a contradiction in terms. But those who so believe should so act. Second, as pacifism grows the hostile element decreases—it works as a leaven. Third, pacifism is aggressive and endeavors to overcome opposition by conversion through returning good for evil. The opposer is given more through the good will or the c.o. than he could ever hope to obtain through violence. There is a Christian way of meeting evil and we must not deny the “positive efficacy of Christian love”. Fourth, war as well as pacifism runs the risk of failure. Some of the argument for war fail if the war is lost. Thus these arguments are uncertain since the outcome of a war is generally uncertain. Fifth, why argue what would happen if all took the c.o. position and then withdraw some of them to be crooks? Sixth, pacifism has had striking success in some instances and there would be more if it were tried oftener. One British officer said that Dr. Pennell, a medical missionary, was worth more to the British Government, in India, than two regiments of soldiers. We must not forget that the early history of the church proves that a society is not doomed to perish just because it does not carry the sword although it is endangered by the sword of another group. Seventh, the way of the cross does not avoid all suffering and the possibility of failure. It is as willing to die for its way as others for the way of war. The way of love in a sinful world involves a cross. Its apparent failure is not more real than was that of His cross. Eighth, war begets war and love tends to beget love. Others will often love us because we first love them. Ninth, international problems must finally be thought out, not fought out. War madness impairs the thinking and it does not prevent injustice and injury. Why not take the Christian way of forgiveness which does not beget war madness in us or others. Tenth, the way of war is ethically shocking to Christians but the way of the cross is not. The important thing for the Christian is to gain the heart of his enemy
(Cadoux, III:107-130). When saving souls becomes our passion the only crime of which we shall be conscious is that of neglecting an opportunity of reaching the sinner. To kill him cuts him off from the possibility of conversion. Hardships endured in such a work are not worthy to be compared with the reward which awaits the Christian (Rom. 8:18). Eleventh, the strange power of love to heal sin-sick souls is testified to by the cross. Twelfth, the way of the cross introduces a new element into the situation and sets “motion a process of permanent healing”. “When, therefore a man is converted to Christian pacifism, the country loses indeed a potential soldier, but it gains an actual and active reconciler: and unless the claims just made for Christian love are illusory (in which case Christianity itself would be an illusion), the gain greatly outweighs the loss.” (Cadoux, III: 157). “The sociologist Benjamin Kidd, in his book entitled the Science of Power, weighs the types of power prevalent through the centuries and says that the final type of power is the power of self-sacrifice. He draws a picture of Christ, standing thorn-crowned and with bound hands before Pilate. Pilate represents the strongest military force of that day—the Roman Empire. He represents self-assertion. Christ standing before him represents self-sacrifice. The two types of power come together. And Kidd says that the center of power shifts from Pilate to Christ, for he represents the final type of power, the power of self-giving.” (E. Stanley Jones, Christ at the Round Table, 219).

XV. Are Conscientious Objectors Cowards?

It is easy to assume the position of an almighty judge, read the heart of a c. o., and label as cowardly a position which one may not understand. Such an accusation reveals more about the one who makes it than it does about the c. o. Were the early Christians cowards for refusing to use the sword to defend the church or their homes? W. G. Kellogg, in World War I, said: “an examination of over eight hundred objectors in twenty widely distributed military
camps and posts has convinced me that they are, as a rule, sincere—cowards and shirkers, in the commonly accepted sense, they are not.” (The Conscientious Objector, 1). He was fair. Those who are unfair need our prayer and admonition. How strange it is that those who try to follow the spirit of this poem are called cowards and “freak specimens of humanity”.

“How hardly man this lesson learns,
To smile and bless the hand that spurns;
To see the blow—to feel the pain,
But render only love again.
The spirit not to earth is given;
Reviled, rejected and betrayed,
ONE had it—HE came from heaven.
No curse he breathed, no plaint he made,
But when in death’s deep pang he sighed,
Prayed for his murderers and died.”—Edmiston.

XVI. JESUS NEVER FACED A DICTATOR

Christ faced totalitarianism, and men under its tyranny, but he did not advocate violence. In fact, He repudiated it. Kirby Page has convincingly set this forth in his pamphlet on How Jesus Faced Totalitarianism. He began “by emphasizing the amazing parallels between the problems of first century Palestine and those of our own times. Jesus’ countrymen were tragically familiar with totalitarianism, enslavement, exploitation, persecution and massacre. Precedents for the most revolting atrocities of twentieth century dictators abound in the cruelties inflicted upon the peoples of Judea and Galilee.” Jesus came into contact with the “patriotic revolutionist”, families whose sons had been crucified by the Romans, mothers whose babes had been murdered by Herod in Bethlehem, disciples of John the Baptist who had been murdered by Herod Antipas”, Roman officers and soldiers who were “habituated to violence”, the “tax-collector whose odious occupation was that of extorting tribute from
his own people for the conqueror", saints who waited for the kingdom of God, resolute youth that determined to serve God regardless of the cost; yes, Christ faced all of these. What sort of freedom was He to bring to them and how was he to bring it? Was it to be in the language of violence, which some would say was the only language Rome could understand? The Jews were familiar with the use of violence as a means of subduing others. "There is convincing evidence also that during the days of Jesus most of the people continued to worship the warrior God who would again lead His chosen race in victorious battle. For this reason they continued periodically to rise in armed rebellion until the Romans became so tired of these repeated insurrections that Jerusalem was destroyed utterly and the populace massacred, crucified or scattered to the four winds." (34) Jesus as the Messiah faced this problem and the yearning of the Jews (E. de Pressense, Jesus Christ, His Times, Life and Work, 69-; Tacitus, History, 5:9-; Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Book 17, Chap. 9. Book 20, Chap. 11; 18:1). He rejected the way of violence. (Cf. MacGregor, 55-). He enthroned the way of love for His disciples.

**XVII. WAR AND SELF-PRESERVATION**

The attempt to justify Christians killing by appealing to the natural man is often evident in the writings of those who favor such. In the June, 1943, *Bible Banner* R. L. Whiteside used this appeal as one of the justifications for Christians killing in wartime. "Self-preservation is a law of our being—it is a God-given law. I cannot believe that God is the author of two conflicting laws."

(i) The appeal to the natural man is often potent but it is full of danger. There are some who stoutly maintain, and the history of unregenerate man backs them up, that man by nature is polygamous. On the appeal to nature the Latter-day Saints can make out as good a case for polygamy as Brother Whiteside can for war. It is more fitting for
Christians to base their conduct upon that which they are enabled to do by grace and not by the prompting of "nature". Regardless of what others do, "He hath granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises; that through these ye may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is the world by lust." (2 Pet. 1:4).

(2) Should the law of self-preservation be the supreme law in the Christian's life? If so, is not war itself against that law? What soldier would go forth to battle if the law of self-preservation, instead of self sacrifice, was supreme in his life? No war could be fought if each individual followed the law of self-preservation.

What if there is a conflict between one's ideals and faith and the law of self preservation? Had Stephen never heard of this God given law? Think of the martyrdom that would have been prevented in the early church if the Christians had read Brother Whiteside's article and realized that since the law of self-preservation is imbedded in our nature, and since "I cannot believe that God is the author of two conflicting laws", that therefore the instinct of self-preservation should have been followed and Caesar worshipped and Christ denied in order that self might be preserved. The soldier who gives up his life rather than betray military secrets into the hand of the enemy has certainly not been given such strength by feeding on the doctrine of self-preservation.

(3) Self-preservation and the preservation of a nation are not identical. As B. L. Fudge pointed out one does not instinctively "defend the form of government, national ideals political and social customs, territories, and other things that go to make up the nation. The very fact that a tremendous national propaganda campaign necessarily accompanies every war is proof enough of this." One must lose his identity in the identity of the nation if an attack on the nation is equal to an attack on the individual, and on every individual in the nation (Can A Christian Kill for His Gov-
If nation-preservation is identical with self-preservation where do Quislings come from? Are they not shining examples of self-preservation?

(4) The Christian life is not run on the principle of self-preservation, in the sense of the protection of one's life and property, but on the principle of self-sacrifice. I find much in the New Testament which inculcates within the Christian self-sacrifice, but where is the teaching which lays down the law of self-preservation of life and property? Did Jesus go to the cross because of the law of self-preservation? Was God the author of conflicting laws when Christ followed the law of self-sacrifice instead of self-preservation (1 Pet. 2:21)? What law of self-preservation of one's life is found in Matt. 10:37-39; Mk. 8:34-37? What law of physical self-preservation, as Brother Whiteside used it, did Christ appeal to when he said "be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28; Lk. 12:4-5). It was this law and not that of the preservation of life and property that sustained the martyrs. What law of self-preservation did Paul violate in Phil. 1:23,25? Did Christ have that law, the one used by Whiteside, in mind when he said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be; if any man serve me, him will the Father honor." (John 12:24-26). Christians can never be God's instrument for the salvation of both friend and foe as long as they give allegiance to the law of the preservation of life and property which is appealed to by Brother Whiteside and others. The law of self-sacrifice, not that of self-preservation, will set the church on fire for Christ and send its members into all parts of the world with the gospel of the grace of God. It
would be well to stress this characteristic of the church the next time one deals with the earmarks of the church which is set forth in the New Testament.

Note: Self-sacrifice does not make war Christian. If it did it would make it Christian for all sides. Then, too, the primary object of the soldier—in spite of the spirit of self-sacrifice—is not to die for his country but to make the enemy die for his.
CHAPTER X

The Essential Nature of War

Since war cannot be made either pleasant or Christian, it is understandable that the efficient killer should combine the stealth of a prowler, the ingenuity of a safe-cracker, the swiftness of the panther, and the knife wielding ability of a cut-throat with the accurate aim of a crack gunman. Commando training is right for a Christian, if killing is right. Is the essential nature of war such that it is in harmony with a Christian’s nature? Should he lend his body to its atrocities? Since it must become a way of life, is that way of life permissible for Christians?

I. Heroics Do Not Constitute War’s Essential Nature

No sensible person denies the sacrifice, daring and loyalty of a sincere soldier. However, the aim of war is not self-sacrifice but the sacrifice of the enemy. It is to make him die for his country. War takes our highest impulses and enlists them in the destruction of others. It is hell and it asks us to inflict hell on another. Unless Christians can willingly give them hell in the spirit of Christ, they cannot war on their enemies.

II. War Tends To Brutalize the Individual

All are not brutalized but that is because all do not give way to its spirit. However, war creates conditions which gives one abundant opportunity to give way. Men are trained to be brutal and inflict brutal torture of months and years of suffering on others. One is asked to become an “angel of hell”, a “devil dog”, whose blood lust is cultivated especially among bayonet fighters. The proper way to choke an enemy, gouge out his eyes, and knee him in the crotch is stressed. “Guts at both ends of the bayonet” is the motto.
Saint-Mancle told of men who fought like maddened beasts whose sole object was to kill and maim and in whom “of necessity the flowers of common decency wilted and died” (148, 153, 142). Commandant Coste said “beastiality enters largely into certain acts of course”, acts “which strangely recall the fury of the wild beast and suddenly occur, like made fits of rage” (Ligt, 211). The primitive passions of man are aroused and cultivated (Edward Glover, War Sadism and Pacifism, 17). The mental and moral disintegration in all armies was shocking in World War I (Shepherd, 210-211). War encourages man to be at war with his virtues and at peace with his vices, and to kill without a qualm. The “Master of Mayhem” instead of the Master of Mercy is in charge. No, one cannot fight like a gentleman and those who think so know nothing of either a Christian gentleman or of war (Gibbons, 55-56). How do you stick a bayonet in a man in the fashion appropriate to a Christian gentleman? How do you so bomb his home?

III. All Means Are Sanctioned by War

If Christians should fight all means necessary to win are sanctioned. The criterion is not Christian love but effectiveness. If a weapon will help the State win few other questions will be seriously asked. It will be used if necessary. Atrocities and weapons of the enemy are condemned, then imitated, then surpassed if possible. The enemy becomes our teacher and from him we learn to “kill without compunction, and possibly get a little fun out of it” (Maj.-Gen. Charles L. Scott, AP dispatch, May 14, 1943). If war’s ways and weapons are right for the Christian, what Christ has taught us about the Christian life is wrong as well as a hindrance to efficient killing.

(1) War upsets all Christian values. Christian virtues are often military vices and vices named in the Bible often become military virtues. Good is when we destroy, bad is when we are destroyed. War’s ethics would jail a man in peacetime. The fundamental doctrine of individual responsi-
bility is denied and the individual is asked to surrender his moral judgement, conscience and will to his superiors in office (Richards, 41-42). The spirit of war helps destroy in us those very moral principles for which men have called on war to protect.

(2) War commends bribery when it is effective.

(3) War destroys respect for human life. The “right to kill” fastens itself on men’s minds (Shepherd, 205-206). The war spirit fosters this but Christ teaches us to respect the personality and life of even an enemy.

(4) War paints the enemy in the blackest terms possible and it often presents a picture which is unfair in its scope and which helps prevent a just and enduring peace. Isolated cases of cruelty are built up into generalizations. Cruelties are widely publicized and merciful acts often toned down or ignored. Deeds which would be praised if done by friends are regarded in the enemy as a sign of their barbarism. This may all be essential to war. We do not argue that it is not. We simply want Christians to know what they justify when they justify war for Christians.

(5) War sanctifies lies but Christians are to be sanctified in the truth (John 17:17). Is not truth the first casualty? God condemned deceit, in Jacob and his mother for instance, but falsehood is “a recognized and extremely useful weapon in warfare, and every country uses it quite deliberately to deceive its own people, to attract neutrals, and to mislead the enemy.” (Ponsonby, 13). It often becomes a virtue to lie (Wallace R. Deuel, Look, Feb. 23, 1943, p. 35). If we can set aside the Christian reaction to the enemy then why not set aside all Christian reactions; the reaction to truth in this instance. If we can kill for our country we can lie for it.

(6) We realize that all soldiers do not use foul language but it is a fact the war encourages such among warriors. It is not at all uncommon to hear the language of pray-
er used in an unprayerful manner. Curse and be cursed is too often the case. "Unprintable" songs are sometimes sung on the way to battle. Of course, foul speech may be heard in peace and in war but should not a Christian refrain from yielding to the spirit of war which encourages swearing lips?

(7) War helps create the spirit of hate. The more one loves the less fit he is for war's deeds. Rex Stout said we must hate (cf. The Christian Century Feb. 17, 1943, 188-189); propaganda of hate is used (Ponsonby, 14; Benson, 241); the Russians make use of "concentrated hatred" which "makes men fight more earnestly" (Demarce Bess, Saturday Evening Post, Jan. 9, 1943, p. 68); Col Milton A. Hill referred to the need for the urge to kill and of "honest hate" (Oakland Tribune, Oct. 2, 1942); Lieut. Gen. Lesley J. McNair said to "get fighting mad" and that if you call that hating the enemy that we must hate them with every "fiber of our being". "We must lust for battle; our object in life must be to kill". He said that "you are going to get killing mad eventually; why not now, while you have time to learn thoroughly the art of killing?" (Oakland Tribune, 11:12-42). A French officer said that the "true passion for war is supremely a passion for murder, the spirit of vengeance, of hate... And all the acts of war must bear the character of violence, and of such slaughter as shall give the enemy the terrifying impression of a hate tirelessly directed on its object and insatiable." (Heering, 108). President Wilson said that "to fight you must be brutal and ruthless" (Dr. Bellquist, California Monthly, April, 1943, p. 8). No wonder one soldier said that war makes one forget that he is a Christian (Heering, 179).

The hate so created is a very present enemy at the peace table and it helps perpetuate the spirit which breeds war (F. Nitti, xxvii). Thus the eternal cycle of hate and war feeds on its own corruption until it again becomes full and belches out its burning breath which mangles the bodies and sears the souls of a generation which in turn passes on the
fumes and flames of hate and war. And the great tragedy of it all is that even Christians do not understand that the cycle of death cannot be broken until a new element, the way of the cross, is introduced. This will never be introduced unless Christians, in love and humility, follow the way of the cross. The more men war the less the spirit of the cross is cultivated and the more men follow Christ's way the more moral they become and the closer to the standard of the cross they get.

We realize that all do not have the war spirit and that one can have the war spirit and never put on a uniform. However, we do maintain that the war spirit is unchristian; but if it is right for Christians to kill it is right for them to adopt the spirit which will make them most efficient in killing. And if this is done then what does it profit to keep the enemy out of a land if his spirit is in our hearts? For “if righteousness perish it is no longer of any consequence that men are living upon the earth.” (Kant).

IV. War And Sex

Venus and Mars are close mates although the mating is not confined to one army or even to the armies. But we do know that the war spirit brings out the “charity girls” who give their all to their countrymen. “Victory girls” become common sights. They become the chief carriers of venereal diseases which constitute “the greatest saboteur” (Time, 3: 29-43, p. 47) (Berkeley Daily Gazette, 2-8-43; Oakland Tribune, 2-3-43). It is a fact that war increases sexual laxness and the virginity is sacrificed by Venus on the altar of Mars. War miserably fails as a protector of virtue. In fact, no foe can rob a woman of virtue although the war spirit may lead them to abandon virtue. Service men are not the only transgressors and most certainly all of them are not transgressors. But no one can deny that the war spirit encourages sexual laxness.

V. War and the Revival of Religion

If war converts men to Christ the world would long ago
have been converted. Putting sinners in fox holes and shooting at them is not, to say the least, a Christian form of evangelism. It is true that men have turned toward God in time of danger and that some experiences have been permanent. However, too often any revival is simply a shallow emotionalism or a wave of terror which is without any deep spiritual change (John Foster Dulles, Life, Dec. 28, 1942, p. 49; Saint-Mande, 223). Morality declined and skepticism increased after the last war (Gibbs, More That Must Be Told, 83-84; Heering, 177). The Civil War was followed by a moral let down (John D. Hicks, The American Nation, 84). Leslie D. Weatherhead reports that England has shown no signs of a religious revival in this war (Christian Century, May, 19, 1943, p. 602). We shall be grateful for any good which comes out of a war but something more than the war spirit is necessary to produce such good.

VI. War Begets War Instead of Love

War sows the seed for wars instead of curing. A lack of love and understanding, which causes war, cannot be remedied through returning evil for evil. Love cannot be begotten by a method which is contrary to love. The way of war tends to beget hate and to confirm the enemy in his belief that the way of war is right. The way of love challenges the method itself and it begets love. To deny this is to deny the known power of the gospel (1 John 4:19). We who believe in the cross believe that love creates love. Why, then, should Christians follow a way which is contrary to the spirit and results of the cross. The “good wish the bad to reform. Will they return good for evil, and thereby hasten their reform or will they return evil for evil and thereby frustrate that reform?” (Ballou, 107). Who will take the lead in this work of reform and salvation? The enemy will not. Who will, if Christians do not take the lead? Does Christ will that we should take the initial step and show the enemy what we mean by Christian love?

Richard Gregg has pointed out something of the results
of the way of non-violence. (a) An element of surprise is introduced for the attacker is not met with violence. No violent encounter results and when the attacker is met with a spirit of good will it does not tend to strengthen his fighting morale; especially when the submission and goodwill is not that of fear but of love. (b) A new element and a new idea has been introduced to the attacker. This element does not feed his anger. It is therefore not encouraged to continue. (c) The attacker may be surprised at the courage of the person and even come to admire him (d) The c. o. appeals to the better nature of the attacker. (e) Your respect for his personality may influence him. (f) He is rendered undignified “for it is undignified to have to proceed thus against harmless, decent, defenseless people.” (g) The attacker can understand that you are willing to see his viewpoint and deal fairly with him. (h) The sympathy of others will be enlisted. (i) The soldiers who oppose you will be robbed of the vital feeling that they are protecting others from you. They will see that no one needs to be protected from you. (j) It robs the attacker of the feeling of heroism for what hero attacks decent non-resisting people? (k) The unselfishness of the genuine c. o. will shame many attackers. (l) It will tend to remove any cause for suspicion and jealousy. (m) The enemy will have little reason to attack you for your possessions for they can see by your actions that you are willing to share. He can gain more from your love than from the use of arms.

This is not peace at any price. It is peace through the price which was paid on the cross for peace between man and God. If this way fails then no other way will succeed for the end Christ had in view (Hodgkins, 114).

VII. WAR IS THE TAKING OF REVENGE

The wars of Rome, which Christians fought in if it is right for Christians to kill, were often for revenge and vengeance. One of the war aims is usually vengeance. It is rather a futile effort because you seldom kill the person
who hurt you and also the ones who are most responsible. And yet, today “practically all of Europe is thirsty for German blood” (Charles Lanius, *Saturday Evening Post*, Dec. 26, 1942, p. 66). Regardless of what others may teach, the NT teaches Christians that they are to take neither revenge or to avenge (Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12:14, 17, 21; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 2:19-24). We cannot avenge and avenge not at the same time. Thus we cannot kill enemies.
Chapter XI

The Relationship Argument

Various relationships in life involve various allegiances. All do not have the same binding power. Self, family, friends, country, humanity, church, Christ and God are all involved. Where loyalties clash the higher loyalty must be followed. In so doing, we believe that the best interest of the lower loyalty is also therein embraced.

I. The Allegiances of Christians

A Christian has a Christian allegiance in every relationship in life in which he is involved. In none of them is he to act as if he was a pagan.

1. Christians, who were slaves, were told to obey their masters (Col. 3:22). Masters were told to be just to the servants (Col. 3:1; Eph. 6:9). However, not many of the masters were Christians. This placed the Christian slave in a difficult situation. A slave was not supposed to have a mind of his own, he had no rights, “and any measures were lawful against a slave” (Westbury-Jones, xv; Geer, 80). “Many acts commanded by his master were forbidden by his God” (Westbury-Jones, xv). “His only law, morality, conscience, was the will of his master; he knew no other rule or obligation but to do his will. So says Menander: ‘Slave, obey the orders of thy master, just or unjust”. “The slave has not the right to say no.” (Presense, IV:422). The female slave “had no option if her master made any claim upon her; and he might even lend her to whom he pleased.” (423, 428). If we argued as some do on Rom. 13 we would be forced to the position that she should do it, or any other act, willingly and without personal responsibility for in the relationship of slave and master Paul said “obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh” (Col. 3:...
However, the scriptural attitude would be to obey the higher loyalty when loyalties clash. All quibbling about “relationships” and “agents” could not justify her willing participating in such prostitution.

(2) Christian were told to obey parents in all things (Col. 3:20; Eph. 6:1). Does this justify a child in feuding as an agent of his parents? The fathers were to nurture their children in Christian doctrine (Eph. 6:4); but not all fathers were Christians.

(3) Wives were told to obey their husbands in all things and “as unto the Lord” (Col. 3:18-19; Eph. 5:22, 24-25). “The Roman family, writes Muirhead (Roman Law, p. 31) ‘was an association hallowed by religion... The purpose of marriage was to rear sons who might perpetuate the house and family sacra... the husband was priest in his own family but wife and children alike assisted in its prayers and took part in the sacrifices to its lares and penates’” (Westbury-Jones, 117). Shall we argue that since we are to obey Christ in all things, that in the husband and wife relationship that the wife should obey every command of her husband?

(4) The husband has an obligation to the wife (Eph. 5:24; Col. 3:19). Not all husbands, however, were Christians.

(5) The Christian has an allegiance to the eldership (Heb. 13:17; 1 Pet. 5:5); the elders have an obligation to the church (1 Pet. 5:2-3); the teacher to the pupil and the pupil to the teachers (Gal. 6:6; 2 Tim. 2:2); the Christian to his brother (Rom. 12:10; Heb. 13:1); and his neighbor (Jas. 2:8; Gal. 6:10).

(6) Christians submit to whatever civil government they are under (Rom 13:1; 1 Pet. 2:13).

(7) The Christian’s highest and primary loyalty is to Christ and God (Matt. 28:18; 4:10; 1 Tim. 6:15). All things are to be done as unto the Lord and He leads us to sustain a
Christian connection in all the above relationships. However, where loyalties clash we must obey God (Acts 5:29).

It will be noticed that in all relationships the Christian is told to conduct himself as a Christian and as unto the Lord. He is told how to act toward his enemies (Lk. 6:27, 28; Matt. 5:38-48), but he is nowhere told how to be an enemy to another person. He is told to submit to the civil government but he is not told to be the civil government. Evidently these two things are not a part of the perfect man in Christ (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

II. THE RELATIONSHIP ARGUMENT

German theologians, with others, contended that the Christian and the Christian nation have different moral standards (Ray Abrams, Preachers Present Arms, 71). Our brethren also place the Christian under two conflicting standards of conduct when they justify war on the basis that it is a part of our impersonal conduct while acting as an agent of a government. This dangerous dualism divides us into “a believing and a spiritual person, and a civil or temporal person” (Scott-Craig’s statement of Luther’s dualism, 87). This dualism approaches, in its practical outcome, the position of the ancient gnostics who regarded Christianity as a union of the mind with God which had “no concern with the actions of the body” (MacKnight, Pref. to Col.). In the spirit then, the Christian is a Christian while he lends his body to do unchristian deeds to the enemy.

This type of approach has led some to reject water baptism for they say that Christianity has to do with the spiritual man and baptism in water is a physical rite for the physical body. But we know that water baptism has been commanded although it has no value except as it is an expression of faith and obedience (Matt. 28:19; Acts 8:36; 10:47). The heart and mind, through faith, lead the body through the waters of baptism.

(1) The Christian life is a life and not an episode or
a picture which presents a chapter a week and takes up the story again next Saturday. Life lasts every minute of every hour that we live. It must be an expression of that one nature and personality—the Christian personality. Since we are always in the kingdom; since the Christian nowhere changes his character; since we cannot lend our bodies to what we condemn on moral grounds; it is foolish to argue that there are periods when Christian principles are not supposed to operate in our lives. And unless we maintain that the way of war is a product of Christian principles and love we must maintain that the acts of war are forbidden to the Christian.

(2) The Christian has no manual of impersonal conduct. No one else can render an account unto God for the deeds done in his body (Rom. 2:6; Rev. 22:12). We must let the word of God dwell in us; the life in the body must be lived by faith; and our bodies must be offered unto the service of God (Rom. 12:1-2; 1:24; 1 Cor. 6:18-20; 7:34; 1 Thess. 5:23; Gal. 2:20; 3:16). The offering of our body unto God is a sacrifice and a spiritual service (Rom. 12:1-2). What becomes, then, of the argument that our bodies can be offered as a war service and that it does not affect our spiritual service to God? The use of our bodies as instruments of righteousness constitutes a spiritual service. On the other hand, if we give our members as instruments of unchristian deeds (and who will maintain that the deeds of war killing are Christian deeds) we become the slave of that thing (Rom. 6:12-13, 16). “And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus” (Col. 3:17). Even bond-servants were to obey masters and do their work “heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men” (Col. 3:21-25). Our deeds must be christian for no government can answer for us. “Each one of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom. 14:12). Unless we have a Dr. Jeckel and Mr. Hyde conception of the Christian, we cannot argue that a Christian in the army is not bound to express the
will of Christ, and the Christian attitude toward his brethren and enemies even in wartime. One brother has said, what most of those who justify war for the Christian must imply, that the Bible teaching concerning love of the brethren and the relationship to the world does not apply if a Christian is a soldier in the army. Nothing is left to regulate him except the commands of his superiors.

We want to know that if our impersonal conduct code releases us from the demands of Matt. 5:38-48, why it can’t from those of 5:27-32? If we can be impersonal in a life destroying situation at the state’s demand then why not in a life begetting situation; if the state encouraged or enforced scientific breeding experiments for the eugenic improvement and the numerical increase of the physical stock in an effort to provide more adequately for national defense. Furthermore, does the Christian as an agent find justification to spread falsehood if it will help win the war? Lies are weapons of war. We also want to know if this dualism extends to politics and to business and social life (Cf. Col. 3:19). Is it not the basis on which some say: Preacher stick to religion and do not meddle in business, etc., for that is out of your realm. Anything that is outside the Christian realm is outside of the conduct in which a Christian ought to be engaged.

This dualism justifies a Christian killing Christians who are under an opposing government. Thus it would have justified Christians in the Roman Empire in killing brethren (while operating as agents of the government) who gathered around the Lord’s table with them only the week before. All would be legal and right for the Christian would then be acting as an agent and not as a brother. Personally, I am sure that he would not be acting like a brother. And yet, the love of the brethren is to continue (Heb. 13:1) and all of our brethren are not in the same country. This dualism further justifies a Christian in giving another Christian a di-
This argument is a form of antinomianism. The Valentinian, for example, held "that the spirit, as part of the eternal Divine energy, existed absolutely separate and apart from the soul and the material body. Hence, all acts of the soul and body were things indifferent to the spirit. Hence, soul and body might wallow in licentiousness without detracting from the salvation of the spirit." (Hasting, Ency. of Religion and Ethics, I:582). Law applies to the spiritual man and not to the acts of his body (The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Ency., I:197). The modern form of this doctrine justifies the use of deceit, destruction and killing on the basis that we are agents whose acts in the physical realm may be different from our inward spiritual nature and attitude.

(3) Christians may do some things in one relationship that they may not do in another relationship but they do not have the authority to violate Christian principles in any relationship. The father may spank a child, but not thrash the deacons. Some thus jump to the conclusion that we may kill in their relationship to the government. It would be as easy to argue since it is right for an elder to sustain a relationship to his wife that would be wrong if sustained to some other woman in the church that therefore, if in Germany, he could follow Hitler's suggestions for raising new Nazis. This would be right for it would not be done as a Christian but in a relationship to the government. For after all are we not commanded to be subject to every ordinance of man (1 Pet. 2:13-). This was stated with reference to our relationship to civil powers and does not "every" cover everything that they command? If this argument is unsound then pick a flaw with it which cannot also be picked with the war argument which is based on "relationship". If you think that this borders on the obscene, ask yourself what the essential nature of war borders on. This is no more shocking.
to Christian purity than the essential nature of modern war is to Christian love. If this is condemned, then why let war go scott free for it encourages the passions and the beast in man.

A Christian may pull a tooth in one relationship (as a dentist) but he should not knock out his brother’s tooth as an enemy. A doctor may cut off a leg in one relationship but not in another. A preacher should immerse a convert but he should not drown a personal enemy. The point is this: in all relationships the Christian is a continuum, the same person, with his conduct regulated by Christian attitudes. In each relationship he should adopt the attitude of parental love which acts for the ultimate good of the individual to whom he sustains a relationship. Thus the father seeks to rear the child, the doctor to save the patient, the elder to feed the flock, and all Christians to redeem their enemies. Any hurt involved will be a hurt administered by fatherly love, (Matt. 5:47-48), for the good of the person and it will not seek his death. Thus the Christian does not have a dual nature although his relationships are many. In all relationships his Christian regenerate nature must manifest itself. In all of them he must seek for means to prepare the soil and sow the seed of the kingdom. And the nature of the Christian does not differ from the nature of the kingdom into which he has been born (cf. John 18:36).

(4) All of the actions of a Christian affect his personality. Regardless of the relationship, with reference to which I act, my essential nature is affected for my faith and my feelings are all present in that situation. What I engage in I engage in. What goes on in me effects me. My spiritual life should control, since it is affected by, my so-called outward and impersonal life. The State cannot change the situation. The individual person does the killing and the deeds one does tend to mould one. The attitude created in me by the acts of war would not fly away with my discharge at the close
of the war. What I cannot lend my hand to as a Christian
person I cannot afford to do.

(5) Christ is our supreme Lord. Commandments of
inferior masters must be judged in the light of His word.
Christ is the Lord of our entire life and not just the superin­
tendent of a “religious department” for His province is
our entire life. He transforms us, not merely hires us for
part-time work. He has placed no sign on my body which
says: Property of the civil government to be used as they
see fit. All religious and spiritual influences please keep
off. If Christ steps over the fence He will be treated as a
trespasser. No! Christ is Lord of all.
CHAPTER XII

Rome and the Roman Army

It is too often assumed that Paul’s statements concerning civil government were written under a friendly benevolent government. Such was not the case, for Paul wrote under a pagan dictatorship.

I. EMPEROR WORSHIP IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Religion and state were inextricably interwoven and the Emperor held religious as well as political offices. Augustus, for example, held “four great priesthhoods” and was the “pontifex maximus”. (Abbott, 345).

There were religious rites in which the Emperor was a participant. They offered sacrifices to pagan gods, instituted games with which idolatry was connected and built, rebuilt or finished pagan temples (Suetonius, 166, 193, 246, 188). Caius instituted worship for his dead mother and brother (Ibid., 189). Thus it is evident that some of the tax money and spoils of war supported pagan religion.

There were rites in which the Emperor was the object of worship. “The magistrates were perpetually bound to offer sacrifices, to invoke the aid of invisible gods, to be present at ceremonies in which the worship of the genius of the Emperor and one or other of the national deities formed a regular and necessary part of the ceremonial. And the revival of paganism under the Empire, dating from the days of the great Augustus, accentuated this idol worship, this perpetual association of religious ceremonies with all state and official proceedings.” (Spence, 316). “The cult of the Emperors was a worship which was almost universal in the period which lies between the death of Julius Caesar and the Edict of Constantine.” (159). To multitudes the deified Emperor was “a god in the loftiest sense of the word” (158).
Although most Emperors were not defied until after their death, Caius (emperor, 37-41 A.D.) acknowledged himself as a brother to the gods and set up images and worship to himself (Suetonius, 194). Caligula called himself divine and in some parts of the Empire divine worship was ascribed to most Emperors while they were alive (Myers, 128; Spence, 156).

Emperor worship prevailed especially in the army. "As a rule the soldiery, when faithful, were devotedly, passionately attached to their supreme chief; the wicked Nero, almost to the last, threw his glamour over the legions" (Spence, 158). Pagan altars, incense, sacrifice and standards are mentioned by such Roman writers as Suetonius and Tacitus. Emperor worship, in fact the entire pagan system, illustrates the fact that Roman religion was, to an extent, a deification of the state. (Spence, 156). As such it would have special significance for the guardians of the state as well as serve as a useful tool in the hands of politicians (Westbury-Jones, 69; Geer, 94; Henderson, 202; Bailey, 142-143).

Although there is no specific statement in the NT that "Thou shalt not worship Caesar as God while acting as an agent of the state", we know that the early Christians refused to worship the Emperor. Thus one of the tests by which the magistrates determined whether or not an accused person was a Christian, was by whether or not he would offer incense "and perform an act of adoration to the Imperial personage portrayed by the image before him" (Spence, 152-153; Hardy, 75). Polycarp died because he refused to acknowledge Caesar as "Lord" "and to offer incense at his shrine." (Spence, 90-91). Since sincere and informed Christians could not worship Caesar it would have been wise for them to avoid those circumstances where they either had to deify Caesar or die. It was not right that they should deliberately provoke the Romans to kill them. Thus the army, saturated with paganism, would have been one of the places
Christians would avoid. This we shall now clearly demonstrate.

II. THE ROMAN ARMY AND ROMAN RELIGION

All who think must admit the following: (a) If the NT teaches that Christians should kill now it taught the same thing in Paul’s day. It cannot teach at one and the same time that it was wrong to bear arms for Caesar’s government but that it is right to bear arms for a government today. What it taught then it teaches now and what it teaches now it taught then. (b) If the NT sanctioned the work of a soldier it sanctioned everything in Roman army life which was necessary to Roman army life. (c) Although a common soldier was not directly involved in all the pagan practices, which we shall mention, some member of the army was involved in each one. But if a Christian could be a private in Caesar’s army, by the same rule he could be a general in so far as his religion was concerned. If he could participate in the things in which a common soldier was involved he could, by the same rule, participate in the religious rites which were connected with any other position in the army.

Let us consider the following. First, Christians stood aloof from pagan rites (Myers, 137; Spence, 179). Second, if a Christian could kill for Caesar (and he could if he can do it for any government) he can kill for any dictator today, if he is their subject. Third, who served in the Roman army? The Jews were exempted from military service (Hardy, 18; Mommsen, II:171, 175, 227; Westbury-Jones, 14; Josephus, Antiquities, 14:10). The military oath, unclean food, fighting on the Sabbath and “idolatrous standards of the legions” led them to resist such service and the Romans had exempted them (William M. Green). Many of the early Christians came from Judaism. Slaves, too, were usually exempted from military service. Some of the early converts were slaves. The Roman soldier had to be a Roman citizen (Dean, 8). These citizens generally volunteered and service was seldom if ever compulsory (Tucker, 338). However,
some foreigners were admitted and made citizens on enlistment (Moore, 466; cp. Tucker, 352). These were recruited from conquered peoples. Fourth, if a Christian was a citizen and he enlisted he was immediately faced with the presence of coarse brutality in the army. The general had unlimited power over the soldier (Fuss, 430). Petty officers could inflict the death penalty (Tacitus, Works, 1:26). Centurions carried vine saplings to inflict stripes on slight offenders. Severe punishments, such as scourging, selling into slavery, beating or stoning to death, beheading, crucifixion, exposure to beast and stabbings by other soldiers, were sanctioned (Anthon, 259; Ramsay, 395). When a number were involved in disobedience, or a crime, and the guilty parties were not known, every tenth man was sometimes punished or put to death (Ramsay, 396; Tacitus, Annals, 3:21; Anthon, 259). A Christian, if in the army, would be under oath to carry out such brutalities if so commanded. Should a Christian place himself in a position where he must violate Christian compassion and forgiveness in order to do his sworn duty?

Fifth, not only were brutalities common in the army but they were also committed by the army. Cities, even some which did not offer resistance, were levelled to the ground (Tacitus, Annals, 13:41). What the Romans did to or took from a conquered people was to be determined by none but the Romans (Annals, 13:56). Conquered countries were often ravaged, plundered, burned; and multitudes massacred (Annals, 13:56; 14:23,26,31; History, 1.63). Thousands were put to the sword and thousands sold into slavery (Tacitus 1; History, 1.67-68. “Exterminate the race”, cried the soldiers concerning the Helveti (History, 1.69). During civil wars the legions were often ready to do anything, lawful or unlawful, and to spare “nothing, sacred or profane” (History, 2.12,56, 73.87; 3.14,15,19, 32-34, 77, 83; 4.1). Virgins were violated and “the non-military population was sold by auction” (Annals, 13.39; 14.35.36.37.38). These things were
done through bloodlust at times and at other times the officers commanded them. Soldiers were under oath to obey their officers.

Sixth, soldiers were often used as the executioners of the personal, political and national foes of the Emperors (Suetonius, 195, 249, 201, 202, 164; Annals, 6.14.24; 11.32; 11.37). Soldiers, who had sworn allegiance to the will of the Emperor, were thus instruments of personal vengeance, lust and destruction. Magistrates and soldiers were used to persecuted and kill Christians (Spence, 196, 92, 97; 207-208, 209, 54, 90-91, 190, 181; Acts 12:2, 6,18-; 27:42; 28:16). A Christian soldier would have to either be unfaithful to his oath and duty or violate Christian love for the brethren, which must characterize Christ's disciples (John 13:34-35; 15:12).

Seventh, idolatrous rites were inextricably interwoven into Roman army life and if it was right for a Christian to engage in some of them it was right for him, if necessary, to engage in all of them. All aspects of war were bound up with solemn sacrifices (Milman's Gibbon's Rome, 1:524; Bailey, 151; Suetonius, 243). Mars, god of war, received his homage. The “Sky-father” was appealed to when treaties were made (Bailey, 14-15). A religious ceremony took place at the declaration of war (Bailey, 172, 157; Myers, 14-15). The general who departed for foreign service offered sacrifices (Ramsay, 341). He consulted the gods before battle (Fuss, 431; Suetonius, 353; Annals 6.37) The “gates of the Temple of Naus at Rome” were open during wartime (Myers, 122). “The altar of sacrifice was ever smoking in the camp; every important military movement was inaugurated by religious rites; the legion worshipped its eagles as its tutelary gods.” (Pressense, IV:455-456). (See also Annals, 1.39; 2.17; 1.43 Anthon, 247; Suetonius, 188, 141-142; James Gilfillan, The Sabbath, 371). A successful war was followed by religious ceremonies and sacrifices (Anthon, 251; 253; Annals, 3.18; Fuss, 439). Part of the spoils of
war were dedicated to the gods (Seutonius, 145; Ramsey, 338-339; Altheim, 387; Annals, 2.41.49). A military oath, in the name of pagan gods, which called down the curses of heaven on the disobedient, was a universal requirement. This oath was renewed with each change in commanding officers, on the ascension of each new ruler, (Seutonius, 137, 352, 314, 296; Abbott, 346; E. S. Shuckburgh, Augustus, 191; Annals, 1.8; Seutonius, 317; Abbott, 285). The genius, or divine essence, of the Emperor was invoked. The soldier swore to hold the divine Augustus dearer than his own family and to use arms for him (William M. Green "The Roman Military Oath", 20th Century Christian, April 1943). This oath was one of unlimited obedience (Tucker, 342; Seutonius, 232). And it was left to the Emperor, not to the soldier, to decide what was right for the soldier to do. If the soldier took the oath with no intention of fulfilling it he was in error. If he took it and fulfilled it he would have to violate Christian convictions in many instances. Umphrey Lee, who is not a pacifist, in The Historic Church and Modern Pacifism, mentioned the difficult position a Christian in the army would be in since he might have to do these things as well as sacrifice to pagan gods, guard pagan temples and even persecute brethren as well as live in surroundings dangerous to purity (62, 68).

Our conclusion is that if the NT supports war for the Christian today it did it for the Christian in Caesar's day. If it did that it sanctioned paganism, brutality, wars of aggression for dictators and all manner of unchristian things. We find this impossible to reconcile with the nature of Christianity and of the Christian. How could the Christian operate under two such contrary standards? How can we imagine that there are times and places where the Christian is so released from all Christian obligations?

III. WARS OF AGGRESSION SANCTIONED

Those who argue that it is right for Christians to engage in a war of defense but not of aggression, overlook the
fact that if the NT sanctioned Christians killing in war it sanctioned the wars which were being fought at the time the NT was written; in other words, the wars which the Roman Empire waged. The Scriptures furthermore no more say that "thou shalt engage in a defensive war" than they say "Thou shalt not engage in a war of aggression".

The Romans carried on wars of aggression continually either to conquer people or to keep them subdued. Rome pursued "and almost uninterrupted career of conquest" "for nine hundred years" (Ramsay, 377). Christ did not condemn, in so many words, Rome's career of conquest. In fact He told the people to pay tribute to their conquerors (Matt. 22:15-21; Rom. 13:1-7). Shall we argue that it is right for Christians to engage in wars of aggression and to make up an army of occupation? Was it right for them to be with the legions who were convinced that "the wealth and the women of Germany should be the reward of valour" (Tacitus, I:71, 75, 94, 51, 22, 43, 47, 72, 38). Would it have been right for them to have helped the Romans conquer Britain? (Tacitus, Agricola, 13). Taxes and other burdens were imposed on Britain (Ibid.) The first Roman Colony was established in Britain at Camulodunum in A. D. 51 (Henderson, 202). Shall we argue that the NT would support the landing of Italian Christians, in the army, in Britain with the purpose of conquering her and imposing burdens on her for the benefit of Italy?

It may be well to observe that no country has admitted that its wars are unprovoked and unnecessary wars of aggression. Britain, for example, has fought "defensive" wars in almost every part of the globe. All are generally convinced of the righteousness of their cause; and, in truth, few historians attribute the sole guilt for the two world wars to one country. Even when the attack seems unjustified countries have argued that such an attack is necessary for their growth and fulfillment of their mission. More than one country has waged war for so-called "living space". Then, too,
how is a Christian always to know when a war is one of aggression against, or in defense of, innocent people? The causes of war are so complicated, the guilt so widespread, the facts so hard to find and evaluate, that even those who have said that Christians should fight in defensive wars only have admitted that they may be mistaken "as to what constitutes aggression" (Glenn E. Green, 15, 16).

Without entering into an extended discussion of this point, we state that it is conclusive that if the NT sanctions war now, it sanctioned it in A.D. 50 and that if it sanctioned it then it sanctioned the type of wars which Rome then carried on—wars of aggression and suppression under the direction of a pagan dictatorship. A Roman soldier on active duty would be forced, sooner or later, to engaged in such wars as well as in civil wars.
CHAPTER XIII

War and Police: A False Analogy

There are some similarities between the military and the police. They both punish and both take life. However, the war question does not simmer down to: “Is it right for police to execute criminals”? In pointing out, however, the difference between the two we do not mean to imply that Christians should deliberately destroy another in any capacity.

I. THE ANALOGY IS MADE BY ALL SIDES

Guilt is not totally segregated on one side, the common people generally feel that they are in a legitimate and necessary struggle, all citizens of all countries do not have access to all the facts and thus they have felt secure in comparing themselves to the police. The seeking of what they believe is justice is the sincere aim of many. Thus doubtless this “police argument” appeals to all belligerents.

II. EACH OPERATES UNDER DIFFERENT CONDITIONS

(1) Police try to bring the accused before an impartial judge. The judge is not a party to the dispute. In war each nation seeks to be its own judge.

(2) The judge endeavors to weigh the case in the light of the law and to render a just and impartial decision. Germanicus said that “war knows no distinction of cases; the innocent and guilty fall in one promiscuous carnage.” (Tacitus, Everyman’s Library, edition, 1:41). Apologists for Augustus said that civil wars were not “undertaken nor conducted on principles of honour and strict justice.” (Ibid. 12). War hysteria, the desire for revenge, the selfishness of nations which seek only their rights, all make it practically impossible to make a just settlement with reference to the causes of a war. Through selfishness or through blindness
we realize that victors in the past have not been overly concerned about justice. We trust that such will not be the case at the conclusion of this war.

(3) War abandons legal methods and resorts to all forms of violence. Police when efficient, follow legal methods.

(4) Police operate within established laws: (a) They endeavor to enforce laws established by common consent of the group; (b) they themselves are subject to the law while enforcing it. There is no international law, or police force, established and maintained by the community of nations. The army is not bound by the laws of a community; instead it makes its own laws and "acts as prosecution, judge, jury, jailer, and executioner in one; while in the process it seeks to inflict upon the enemy people the maximum of injury, harm, and destruction, alike to property and life." (Richards, 17-18).

If all nations abandoned armaments, except internal police, to an international police force there would be a much closer analogy between war and police. However, even then they would be dealing with nations and not with individuals who are a unit. It could not bring a nation to the bar or put it behind bars with the same show of impartiality and justice that a police force in a nation can. A nation cannot be dealt with as a single individual. The guilt of individuals in a given nation may range from much to none. But war rains bombs, sets up blockades and lets loose flood waters without any concern for the guilty or innocent. Try as they may warriors today are unable to segregate the guilty and spare many who are innocent.

(5) Police do not merely use force but they are also the "authorized representative of the whole community and they thus exercise a "moral pressure" (Cadoux, III:23). A social and civic sense operates in the obedience to the laws and to the police. This communal feeling is absent in the deal-
ing of nation with nation. Nations are not always concerned about the common good, except insofar as it furthers their interests. Examples of this are present in M. J. Demiashkevich’s *Shackled Diplomacy*.

(6) A police force is not faced by organized police force but an army is faced by another army which is the recognized instrument of its nation. The increase of a police force in St. Louis does not force the police in San Francisco to increase their armament. Large armies loom as a threat to other nations and call forth large armies.

III. THEY DIFFER IN IDEALS

Richards pointed out that the ideal police system is more redemptive than destructive. Armies tend more to destroy than to redeem the enemy. Treaties in the past show too often that the purpose of one nation is to cripple another nation and if possible prevent its recovery. The police are not the scourge, with the scorched earth policy, that is so often the characteristic of an army. Police try to save lives and they justify capital punishment on the basis that it saves lives. War condemns millions who would have lived if the nation had not gone to war. Police endeavor to discourage the roots of crime while armies, armaments, vindictive peace terms, and selfish nationalism all sow the seeds of war. Police try to prevent “the litigant from being his own judge” but the army tries to “enable the litigant to be also his own judge” (Nichols, 200).

IV. THEY OPERATE AGAINST DIFFERENT OBJECTS

(1) Police deal with individuals and the military with masses. Police try to discover, try and punish an individual if he is guilty. Bombs and bayonets are not so discriminatory or impartial. War passes a “cover-all” judgement on a nation. In World War I soldiers on both sides recognized that some, at least, of the men whom they were killing hated the bloody work as much as they did and that they were more or less “forced” into it (Saint-Mande, 98, 329; Gibbs, 41).
But war places all under the sentence of death. Police generally have little respect for the qualities of criminals but soldiers in opposing armies often recognize good qualities in one another and thus General Montgomery shakes the hand of a captured high ranking German officer and seems to have had him to tea. Captured Generals are not usually put in cells.

(2) Police endeavor to bring all guilty parties, even members of their force, to justice. The military too often punishes both the innocent and the guilty on one side and ignore the guilty who may also be on their side.

(3) The police are better able to distinguish between attacker and the attacked. The selfish “political bargaining and maneuvering” between nations complicate the causes of war and thus all nations claim to act in self defense. We are not saying that all are equally guilty in a war. But we are saying that it is easier for the police to distinguish between the attacker and the attacked and the fact that they are a “third party” facilitates their so doing.

V. THEY DIFFER IN THEIR TREATMENT OF THE SUBDUED ENEMY

Although prisoners and wounded have been shot in some instances, it is not customary to destroy all prisoners. Prisoners are exchanged and after a war they are freed. If the army was actually a police force operating against gangsters they would try prisoners for shooting members of the army and imprison for a long time or execute them. There would be no swapping of diplomats, of the interned, or of disabled prisoners any more than the police would swap criminals back to gangsters against whom they were operating. Do the police free an entire gang, whom they have imprisoned, when the last gangster surrenders? The British have given honorary military funerals to Nazi airmen who were shot down while bombing England. One casket was draped in a swastika and bore a wreath from the RAF while planes
flew overhead in tribute to the fallen enemy (AP dispatch, 2-6-43). Imagine the police turning out in this manner for a fallen gangster. "War criminals" have been permitted, in times past to live in peace after an Armistice. On Feb. 17 or 18, 1943, a high ranking British official said that the war criminals would be punished but that there would be no mass reprisals. This further indicates that the destruction of civilians and soldiers is not a police measure against criminals or else there would be mass reprisals. President Roosevelt expressed a similar sentiment, to that of the Britisher, on Feb. 12, 1943.

Thus those who use the argument of "police" and "gangsters" do not follow out their own argument.

VI. War Methods and Police Methods Differ in Some Respects

(1) Propaganda is not used to create hate in the policeman's heart as it is used in war (Ponsonby; Willis).

(2) The cruel use of force against women and children which war today necessitates is not evident in police methods. Police are discriminatory and economical in the use of force when they are efficient. This is particularly true with reference to their use of arms. War butchers and starves multitudes of all ages, and sexes with all degrees of guilt; as well as many innocent one.

VII. The Police and Military Differ in Their Results

(1) The general spirit of war and its effect on the community generally exceeds in scope and duration the spirit which is present in police activities.

(2) Wars tend to prove who is powerful enough to hold physical supremacy and not necessarily what is just—unless justice is limited to the ideas and ambitions of one group. Nations want to hold their own no matter how they must act to do it or what they intend to do with it.
(3) War, regardless of the victor, tends to sow seeds of future wars.

(4) Nations sometimes "pick the pocket" of the vanquished (Milne, 139).
CHAPTER XIV

About A Number of Things

I. THE APPEAL TO THE NATURAL MAN

Christians must put on the new man, that they may be renewed “unto knowledge after the image of him that created him”. “Put on therefore, as God’s elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any; even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye: and above all these things (put on) love, which is the bond of perfectness.” (Col. 3:10,12-14). As partakers of the divine nature we are to live as children of God (2 Pet. 1:4; 1 John 3:1). However, in spite of this fact, there are some who make appeals for Christians going to war on somewhat of the same basis that the world argues for it. These appeals are addressed to the natural man and some Christians argue against the conscientious objector in much the same fashion that unbelievers argue against them. These appeals do not consider at all what the Christian thing is, they are concerned with the natural thing. We shall not answer them in this section as they are dealt with by statement or implication elsewhere in the book. However, just listing them will help some Christians to see that some of their arguments which they think are the most telling arguments are not scriptural arguments at all and that they would still be made even if there was no such person as a Christian. Surely we should not succumb to them. Or if we succumb under temptation, we should not argue that we have done the Christian thing. Notice also that they are generally equally useful in all countries.

(1) You are a fanatic, a coward or insane if you would permit someone to kill you and yours rather than kill them (and may we add, theirs). (1 Pet. 4:4)
(2) You have adopted a "holier than thou" attitude which says, "I am too good to kill."

(3) Your refusal to fight really enlists you on the side of the enemy.

(4) Ideals and freedom will perish if you do not fight with the sword.

(5) You are standing in judgment on the majority and saying that they are wrong (Cf. Rom. 12:1-2). Where do Christians stand when they say Christ is right?

(6) You are calling those who do fight "murderers". (Every stand says that it is nearer the truth than any other stand, or else one ought not to take it. Then, too, regardless of what we do, or do not do, we do not change the actions of the warrior). The same God who judges them will judge us. This person may well ask: Are Hitler's soldiers murderers? Were Caesar's in A. D. 70?

(7) Men will fight, it is human nature, so there is no need to stand against it as human nature cannot be changed. Christians know that human nature can be elevated. We are concerned with what is the Christian thing.

(8) What else can you do when they make you fight. "Faith acknowledges no plea of necessity."

(9) What if everyone took that position?

(10) It is your duty to your country.

(11) We are in it now and we might as well get in and finish it up quickly.

(12) It is necessary for survival—personal and national. (Matt. 6:26).

(13) You are of no use to anyone, anywhere.

(14) What if it is the only way to overcome an injustice.

(15) Be reasonable, be sensible.
(16) The position is impossible.
(17) Your position is idealistic, beautiful, but impractical.
(18) What if all Christians went to a conscientious objectors camp.
(19) You want others to fight for you.
(20) It is not safe.
(21) War is impersonal.
(22) You are an agent of the government in war and do not have a personal responsibility.
(23) The enemy is cruel and worthy of death.
(24) They will invade our country.
(25) It is against the instinct of self-preservation. The "instinct" argument, in another form, has been used to do away with monogamy. Is not war against self-preservation? Should self-preservation rise above the preservation of ideals. Is not self-sacrifice the Christian law of life? (John 12:25).

We do not suggest that the way of redemptive love can be followed by those who have not experienced that love, but we do argue that no Christian should be in a position of dropping back on the arguments used by men, who have not experienced that love, in an effort to justify war for the Christian.

II. SECTARian Approach To the War Question

Members of the church of Christ, who recognize the various ways in which sectarian groups have endeavored to avoid the full force of New Testament teaching, will realize that some brethren employ similar tactics in dealing with the New Testament teaching on the Christian attitude to the spirit and the actions of war. We shall list some of them.

(1) You are condemning the boys, and insulting their parents, who go to war. How often have people objected to
the Bible teaching concerning Christ, the church, baptism, etc., on the ground that such teaching condemned their ancestors, or their family, who did not believe it that way. Regardless of our actions, we cannot change the position of those who have passed on. All are in the hands of God. However, regardless of those who do take the other stand we must conscientiously declare what we believe is right for Christian.

(2) Your teaching is impractical. How many denominationalist have you heard who tried to ignore Christ’s prayer for unity (John 17:20-) on such a basis?

(3) The Jews went to war. How often we hear people justify doctrines on the basis that the Old Testament taught this and that. We are under the New Testament. Regardless of what they did at the Old Testament stage of the revelation of God’s progressively revealed will, we know what Christians ought to do—follow Christ.

(4) God is unchanging and therefore it is still right for His children to go to war. What is said of number (3) applies here. This argument is used by various people to bring over O. T. ritual and doctrines into Christ’s church. God is unchanging but that does not mean that His commands to men may not change. If it did, then the first command of God would have been the last one and we would, furthermore, be under the sentence of death instead of under grace in Christ.

(5) C. O. are no better morally than others. How often has that objection been made against the church and against Christians? The question is not whether I have perfectly lived up to His teaching, but whether or not a particular position is a Christian position. If we find it is Christian, let us try to live it, not ridicule it.

(6) Peter did not, in so far as Luke records it, tell Cornelius war was wrong—even war for pagan Rome in her aggressive wars. How many of us have heard this same argu-
ment used by Seventh-day Adventist to bind the Sabbath on Christians because Luke does not say that Paul told the Jews that the day of worship under the new dispensation was the first day of the week. When we view the scriptures properly we do not take our doctrine from a place where the scripture is silent—and where we think that it should speak; instead we go to where the scriptures speak on the subject, gather all the passages on it, and then construct the Christian doctrine on that subject.

(7) What about those who do go to war? They, like the rest of us, are some day to answer to God for their deeds. However, have you not heard people use this same approach by saying: What about those who have not obeyed the gospel, or followed Acts 2:38, or who have not believed in Christ?

(8) It is a “horrible doctrine” to teach that Christians ought to allow themselves to be killed rather than kill. Perhaps there are many who think it is a horrible doctrine for a Christian to teach that Christ is the only Saviour of the world.

(9) Here is an infidel argument which had been adapted and done service for some brethren. One form of an infidel argument is that either God does not exist, or that he is not interested in his children, because God does not immediately step in and destroy those who persecute, violate and destroy His children. We shall not here deal with this problem except to say that it is another sign of God’s long suffering toward the unjust and that he is giving them additional days of grace in which to repent (Matt. 5:45; 2 Pet. 3:9). Some have referred to the c. o. as being in a state of mental collapse because they do not believe that they should kill rather than spare themselves and their children. If we are in a state of “mental collapse”; what state do they imply that God is in who has commanded Christians to return good for evil, suffer persecution, and who permits His children to be killed? What do they say about Him for not strik-
ing Stephen’s persecutors, and Christ’s persecutors, dead? God could kill all our enemies, we could not. To both the infidel and the “some brethren” we reply: Christians are agents of mercy and they ought to leave all vengeance to God. It may be that their death will be more effective in the long run in converting the world, than if they return blow for blow. And let us never forget, that Christ can deliver Christians by death as well as from death.

(10) Good people believe in it and you “upset” them and condemn their loved ones who are in it. The question is not whether it is “upsetting”, but whether it is scriptural. Think how upsetting it must be to Japanese to be told they are wrong; or the heathen that they must accept Christ to be saved; or the sectarian that Acts 2:38 still holds good.

Christians ought not to adopt sectarian, and unbeliever’s, arguments in trying to substantiate a position. If they cannot support it by the Bible, then it is not a Christian doctrine.

III. WHAT IS SAID OF US MAY HAVE BEEN SAID OF CHRIST

We do not mean to imply that we are so Christ-like that every reproach directed toward us also hits Christ. Such would be a foolish attitude. However, we do believe that the majority of charges levied against the position of the Christian conscientious objector, were, or could have been, levied against Christ. If this is true it is a forceful point in favor of the position. Notice these charges:

(1) You are unwilling to help people throw off bondage to a pagan dictator. Christ did not help, or instruct them to, the Jews to throw off the yoke of bondage of the Roman pagan dictator. (See “The Things that are Caesars”).

(2) You violate the Golden Rule (See “The Golden Rule Goes to War”). Since Christ refused to draw the sword to protect his home or his country, the same accusation could be applied to him.
(3) You are unpatriotic. Christ's instructions to the Jews to pay taxes to a pagan dictator, and his failure to tell them to form an army to rebel, merited that charge as much as the C.O. merits it.

(4) You are insane. Christ predicted the persecution of His disciples, he did not instruct them to fight back, and he did not destroy all of their persecutors at the time they were suffering.

(5) You are useless to humanity, or the nation, because you won't use the sword. Where did Christ use the sword, while on earth, and fight aggressors and protect his nation in that manner?

(6) You are impractical. What about Him who spoke the Sermon on the Mount and ended up on a cross? What about Him who instructed us to live a Christian life in an unchristian world?

(7) What if everyone believed that? What if everyone said, "no rebellion" to a dictator, as Christ counseled? Pagans often asked Christians: "What must be the fate of the empire, attacked on every side by the barbarians, if all mankind should adopt the pusillanimous sentiments of the new sect?" (W. Smith and S. Cheetham, A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, II:2028).

(8) God has used agents of vengeance, why not the Christian as one of them? God used agents of vengeance to destroy Jerusalem, why not use Christ while he was on earth? Where did Christ, during his lifetime, serve as an agent of vengeance? (Cp. Matt. 23:37; Lk. 21:20-).

(9) You are a coward. (Lk. 21:20-; John 8:59; Matt. 10:23). (2 Cor. 11:32-33; Acts 9:25).

(10) You must fight or you fight on the side of the enemy. Perhaps that is the way some of the Jews felt about Christ with reference to Rome (Matt. 22:17-; Lk. 21:20-).
(11) You are out of step with the times? What, then, was it that got Jesus in trouble? Was he in step with the times? The times are out of step with God. We must choose between being in step with them or being in step with God, with the possibility of getting others in step also.

(12) You are a “freak specimen of humanity”. How do you think the sermon on the mount sounded to the unregenerate humanity of that day or of this day?

(13) You are implicated in all the evil because you pay taxes. The N. T. instruct us to pay taxes but not to avenge ourselves. Was Christ implicated in Caesar’s bloody deeds because he said pay taxes and tribute?

And thus we can see that some of the difficulties which are presented to the c. o. are difficulties which may have well been presented to Christ. They are not difficulties of just the Christian c. o. but of the Christian faith as a whole.

IV. Step By Step

Brethren sometimes leave the impression that the Civilian Public Service Camps are concentration camps; that the work which they do is of little or no value; that surely a Christian can render some service to the government; and that the c. o. should be willing to do non-combatant work in the army. Then, some of them state that there is no difference between a combatant and a non-combatant. Thus step by step they would lead one to war. If they really believe that there is no difference between combatant and non-combatant work (although we believe that there is a difference) how can they urge a c. o. to take non-combatant work? Why do they say it is inconsistent to do even non-combatant work and then urge him to do it?

V. War and the Preacher

Any nation in any war may usually count on the support of the majority of its preachers. (Ray H. Abrams, Preachers Present Arms.) For a group who have been exempt-
ed, as a rule, from active combat they have often been very belligerent. I agree with the late Eric Knight: if any man wants any killing done let him do it himself instead of asking another to "get one for me". This attitude of preachers has been seen by men, who think it somewhat inconsistent with their position as ministers of the Prince of Peace who did not even advocate the slaughter of Herod or Nero (Lasswell, 73; John Gibbons, 23). Strange, is it not, "that persons professing Christianity were more blood-thirsty than soldiers who cried out to God in hours of agony and blasphemed in hours of rage" (Philip Gibbs, Ten Years After, 38). Have they overlooked the fact that the exemption granted to preachers runs back to the old idea that it was wrong, or at least unfitting, that the hands of those who have devoted their life to the church should not be stained with blood? However, as the NT teaches the priesthood of believers it is evident that if their hands should not be soiled with blood, no Christian hands should be so soiled. Or if Christians should do it, then the leaders in Christendom should be outstanding in setting the example.

VI. CRUCIAL POINTS AS SEEN BY CADOUX

(1) Activities of fighting men cannot be described as Christian. (2) War begets more and worse war. (3) Christ said to overcome evil with good and to make any sacrifices which may be involved in temporary failure or in success (Cadoux, III:ix).

VII. HOW THE ANTAGONISM OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM TO THOSE OF THE WORLD IS EXPRESSED

That Christ's kingdom is unlike the world is evident from the fact that the new birth is necessary to enter His kingdom whose nature differs from that of the world (John 3:5; 18:36). That Christ's kingdom is antagonistic to those of the world is evident from the prophecies (Dan. 2:34, 35, 44; Heb. 2:8; Rev. 11:15; 1 Cor. 15:24-27). Rome was the kingdom which Daniel said that Christ's kingdom should
smite (Dan. 2:34, 35, 44). How was this antagonism expressed? It was not expressed through armed rebellion (Rom. 13:1; 1 Pet. 2:13). Christians were told to submit to Rome. We know, however, that where Rome’s command conflicted with obedience to Christ that Christ was to be obeyed although they were to submit, without armed resistance, to whatever penalties Rome might inflict because of their disobedience. The antagonism was expressed in that Christians fought with spiritual weapons and righteous lives against the sin which existed in the heart of the world and which expressed itself, among other ways, in rebellion to God. They endeavored to convert men and to bring them into submission to God. However, they did it in such a way as to bring harm to the body of none and so as to leave him with the freedom of choice. Sin is in the world and it leads to antagonism between the world and the church; but Christians seek to convert, not to crush with physical might, non-christians.

VIII. WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM THE WAR?

If man really learns from his past experiences the World Wars have the following lessons for him. First, the acknowledgment of a universal Ruler and authority is necessary to peace. When there is no higher vision and allegiance that a national one the people destroy one another for their visions clash. Peace conferences fail because men do not seek peace with one another on the basis of peace with God. The brotherhood of man is a mockery because the Fatherhood of God has not become a living reality in men’s hearts and thinking. It is still true that “except Jehovah build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except Jehovah keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” (Psa. 127:1). Men are not killing one another because God does not care but because men do not care for God or man and do not listen to His will and warning.

Second, we can learn that the fault is within us and not in fate. Men are unwilling to shoulder their part of the re-
sponsibility for the world’s condition. We blame others, we side step responsibility, and thus fail to take the steps necessary to lasting peace. We have clung with blind faith to the way of violence and have forgotten that violence begets violence and hate, hate. The sins which beget dictators work even in us and so much of our “house” has not been built with God that we should not wonder at His lack of interest in preserving the status quo. As John Baillie said in the Christian Century: “How much does God love our old order? Are we sure that the ‘Eastern civilization’ which Hitler is threatening is something which it is worth God’s while to save? Can we think that the life of this city of Edinburgh—or of the city of Chicago—is something which he wants to protect, just as it is?” (355). War is in part a judgment on our pagan way of life, which has been veneered with a Christianity of words.

Third, we can learn that we ought to be our brother’s keeper. We cannot squander the fat of the land without consideration for the economic and spiritual condition of the rest of the world. If we allow our brother to go to the devil we are apt to feel his wrath. We must become as interested in the four freedoms for him, as we are for ourselves, or he is apt to make us suffer what we have allowed him to suffer.

Fourth, we can learn that we reap what we sow (Gal. 6:7-9). Violation of God’s laws necessitates the inevitable consequences of such violations. Selfish and sinful foundations cannot be the basis of a world civilization. If we do not want to reap corruption let us turn from sinful ways to the way of redeeming love. If we sow violence we shall reap violence. To reap love and peace we must sow love, peace and unselfishness. Certainly the essential nature of war, when seen in the light of the NT conception of the Christian, teaches us that war is not the way for the Christian to deal with sinful men.
IX. Questions for Your Consideration

(1) Was the cross of Christ a "do-nothing attitude"?
(2) Was the way of the cross a failure?
(3) Is there any idea as to the nature of the Christian to be found in the fact that ministers have usually been exempt from killing in wartime?
(4) Is the pacifist the only one who exposes his country to a military defeat? What about the militarist? or the individual who would not fight in an "unjust" war?
(5) If you fight just because other men fight are you not partaking of other men's sins (1 Tim. 5:22).
(6) If the c. o. is to be condemned because his way may involve seeming failure and death, then why should the warrior go free from the same condemnation?
(7) Before condemning the c. o. would it not be a good idea to recognize that you are as far away from him as he is from you.
(8) Is it so, or not so, that Paul said God (in some way) overruled pagan magistrates (who were unconcious of it) to do what he forbade Christians to do? (Rom. 12:17-21; 13:1-2).
(9) Where is it said that the Christian should bear the sword in any relationship of life?
(10) Do you, or do you not, like to associate with a person who always endeavors to return good for evil? Is he, or is he not, of any value to the church and community?
(11) Is a Christian position demolished because your parents, or your family, did not believe and follow it?
(12) Is a Christian position overthrown because of difficulties and reproach it may involve?
(13) Is the divinity of Christ to be denied by Christians because there are some questions concerning it which may be
difficult to explain although they may be clearly taught in the N. T.?

(14) Should a man remain silent on a vital issue just because opposition is strong?

(15) What would you do if there was no other way to protect your wife than permanently to deny Christ?

(16) Does an individual have either the right or duty to refuse to obey the state at any time? If not what about the early Christians when the church was illegal?

(17) Is Christianity a life or is it an episode? Is there any time when we are not servants of Christ? (John 18:36; Col. 2:21).

(18) Would you condemn a man who, though he was not opposed to all wars, refused to fight for his country because he believed that a particular war was unjust? Would he not be accused of many things of which the c. o. is accused?

(19) If the outer man is under the control of the government, then is it not right for the outer man to do anything which is authorized by the government—not merely commanded but permitted?

(20) Would you welcome the rise of a large group of Christian c. o. in Axis countries? What would they be accused of by their countrymen?

(21) Would it be Christian for a Japanese Christian to be a c. o. but unchristian for an American Christian to be a c. o.?

(22) Is it wrong for a Christian to refuse to kill for his country?

(23) Is there any account in the N. T. of a Christian becoming a soldier?

(24) Is there any account in the first two centuries of Christians becoming soldiers after their conversion?
(25) Since most Christians realize that the only way to permanent peace is through God, through Christianizing the world, why should they turn from concentration on their work to the work of the world?

(26) Would you ask a c. o. to kill as long as he believed it was wrong?

(27) Would you approve the actions of the man who used every means possible in order to spare his family? even if it meant betrayal of his country? or of Christ?

(28) Does violence beget violence or love? Does love beget hate?

(29) If you believe that it is right for Christians in all countries to fight, do you not admit that if you fight a just war, he fights an unjust one?

(30) Is it right for one Christian—in another country—to fight against what you fight for?

(31) Do you love your neighbor if you consciously work him ill? (Rom. 13:8-).

(32) Where does Matt. 5:38-48 limit itself to "personal" wrongs?

(33) Would it be right for a missionary to kill any converts, which he had made during peace time, if he meets them on the battle field or if he sees their home through his bomb sights? Or should you be like the fellow who would not convert any of his slaves because he did not believe it would be right for a Christian to keep Christians in slavery.

(34) What if all preachers signed up as ministers and thus kept that many out of the armed forces? Is it any more wrong for a c. o. to stay out, than for them?

(35) Can you demonstrate the way of the cross to a person whom you are about to kill?

(36) Does the Christian have the right to go to war
with his brother (1 Pet. 2:17; Heb. 13:1)? neighbor? (Gal. 5:14) enemies? (Matt. 5:11, 39); Rom. 12:18-21).

(37) Do you think that Paul, if drafted, would have fought with the Romans against the Jews in A. D. 66-70? (Lk. 21:20-).

(38) How do you know that this war is not a just retribution on all the world for its sins and selfishness?

(39) Is it better for the Christian to spoil or be spoiled? to shoot or be shot? kill or be killed? to become an agent of vengeance and cultivate hate and do deeds of violence, or die with a prayer on his lips like Stephen did?

(40) What sort of revenge is Christian?

(41) Which example will do the most toward increasing your Christian character? stimulate your spiritual growth? Which will be the greatest encouragement and stimulation to other Christians? which life and which death will add most to Christ's glory?

(42) Does N. T. teaching concerning the Christian's attitude toward his brethren and the world apply to a Christian when he is a soldier?

(43) Would it have been right for a Christian to be in the army in Nero's day and to have carried out his orders to persecute Christians? Could this have been done in a "public capacity" or in another "relationship"?

(44) If it is right for a Christian to kill in war, is it not also right for him to do anything else which is helpful in doing the job efficiently? Would it be right for him to broadcast lies, if his government asked him to do it, to an enemy country?

(45) Should a man as an "agent" fight insults and persecutions, which he should not resist as a Christian in a "private" capacity?

(46) Where is the word of God that says we should
fight to defend a government, but not to defend the church in a religious war?

(47) If it is right for a Christian to kill his enemies, is it not right for him to kill those (who in peace time) teach the ideas which make these men his enemies? Would it be right for him to kill such teachers in his own country?

(48) If the enemy rulers were free after the war, as was the Kaiser after World War I, would it be right for a Christian to kill them when they see them in order to insure the execution of the vengeance which they set out to take?

(49) When should a Christian stop following the golden rule? Is he to allow the enemy to furnish him with his pattern of conduct?

(50) Would you want God to do to you what you want to do to your enemy?

(51) Have you ever met a preacher, or brother, who would try to keep a young man from going to a foreign country for mission work; but who would encourage him to go as a soldier?

(52) Does the world use Christ's teachings to make efficient killers? Would Christ's teachings do it for the Christian?

(53) Do you think Christ would kill your enemies? Did he take the sword against Caesar? Pilate? corrupt leaders of his day?

(54) What would you have done if you had been called on to be the executioner in Acts 12:2?

(55) Would you shoot a brother, who was a c. o., if the government said that he was a rebellious evildoer and that they wanted you to execute him legally?

(56) Since there is no command from God for the Christian to kill, should we accept such a command from men?
(57) Is our cross the way of redemptive sacrificial love for even those who oppose us? (Lk. 14:27).

(58) Is there nothing that a Christian can do for humanity if he is not willing to kill for his country?

(59) One preacher asked: What if all were c.o. We ask: What if all were registered as preachers?

(60) Shall we call off the war on religious division, for the duration, for the sake of national unity?

(61) If Rom. 13:1 applies to the extent of killing, then why not the same in Eph. 6:5; 1 Tim. 6:1; Eph. 5:22-24; 1 Pet. 2:19?

(62) Is the way of the cross the way of sacrificing love which is willing to die for the enemy at the hand of the enemy or is it the way of retaliation? (Rom. 5:10). Is it just something to sing about?

(63) Should Christians become “breeders” at a government’s command and at the sanction of eugenics, in order to build up a future army? (1 Pet. 2:13)?

(64) Should our women become spies who use every means that they have in order to get information? Are not all means sanctioned by war if they are successful in helping defeat the enemy?

(65) Had you rather have your wife killed than to be taken with the spirit of vengeance and to lure your killers to their death?

(66) Can a soldier treat his enemy as a potential Christian if he tries to kill him? Should Christians treat enemies as potential Christians?

(67) Why should we kill a sinner and send him to judgment unprepared in order to prevent him from sending a Christian to be with Jesus? Do we really believe?

(68) Can Christians be well taught who are willing to go across the world as soldiers to take life but who are unwilling to go as missionaries to save life?
(69) If paying taxes, according to Rom. 13, means that we might as well do what the taxes are used for; then since Nero’s government was pagan and tax money helped support the pagan religion, should the early Christians (who were commanded to pay taxes to Rome) have worshipped idols? Would you tell a Christian in an enemy country to pay taxes? If so, should he kill his brethren in another country?

(70) If paying taxes during wartime fully implicates us in the war, the Lord was implicated in the responsibility for the Roman troops of occupation in Palestine for tribute money (which He said pay) helped support that army. Will our brethren follow their logic and maintain that Christians in occupied countries should serve in the army of occupation since Christ said “pay tribute”?

(71) If not to fight is the same as committing suicide (as one has argued), what about Christ? Stephen (Acts 7:57)? James (Acts 12)? and all the martyrs?

X. THE USE OF FORCE

Without an application of force and energy we could not cook a meal. Within itself force is a-moral. The user of force, however, may turn it to good or to evil ends. In the hands of parental love, force may keep a child from jumping out of a window, pull a tooth, perform an amputation, etc. In the case of the amputation the limb is already lost, no injury is meant to the individual, and its purpose is to prevent further harm to the individual and to preserve his life.

Christ did not prohibit all forms of resistance. We are told to resist the devil. However, He did inculcate the “non-resistance of injury with injury—evil with evil.” (Ballou, 3). Moses allowed retaliation, Christ did not. However, He did not prohibit remonstrance, rebuke, instruction and exhortation (2 Tim. 3:16). Neither would it forbid moral or physical restraint which was “uninjurious to the evil doer,
and only calculated to restrain him" and give you an opportunity to teach him. Thus benevolent restraint, such as a mother uses, which respects the personality, which is used in love, which aims at the rescue of the individual and ultimately at his conversion, which does not stir up hate in the user, and which does not have as its purpose or essentially involve destruction, would be in harmony with Christian love for the just and the unjust. It would rescue a drunkard from the path of an automobile or keep a baby from jumping off one's lap. If we allow parental love to be our guiding principle and if we select actions in harmony with it, we shall not go astray in the use of benevolent restraint.

Benevolent restraint no more sanctions the specific use of force in killing in war than it does piracy or gladiatorial combats. Their spirit, application, methods and results differ. Things such as force, eating, etc, all have their measure for the Christian but when they pass their measure things cease to be what they once were.

The further away from all the manifestations of violence redemptive love gets, the more likely it will be to reveal its true spirit and succeed.
Each must act for what he believes is the best under the circumstances. Acting on this right, without denying the same right of decision to others, I do not plan to become a part of the armed forces. In the military uniform I would receive the acknowledgedgment given to a soldier; my appearances would seem, at first glance at any rate, to endorse the military way for the Christian; my teaching would be out of harmony with the uniform; and my enlistment might encourage some c.o. to enlist who might be led into temptations which he might not overcome. As I see it, it would dim my testimony to the way of the cross and be a step in the opposite direction. The CPS Camp seems to offer a more effective testimony to the cross. In fact, many non-pacifists are convinced that non-combatant work is inconsistent with the c.o. profession. Then, too, I do not see my way clear to taking an oath of allegiance when enlisting which calls on me to obey the officers even though I may personally think a particular order is wrong (New Soldier’s Handbook, 3 A Penguin Special). Thus since I believe that the most consistent course is to refuse to join the army, since it will make my position more real to me and since I think that it will offer a more abundant testimony to the way of the cross, I have refused military service. In so doing, no personal reflection is intended toward those objectors who have taken another way. The work which many of them do is certainly good within itself. We would caution such an objector to never take up arms even to drill. You have to stop some place so do not even drill with it since you do not intend to use it. Courteously take the consequences of such a refusal,
SPECIAL FORM FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Those c.o.'s who cannot conscientiously do military service should take care to request a special form to fill out. The following is the way in which I filled out a portion of it.

There are two classes who can claim exemption—those who cannot conscientiously perform combatant military service, and those who cannot conscientiously perform any military service, but are willing to do “work of national importance under civilian direction.”

What does noncombatant service include? "The following military service is noncombatant service: (1) Service in any unit which is unarmed at all times. (2) Service in the Medical Department wherever performed. (3) Service in any unit or installation the primary function of which does not require the use of arms in combat, provided the individual's assignment within such unit or installation does not require him to bear arms or to be trained in their use. I further declare that noncombatant training consists of training in all military subjects except marksmanship, combat, firing, target practices, and those subjects relating to the employment of weapons." (Quoted from May, 1941, Twentieth Century Christian, page 19). Since this noncombatant service, as above defined, might involve me in duties which I could not conscientiously perform, I have claimed exemption under Series I, B. as follows: “I claim the exemption provided by the Selective Training and Service Acts of 1940 for conscientious objectors, because I am conscientiously opposed by reason of my religious training and belief to participation in war in any form and to participation in any service which is under the direction of military authorities.

The objector is then asked for the nature of his belief. The Scriptures teach that the Christian is to love his enemies, to turn the other cheek, to overcome evil with good, to render to no man evil for evil, to bless, not to curse, those who
He is then asked to explain how, when, and from whom or what source he acquired the belief. The Christian, of course, is often assisted in his study of the Scriptures by elders, preachers, and other Christians; but his final conviction must be based upon his personal study of the New Testament.

He is then asked to name individuals upon whom he relies most for religious guidance. The individual may be an elder or a preacher, but the primary source of the Christian's guidance is the New Testament itself.

He is then asked if he believes in the use of force in any circumstances. My answer to that is that under some circumstances I could as a Christian exercise benevolent restraint which would prevent—or purpose to prevent—an individual from hurting himself or another, but which did not entail the destruction of human life.

He is then asked what event in his life most conspicuously demonstrates the depth and consistency of his religious convictions. My answer here was that I had expressed my conviction against Christians fighting in war both before and after the war started while I was in Canada. However, I did not know whether or not I had really met with a very severe test concerning my conviction upon this subject. (Perhaps this may be our test).

He is then asked if he has ever given public expression, written or oral, to his conviction; and if so, when and where.

He is also asked the name of the church to which he belongs, as well as the name and location of its governing body, or head. Christ is the head of the church, and he is in heaven. The church is congregational in government, with no city, state, national, or international boards. The individual becomes a member of the church when he is buried and raised.
with Christ in baptism, and is added to the church by God. (Acts 2:38, 41, 47; Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:2f).

The creed of the church, or its official statements, concerning participation in war is contained in the New Testament. Some of the Scriptures have already been referred to.

The work is somewhat similar to that done by the C. C. C. It is of “national importance”. In some cases c. o. have been able to volunteer for special types of work which they believe to be more humanitarian. It is hoped that more such avenues shall be open to them. If interested in the work which is done, you may send five cents to National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Washington, D. C., for the pamphlet on “The Conscientious Objector”. Information may also be obtain from the American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. The CPS Camps are not under military direction. The c. o. also pays for his own room and board which is about $35 a month. If he, or his friends, cannot pay it the historic peace churches, who sponsor these camps, will pay it for him. In some projects the c. o. is self-supporting.
CHAPTER XVI

The Value of the C. O. to A Country

The c. o. is devoted to the work of reconciliation but there are some who seem to think that he is of no value because he will not render military service.

(1) Rome asked if the Christian was of any value to the country. They did not worship the Caesars, they did not worship the other pagan gods and they were not extreme nationalists. Rome regarded all these things as essential to the welfare of the state and they thus regarded Christians as useless and disloyal (Hardy, 68, 71-). “The useless folks” was a common term for them; it was an “ingenious play upon their name of Christian (Achrestoi) or the Useless ones.” (Spence, 317). At times they were regarded as social revolutionists and Nihilists (Hardy, 34-35).

(2) All should grant that a person ought not to engage in anything contrary to his conscience. He may need instructing but if his conscience is not respected here why should it be elsewhere? If he does not respect it in wartime, why should he do so in peacetime.

(3) The c. o. is of value to society for he endeavors to conquer for Christ the hearts of men in order that they may be saved and the world may become sane. And yet some brethren accuse us of selling the church down the river and of being of no value to anyone anywhere. Regardless of this we shall try to view both God and man through the eyes of Christ (Matt. 22:37-39; 25:43-45; I John 3:16; 4:19-21; Matt. 5:47-48). Christ has made us the salt of the earth and not the sword of the earth (Matt. 5:13). As salt we can preserve and purify as well as make people thirsty for the water of life. This is done through the power of a righteous life (Matt. 5:14). The Christ the enemy sees is the Christ mani-
fested through us. If he does not see in us the redemptive love of Christ he cannot see and be influenced by Christ in us. If we are futile in our efforts because we cling to the way of the cross, then Christ the light of the world has made no contribution for he refused to use the sword to propagate, protect or perpetuate His kingdom and ideals. If Christ could, and did, make a contribution without using the sword, we can do the same within our little measure. Since righteousness exalted a nation, since a few righteous may insure the survival of a group (Gen. 18:22-), the Christian should create a spiritual safeguard by throwing his entire efforts into that which makes for righteousness both within ourselves and within the enemy. Skeptics may laugh at our “spiritual and righteous contributions”, but no Christian has such a sense of humor or lack of knowledge concerning the power of goodness and redemptive love. Certain preachers, who think that they can do more for their country through preaching than killing, have no right to say hard things about a c. o. who believes that his greatest contribution is in his preaching and practice. There is the difference, however, that a c. o. will not make a good recruiting officer like some preachers have made.

In his Farewell Address Washington referred to religion and morality as indispensable supports of political prosperity. C. o. are willing to make this type of contribution but they cannot conscientiously render a service with the sword. They try (they do not affirm they are the only ones) to demonstrate the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—the only basis for world peace; to combat hate: to combat racial prejudices; to help the world see both sides of the question; to spread the spirit which will help the peace. “So, by a compassion for mankind which begins with our own countrymen at home and reaches at last to our enemies abroad, would we keep love alive in this sorely stricken world. Is this sedition, or perhaps even treason? There are those who would have it so. But take a
longer look, and a wider survey. Some day this war is going to end, and peace return. We want this peace to endure, and thus abolish war. But will it endure—or only be another truce?—It all depends—on whether there is any goodwill left in the world to work the miracle of brotherhood. This sword may wound, but cannot heal. If to the peace table there comes only the spirit of hate and vengeance, then will the peace be lost, however, the war be won.” (Peace Digest, Summer, 1942, p. 16, John Haynes Holmes). C. o.’s in this war have been guinea pigs for experiments to help humanity; they have worked in hospitals and in other activities which the government has designated as of “national importance”. Most of them desire a more humanitarian work than the majority of them have been permitted, as yet, to engage in. He wants to fight evil, but with spiritual weapons.

I. Is THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR IMPrACTICAL?

If the way of redemptive love is impractical, the cross of Christ is also. When judged by the short range view, those at the cross doubtless thought that His life and work was a failure. What, however, is the judgment of history?

(1) What has been so practical about the way of war? It does not solve problems although it does decide who will be the one that renders decisions. And the war may have so impaired thinking that the problem ferments to create future wars. Thus John Gibbons called the last war, the “opening and interrupted chapter” of the Great War (p. 1; 1936). The Civil War, for example, did not solve the race question. It still needs to be thought out. When we see the essential nature of war, its cost and its results, we wonder why the c. o. is singled out as “impractical”. Why do some Christians think that the way of war will bring “living righteousness to victory” and that the way of love will not do it? (cf. Scott-Craig, 12).

(2) The way of the c. o. could hardly stand in great-
or danger than the way of war. It has far greater possibilities of cultivating the spirit of love in us and in others. It does not becloud our vision with hate. It is true that many might lose their lives by adopting this way. However, it is hardly likely that the millions would die as they do die in war. It is likely that an enemy would finally turn away from killing people who returned good for their evil continually. Even though many fall why should they be called “impractical” while the man who dies in battle, even though the particular battle is not won, is called heroic?

What if the money spent on war was spent on relief squads which would rush to any stricken corner of the globe with medicine, clothing and food? What if we dropped bread instead of bombs on the enemy? At any rate, such would be in harmony with the Christian spirit. It is true that it is out of step with the world’s way, but since when did Christ fall into step with the world? The thing Christians must do is not to get in step with the world, and out of step of Christ, but to try to bring others into step with Christ. As Rufus M. Jones said: “But in any case, there ought to be a world like this one for which Christ lived and died. And that kind of a world will never actually come unless some of us take the vision and the hope seriously and set to work to make it real here on this very earth.” (The Faith and Practice of the Quakers, 121). As long as the world is pagan or semi-pagan Christians will not fit into the world (Rom. 12:1-2). “The Christian fits only into the Kingdom of God.” (T. C. Mayer, Fellowship, Jan. 1843, p. 19).

One preacher, in trying to show how “impractical” the c. o. is, wanted to know “what if” the entire church went into an objectors camp and out of circulation for the duration. We ask: What if the entire church went into the army? If the church went into an objectors camp it would be no more out of circulation than the early church when it went into the catacombs of Rome, or when it was persecuted in other places. Paul was in prison but that did not
bind the gospel (2 Tim. 2:9; Phil. 1:12-14; 2 Thess. 1:4). We believe that if the entire church went into an objector's camp that it would be a mighty testimony to the nature of the gospel and of Christians.

II. THE POWER OF REDEMPTIVE LOVE

There are some who seem to have no confidence in the power of good and love to kindle goodness and love in another. Others do have some confidence in them but they are unwilling to trust themselves wholeheartedly to the way of redemptive love and so they want a gun handy "just in case".

(1) Christ trusted Himself to the way of redemptive love. Yes, He got a cross, but look what the world got—a demonstration of forgiving love, the love of God. Thus though such love may involve a cross no Christian will affirm that it has no power. Has the cross brought no victories? no protection? no salvation? no elevation of life? no creation of love? Did not the early Christians win victories through the way of redemptive love? The spirit of the martyrs caused even the Romans an uneasiness in applying persecution (Spence, 215). More than one martyr's death was a means of turning men to the faith. The Christians won respect for their rights through their willingness to have their own blood shed instead of through their willingness to shed the blood of others. Uhlhorn said that the church owed its victory to the steadfastness of martyrs in persecution as well as "to the faithful work of its members in times of peace". "Hearts were won, consciences convinced," (385). Christians suffered for their faith instead of making someone else suffer when they persecuted Christians. "In patient silence they endured all. The Heroic Age of the Christian Church had begun, a heroism not of action, but of a suffering mightier than all deeds." (248).

Redemptive love has won battles and a greater use of it will furnish us with a greater number of successes. It does
not always guarantee physical safety—what way does—but it has often done so as well as converted the opposer. It is not just through suffering but through our reaction to the enemy. It was not the mere fact of Christ’s death that made the cross a triumph instead of a disaster; it was his specific reaction to his murderers (Richards, 116). He taught love for enemies, He prayed for their salvation and He demonstrated redemptive love.

Redemptive love does not appeal to violence or politics; it appeals directly to the individual concerned. Jesus, for example, won Zacchaeus and when he was changed the entire neighborhood felt it. There is power in redemptive love and we should be ashamed of ourselves for having scarcely used this power.

III. CHRISTIANS PRAY FOR THE RULERS OF THE WORLD

We pray not merely for one, for but all. “I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men; for kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity” (1 Tim. 2:1-2).

Christians pray for their enemies and for all rulers that their hearts may be turned to the way of peace and that they may be reached with the gospel. Justin (later martyred) in his Apology to Antonius Pius, sovereign of Rome, pointed out that they prayed for the sovereign. However, that did not mean that it was therefore right for them to do all that the ruler asked them to do. As Apollonius told the Prefect Perennis, who sentenced him to death at the close of the trial, that he loved the emperor and offered “up prayers for his majesty”. However, he refused to heed the bidding of the Prefect that he sacrifice to Apollo “and to the other gods and to the emperor’s image.” (Hardy, 155-156).

To pray for a government or a person does not logically involve us in a participation in all its actions. We pray for Hitler but that does not mean that we have any inten-
tion of fighting for him. All of our prayers should acknowledge our desire for the will of God to prevail, and not that everything which we think should come to pass must come to pass. We see dimly and even that vision is further clouded by our own selfishness. We should pray that righteousness shall more and more prevail, and that more doors may be opened for gospel preaching, even if it involves a cross for us. We know that the early Christians, when scattered by persecution, were not annihilated because their enemies ruled over them (Acts 8, 9). Seeming defeat for them did not spell defeat for God and Christianity. We do not know that the way we would open doors is the way God shall open them. Let us also pray that we may keep the spirit of love and shed no man's blood. Let us, like the early Christians, pray for our hard pressed brethren in enemy lands (Acts 12:5, 12). Let us pray for strength, courage and wisdom to carry the message of the cross in an aching, sinful world.
Chapter XVII

The Early Attitude of the Church Toward War

I. Historians

Historians have commented on the fact that the early Christians, as a whole, were against Christians killing in war. Professor J. W. Thompson said that they were “out-and-out pacifists” (30). John F. Hurst said that although there were some Christians in military service that the Christian “attitude toward war in the first two centuries was almost like that of the Quakers” (I:185). He thought that one of the reasons for this was that no man could hold office without at the same time engaging in the national religion and declaring fidelity to its priesthood and taking the oaths, or sacraments, which was enjoined by the religion. The citizen, to bear office, must declare himself a pagan. If he refused office he practically renounced paganism.” (I:186). The reference here is particularly to political life. However, the same thing was true concerning military life. Christians shunned military service also because of their pacifist disposition (I:185). E. G. Hardy in his scholarly study referred to “the absolute refusal of the Christians to join in any religious festivals, to appear in the courts where an oath had to be taken, to illuminate their doors at festivals, to join in the amusements of the amphitheatre; their unwillingness, if not refusal, to serve in the army, and their aversion to all civic duties and offices.” (36) Gibbon said that the Christians could not be “convinced that it was lawful on any occasion to shed the blood of our fellow-creatures, either by the sword of justice, or by that of war; even though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace and safety of the whole community.” They refused an active part in “the military defense
of the empire”. “It was impossible that the Christians, without renouncing a more sacred duty, could assume the character of soldiers, of magistrates, or of princes.” (Milman’s Gibbon’s Rome, I:551-552). Harnack, a German scholar who was not a pacifist said: “The position of a soldier would seem to be still more incompatible with Christianity than the higher offices of state, for Christianity prohibited on principle both war and bloodshed.” “It followed without question, that a Christian might not of his free will become a soldier. It was not however difficult to keep to this rule, and certainly the oldest Christians observed it.” (quoted by Cadoux, I:97). Harnack said that “the fact was just this: the baptized Christian did not become a soldier.” (quoted by O’Tolle, 79). Herring quoted from Harnack’s Militia Christi (9-10) that “It requires no further proof to establish firmly that the Gospel excludes all violence, and has nothing in common with war, nor will permit it.” (31). E. Stanley Jones referred to the early Christian recognition of the incompatibility of killing with the Christian life. He also referred to some in India who referred to the peaceful nature of Christianity and the warlike nature of “Christian” nations. One Moslem said “Your NT teaches you to love your enemies, while our sacred book teaches us to fight, therefore you should set us a better example” (191, 194). E. de Pressense referred to the relation of the church and the state during Apostolic age as very simple: “they were those of the persecuted and the persecutors.” (I:384). He asked how Christians could exercise “any magisterial function at a time when religion was so identified with politics that the most simple public act was associated with idolatry?” (I:382). J. Wells in his Short History of the Roman Empire said that “to serve in the army was inconsistent with their religion” during the second century (300). With reference to military service William Smith and Samuel Cheet- ham said that the “more austere teaching of the church rejoined with an unqualified negative, and the words of Christ (Matt. 26:52) were adduced as placing the matter beyond
dispute." (II:2028). They referred to the effort of the church, after the time of Augustine, to keep the clergy off the battle field. "That such service was wholly unbecoming their profession does not appear to have ever been seriously denied." (II:2030). Even after the apostasy developed it was still considered out of harmony with the life of the clergy. However, since all Christians are priests it is out of harmony with their profession. Schaff, in his history of the church, referred to the Christian's aversion to military service (II:43). The Romans thought that Christians had a "notorious lack of patriotism (McGiffert, The Apostolic Age, 628). We could quote other historians but these are sufficient to reveal that, to say the least, it is not at all uncommon for historians to be convinced that the early church as a whole did not believe in Christians killing.

II. THE EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS

Professor Cecil John Cadoux has presented evidence in his book, The Early Christian Attitude to War, to the effect that the early church did not sanction Christian's killing. He also presented this evidence in The Early Church and the World. Of course, the early writers were not inspired but they were much closer to the apostles and the attitude of the church of the first century than we are today. All quotations, with reference to their sources, may be found in Cadoux's The Early Church and the World.

After stating that we must admit the possibility that there may have been some Christian soldiers he stated: "The positive evidence on the subject can be briefly stated. After the best doubtful cases of Cornelius and the Philippian jailer in Acts, we have no reliable evidence of any Christian soldiers until we come to the reign of Marcus Aurelius" around 173 A. D. (276-277). However, at this time Celsus, an infidel, censured Christians for their unwillingness to fight to protect the Empire. He wrote against Christianity around 177-180 A. D. Origen saw and answered this attack about 248 A. D. "It is noteworthy that both Celsus
and Origen write here as if the refusal to serve in the army was the universal attitude of the Christians." "This was not quite the case" but "still, the language of these two writers is significant as showing what at both their dates was understood by well-informed persons to be the normal Christian view and practice. It is also interesting that neither Celsus, nor Origen in replying to him, alludes explicitly to the fear of contamination with idolatry as the Christians' reason for refraining from military service: Celsus does not say what their ground was; but Origen makes it perfectly clear elsewhere in this treatise that it was the moral objection to bloodshed by which they were mainly actuated." (Cadoux, III:230-231). These two individuals were both in a position to know the attitude of the church as a whole even before their own day. Origen said that "we do not indeed 'render military service along with him', even 'if he press us to do so'; but we do 'render military service' on his behalf, by marshalling a private army of religion through the prayers we offer to the Divine Being." (238).

During the period from 180-250 A. D. the prophecy of Isaiah about the "substitution of agriculture for war is often spoken of as being fulfilled in Christianity" (II:402). Clemens said that Christians "are being educated not in war, but in peace". (403). Pseudo-Justinus spoke of Christians "who never inflict slaughter on peoples" (404). Tertullian said that Jesus "cursed the works of the sword for even after" when Peter cut off Malchus' ear (404). During the period from 180-250 A. D. Tertullian, the Canons of Hippolytus, and Origen deal with the "concrete question of Christians refusing to serve in the Roman armies" (422). Other writers make statements "all pointing to the positive refusal of service as their logical implication." (423). Among these were Irenaeus, Clemens, Minucius Felix, and Cyprianus (423-425).

From 250-313 A. D. we find that there were some soldiers in the Roman armies who were members of the church.
It is clear that there were more soldiers in the armies at the end than in the middle of the third century, and that Constantine’s accession to power increased the number still further.” (580). “Figures are, of course, out of our reach; but when we consider that these two Emperors (Diocletianus and Galerius around 300 A.D., JDB) endeavoured to cleanse their whole army of Christians, we cannot imagine that the percentage could have been very high. No sovereign readily deprives himself of a tenth, or even of a twentieth, part of his military power. As we shall see presently, Christian opinion, even at this date, contrary to the usual idea, was still very far from being unanimous as to the propriety of military service for Christians;” (580). Examples of soldiers who were martyred because they refused to serve longer, on the basis of an incompatibility with Christianity, may be found (580-). This incompatibility was recognized by the Emperor Julian in the second half of the fourth century when he, a pagan, “decreed that the Christians, whose God had forbidden them to kill, should not be intrusted with any office with which judicial functions were connected.” (Uhlenhorn, 472). He knew more about the spirit of the Christian faith than did those misguided Christians who may have been seeking such offices.

It is significant that the following are true with reference to this question of the early Christian attitude to war: First, when the apostate church sanctioned killing for the Christian it was not long until it sanctioned the use of violence on heretics. Second, even after war was sanctioned for the “lay” Christian this sanction did not extend to the “clergy”. Third, those Christians who were in the army compromised their conscience to the extent of participating either passively or actively in some form of idolatry. Fourth, in the persecution of Christians in the army I have not found any indication that they resisted death with arms. This alone indicates that even they, to that extent, had seen that Christ
did not authorize Christians to kill in their own defense. Fifth, as the church grew more worldly we find more Christians killing for Caesar.