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a first aid man in a battalion medical detachment of the 86th Infantry Division, who attended a rifle unit in the front lines in the battle for Germany and was under direct fire of the German 88's as well as the individual target of sniper and machine gunner, yet without violating army regulations, exercised his Christian prerogative and alleviated the suffering of the wounded and administered first aid not only to his own fellows but also to enemy soldiers and civilians.
It is well to admit at the outset that the arguments and criticisms made in this discussion and review of Bro. Green's book, entitled: "The Relation of the Christian to Civil Government and War," and the one written by Bro. Amis, entitled: "Civilization and War," are offered on the assumption that the Bible, being the inspired word of God, is fully authoritative. What I write is directed to those who walk by faith, not by sight, and to live by such a principle can mean nothing less than obedience to what God commands and teaches, even when to do so is contrary to all human experience and all human intelligence and knowledge. There are many examples of such obedience in the Old Testament, such as that of Naaman, Israel under Joshua at Jericho, the brazen serpent for healing in the wilderness, and especially the example of Abraham referred to so often by New Testament writers as the kind of faith Christians should have. When he left Ur, by faith he obeyed and went out "not knowing whither he went". When God informed him that he was to be the father of a son, contrary to human experience and knowledge, "he waivered not through unbelief", and even when commanded to sacrifice Isaac through whom by God's promise the world was to be blessed, still he obeyed. In the New Testament, too, there are examples of such faith, such as that of the man whose eyes were healed by washing in the pool of Siloam, and immersion of penitent believers in water for the remission of sins. Apart from genuine faith, baptism is wholly meaningless.

I am not a pacifist. At no time have I criticised this government for its entry into the present war. I recognize the civil government under which we live as being ordained
of God, but not as having supremacy over God's revealed word in matters concerning the life a Christian lives as the servant of his Lord. The Christian is obligated through command of God to be in subjection to his government so long as that government does not require of him acts such as he may not perform as a disciple of the Lord—acts which in themselves are unrighteous acts. The righteousness or unrighteousness of any act must be determined by the teaching of Christ concerning that act. As every informed person knows, there are numerous services of non-combatant nature which can be performed in time of war, some of which expose one to as grave danger as that of the combat soldier.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my brother, T. W. Croom, and to Bro. Clyde P. Findlay, for carefully reading the manuscript and making a number of valuable suggestions and corrections.

A. S. C.
PART I

Reply to GLENN E. GREEN
Enlightenment or Confusion

When a man writes a book on a subject involving as grave consequences as does this one, he ought to have something to offer which rises above the level of human opinion. Even though Bro. Green has printed a second edition of his book, nevertheless he has hopelessly undermined his whole effort by reducing the first and most important decision a Christian has to make, to a matter of mere opinion.

On page 15 of his book we read: “Now it may be said, ‘Suppose this government should engage in a war of aggression’. If such were the fact, then I could refuse to serve in any capacity and take the consequences. Yet I could continue to pay taxes and obey all the laws that are right, because I hold the institution itself is right and that I may participate in it, and would need only to register my protest against the part that was wrong. However, I might be mistaken in my opinion as to what constitutes aggression.” Now, this last sentence deals with the first decision a Christian would have to make, according to Green’s teaching; namely, whether or not the nation at war is an aggressor, and Bro. Green says plainly that he might be mistaken in his opinion as to what constitutes aggression. That places it not only on the basis of opinion, but one Bro. Green confesses might be wrong. He is to be commended for this frank acknowledgment, but since as Jesus said, “a disciple is not above his teacher”, those whom Bro. Green proposes to set right on this important question would have to make the first and most basic decision on human opinion, even on one that “might be wrong”.

My Bible asserts that the scriptures furnish the man of God “completely unto every good work” (II Tim. 3:17), but according to Green here is a necessary work, decision regarding which rests on opinion which might be wrong. As Bro. Green says on this same page, “Truth is never so embarrassed”.

(6)
CONTRADICTIONS

As further evidence of the futility of Bro. Green’s doctrine in this book, I offer an array of contradictions, inconsistencies, and other fallacies, that could not occur in any book written in truth.

Contradiction No. 1

Again on page 15 of his book, Bro. Green, under the heading, “Taking Part in Government by Paying Taxes”, says: “You can refuse to pay taxes as well as to enlist. If the government is engaged in wholesale murder, as some argue, then why pay somebody to do the murdering? If in private life I hire some one to assassinate another, am I not equally guilty?” He is trying to show that the conscientious objector is inconsistent and affirms that they become by paying taxes an indispensable part of the war effort and, therefore, participate in war. In another place he says, “If I help a neighbor who is butchering hogs, I am helping to butcher the hogs whether I actually cut their throats or only tend the fire”. As to the soundness of these statements, I deal with them under the heading: “The Christian’s Obligation to the Government”; but note the quotation from Green above under the heading: Introduction. Of himself he there says that if this government should engage in a war of aggression, he “could refuse to serve in any capacity and take the consequences. Yet I could continue to pay taxes and obey all the laws that are right.” Now, for him to pay taxes to an aggressor nation and escape guilt, contradicts what he says above regarding the guilt of a conscientious objector who does non-combatant service, or pays taxes. If paying taxes to the government makes the conscientious objector a participant in war, then for Green to pay taxes to an aggressor nation at war, makes him equally a participant in an aggressive war. Verily, “truth is never so embarrassed” as Bro. Green well said.
Contradiction No. 2

While on this subject of aggressor nations, we should examine yet another of Bro. Green's contradictions. He positively states it is wrong for a Christian to serve in the army of an aggressor nation (see pages 3, 15, and 18 of his book). Yet on page 2 of his book, in his attempt to prove that the early Christians served in the armies of Rome with divine approval, he says: "Rome was a conquering power that allowed no trifling with her authority. For the apostles to have taught against capital punishment, and soldiers not to be soldiers, would have been plain sedition. In Acts 24:5 it was charged that Paul was a mover of sedition, but in verse 13 Paul denies it."

Now, note that Green says it is wrong for a Christian to serve in the army of an aggressor nation, then thinks he has proven the early Christians were in the Roman armies with the approval of the apostles, because "Rome was a conquering power" and would not tolerate teaching against capital punishment and being soldiers in her army. "A conquering power" is an aggressor nation. Evidently, Bro. Green did not discover that he was condemning the early Christians and even the apostles by asserting they were in the army of a conquering power and did not teach against it. Furthermore, on page 15, readers will recall that he said that in case this nation should engage in a war of aggression he would need only to register his protest against the part that was wrong, yet he declares that for the apostles to have taught against this conquering power (Rome), would have been plain sedition. Then if Green had been under the government of Rome, a conquering power, he would have needed to register his protest against the conquests of this conquering power, yet he says the apostles would have been guilty of sedition to have taught the brethren not to be soldiers in that army. This would necessarily have compelled Green to do what he says the apostles did not do, and to have been guilty of sedition or else to have failed in what he would need to do.
Contradiction No. 3

In referring to the instance of Christ's driving out the money-changers, Bro. Green evidently overlooked some statements he made with reference to Christ's commanding Peter to put up the sword (Mt. 26:52). Of Peter, Green says: "The issue was not a question of punishing a criminal, but religious. Peter was no officer, constable, or police. He was taking up the sword against the constituted authorities, and Jesus said put it up, 'All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.'" (Bro. Green inserts the words: "against government,"—an addition to God's word which he has no right to make.)

Now, if Christ's act was an example of the use of force, as Bro. Green contends, it must have been of a religious nature, or in the moral realm, or as a "constituted authority." Relative to the moral realm, Bro. Green elsewhere asserts: "Certainly, no force can be applied in the moral realm." Likewise, he has ruled out force for religious purposes, and just as Peter was no officer, constable, or police, so neither was Christ, hence on the same basis by which he proves Peter was wrong, he proves that Christ gave us an example of the use of force. I hardly think Christ condemned Peter for acting with as full civil authority as he himself had. It is not my purpose to place Bro. Green in such poor light as a preacher; he placed himself there and it becomes my duty merely to point it out.

Contradiction No. 4

While indulging in a fancied theory on what he chooses to call "sinners only in government," Bro. Green has this to say: "For God to appoint a sinner to do anything in righteous service to him, would be to recognize and treat with him in rebellion, which means to negotiate with him in sin. God requires the sinner to lay down the arms of rebellion before He recognizes him in any way" (page 13). On another page he says Cyrus was a sinner and yet acknowledges that God did recognize him and quotes Isa. 44:28 as proof: "He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure." In one place he says God will not recognize a sinner; in another he
says God did. This may be good doctrine for Bro. Green and the brethren who agree with him, but one thing we know, it is not truth, for as Bro. Green said, “Truth is never so embarrassed.” In fact, a considerable portion of his book is devoted to discussing sinners in government, yet the New Testament has exactly nothing to say about such. In still another place even Bro. Green says: “Being a saint or sinner does not make a man a ruler. Men become rulers only by political means, regardless of their spiritual standing.” Now, such matters of pure opinion he may discuss with his opponents, imaginary or otherwise, but I have neither time nor disposition to engage in such worthless activity. Nevertheless, I ought to point out certain discrepancies in some of Bro. Green’s statements and this leads to the next contradiction.

Contradiction No. 5

Under the heading: “Government as Defined in Romans 13,” Bro. Green writes: “The truth of the matter is God has never ordained any particular government in toto, as a corporate body, but the institution of civil government as defined in Rom. 13:1-7. He ordains civil government just as he ordains marriage.” As to the truthfulness of this statement I shall deal with it elsewhere in my review, but let us compare this statement of the meaning of Romans 13, with Green’s use in other portions of his book. On page 29, he says: “The sinner of Rom. 13 is supposed to be appointed because he is a sinner, but Judas was appointed an apostle, and only became a sinner after he was in office.” And again on page 14, he writes: “How can it be wrong for a Christian to be God’s minister, and execute his wrath on the evil-doer?”

Such is the double use he endeavors to make of Rom. 13. To satisfy his requirement in one instance, the minister in Romans 13, is an institution—an abstraction, and not even a government as such of any kind. But to meet his need elsewhere, the minister has to be a person. Now, institutions are not Christians, neither can a Christian be an institution. And if the government mentioned in Rom. 13, is an institution just as marriage is one, then how can we harmonize the use
of marriage or civil government as something that might be a Christian?

**Contradiction No. 6**

Green argues at length that the work a non-combatant soldier does, makes him fully responsible for all that is done by the combat soldier in time of war, and affirms that the "all-out conscientious objector is the only nearly consistent man on that side of the question." See other quotations from him quoted by me under Contradiction No. 1. He also affirms that it would be wrong for a Christian to serve in the army of an aggressor nation.

In contrast with the above teaching, he calls the United States a righteous nation and refers to it as "this blessed government," yet this government has furnished untold quantities of war equipment to Soviet Russia—an aggressor nation. If any one doubts that Russia has been an aggressor in this war, let him ask what has happened to Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and parts of Finland and Poland. Russia was an aggressor of the worst sort, when little Finland was attacked for no reason except that Russia wanted some of her territory. Therefore, she was a known aggressor before we began to furnish the materials of war, and during the very time we continued to supply her at great hazard and great expense.

Therefore, according to the very principle by which Bro. Green lays the guilt upon the conscientious objector, "this blessed government" is guilty of aggression through aiding an aggressor nation, and every soldier in all our armies is guilty of aggression. This is the consequence of Green's doctrine and not my teaching. In fact, it makes Green himself an aggressor by paying taxes and buying bonds in aid to a government that supported an aggressor nation. According to my view the United States is not an aggressor nation, but Green's teaching certainly makes it such.

**Contradiction No. 7**

Desperately trying to find some single case to uphold his doctrine, Bro. Green has the effrontery to call the case of

(11)
Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-10) an “Example of Christ and Apostles,” his heading for the paragraph. He says, “They lied to the Holy Spirit. An Apostle pronounced their doom. Christ executed them on the spot.” Now, if that be an example, we must execute on the spot every old hypocrite found in the church, pretending to be what he is not. Even though he calls this an example, he fails to tell us the consequences of such doctrine.

Moreover, this was purely a religious matter. Ananias and his wife had violated no law of the “constituted authorities,” hence Green has Christ and His apostles “taking up the sword against the constituted authorities,” whereby Green says Peter was in error, when Christ commanded him to “Put up again thy sword into its place.” Mt. 26:52. Besides, Green says: “We need and advocate no force against any, except those who first employ it against others, and then only to the extent necessary for protection.” Did Ananias and Sapphira employ force against anybody? And just for protection, was it necessary that they be “executed on the spot”?

**INCONSISTENCIES**

Scarcely less significant than outright contradictions are the numerous inconsistencies to be found in Bro. Green’s writings. Many of these are exactly of the type often resorted to in support of denominational errors, hence the inconsistency of resorting to the same erroneous form of procedure as those whom Bro. Green, no doubt, has so often criticised for it.

**Inconsistency No. 1**

In view of what we have already observed, it ought not to be surprising to find the first inconsistency on page one of his book. Referring to the fact that the Roman government and the Jewish government had supported themselves at various times by force of arms, he asks: “Therefore, under
such circumstances how could the converts of Christ know that it was wrong for them to participate in government, bear arms as soldiers, unless they were plainly so commanded then?" Then he asks, "Where is such a command?"

Now, with all due respect to Bro. Green as a preacher, it ill befits a gospel preacher to display that kind of weakness. Those who use instrumental music in worship, can just as well ask: "In view of the fact that the Jewish people were accustomed to the use of instruments of music in their worship, how could the converts of Christ know that it was wrong for them to use musical instruments in their worship unless they were plainly so commanded then? Where is such a command?" Bro. Green makes this same blunder of proving a doctrine by what the Bible does not say, in his discussion regarding the Jailer and Cornelius. When a man's mind is so bemuddled as to start a book with any such sort of statement, brethren who think carefully will read what follows with suspicion, I am sure. Much of Bro. Green's book is based on no better proof than this. He fills it with his "I say" and his "I maintain," but such is of little value, if any at all.

**Inconsistency No. 2**

On page 5 of Bro. Green's book we read: "The moral teaching of Christ and the apostles excluded recourse to all violence." He further states the Lord's command: "resist not him that is evil," is also moral teaching. Then on page 2, he affirms that "God alone has the right to dictate man's religion, moral allegiance, and worship, not Caesar." This shows that Green regards a man's moral life within his relationship to God, and raises the question of our obligation to fulfill that moral relationship.

On page 4, we read: "If this government commanded us not to set the Lord's Supper, made the issue religious, we should set it and take the consequences as did the apostles; to do otherwise would be to put the church as such into carnal warfare." Now, since he states that God alone has the right to govern a man's moral conduct and his religious life, just on what kind of principle does Bro. Green refuse to forego the
Lord's Supper, yet be willing to violate Mt. 5:39? Is it greater sin to neglect the Lord's Supper than to violate the command: "Resist not him that is evil," which Green says is moral teaching? Strange doctrine this, whereby a man can refuse to obey the government in order to perform an act of worship, yet cannot refuse to obey the government in order to obey a moral command of his God. There were those in the days of Christ who thought similar to that. "Woe unto you, scribes and pharases, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint, and anise, and cummin, and have left undone weightier matters of the law: justice, mercy, and faith; but these ye ought to have done and not to have left the other undone," Mt. 23:23, 24. In fact, one of the most disgusting sights in the whole realm of religion is to behold an immoral man punctually observing acts of religious worship. May I suggest to Bro. Green and those who agree with him, that being moral is quite as important as being worshipful.

**Inconsistency No. 3**

"Not a passage in the Bible says soldiering is murder," says Green. The most suitable reply to make this as ridiculous as it deserves, is to say: "Not a passage in the Bible says baptizing babies is wrong." A more enlightening statement would have been: "Not a word is written by inspiration about soldiering, to those under the New Testament."

**Inconsistency No. 4**

Without being effervescent in expression, I think I am quite as patriotic as Bro. Green, but some of his high-sounding statements do not conform to other things he has said. As previously pointed out, he calls the United States government blessed, and then makes the inconsistent statement that "For God to appoint a sinner to do anything in righteous service to Him, would be to recognize and treat with him in rebellion, which means to negotiate with him in sin. God requires the sinner to lay down the arms of rebellion before He recognizes him in any way." Now, Pres. Truman, who is our president, is a member of the Baptist denomination. Green, defining a sinner in government, says, "that is, non-
Christians." Now, let him tell us whether Pres. Truman, a Baptist, is Christian or non-Christian. If he is a Christian, then what is wrong with Baptist doctrine? If Green says Truman is not a Christian (as his teaching about Baptist doctrine no doubt requires), then, just as with Cyrus, we do have God recognizing a sinner. And if this government can be so good as to be called blessed, with a man non-Christian at its head, why all this noise about "sinners in government"?

Inconsistency No. 5

Concerning exemptions for conscientious objectors, Bro. Green says, "Yet I notice most seek first every avenue of exemption allowed by the government. If he isn't trying to save his own skin, what is he doing?" Page 16.

I challenge Bro. Green to present for examination copies of his income tax reports for the last four years, so that we may know whether he sought (and got) government exemptions to save his pocketbook. Which is greater fault, to seek exemption on account of conscientious scruples, or to save a little money? Let the readers judge.

Furthermore, every preacher within the draft age that took advantage of the exemption allowed by the government, is as much a coward as the conscientious boy who exercises his right to an exemption to avoid service he has conscientious scruples about doing. And if said preacher is not conscientiously opposed to military service, he is far more open for the charge of cowardice than is the conscientious objector.

It is a pleasure to record that when I wrote Bro. Green asking for specific data relative to his own status in the World War I draft, he replied promptly and gave his record in detail and it showed that he acted according to his conviction, unless it be that he waited to be drafted rather than to volunteer. He was rejected because of physical impairment. My experience with his collaborator, Bro. Robert C. Jones, was not so satisfactory, however, for I wrote him a letter on Aug. 3, 1945, and another on Aug. 26, 1945, requesting exact information on his status during the first World War, and to date no reply has been received. Bro. Green has written in bitter language against taking exemp-
tions “to save their own skins” as he chooses to describe such action.

Inconsistency No. 6

“Therefore, I maintain that a Christian can do anything upon which God sets His approval.” That is a very good statement of fact, but what does Bro. Green apply it to? He uses it in connection with God’s ordaining civil governments according to Rom. 13. In the first place we do not do civil government, but rather the things such an organization requires of us. If what Bro. Green says holds true, then it proves that any and every command of a government is right and must be obeyed. Yet he positively denies that a Christian is to do that in all instances. Then, why such a statement? It shows how loosely Bro. Green thinks. On page 39, for instance, he says, “I have never taught that God has ordained any government in its entirety.” Why not, if God sets His approval upon it and a Christian can do anything upon which God sets His approval, as he “maintains”?

OTHER FALLACIES

Who Argues From Silence of the Scriptures?

Bro. Green has a paragraph on this, and in it he says, “The scriptures do not say the jailer resigned.” That is true, and it is also true that they do not say he continued in office. Either argument is based on silence as any well-informed, unbiased person knows. At least, Bro. Amis says, “Every one knows that the Inspired Word says not one word about the jailer’s later life,” and he is on Green’s side of this question.

Other statements of Green show that he does base arguments on the silence of the scriptures. Note these: “Not a text in the Bible says soldiering is murder.” “No apostle ever told any soldier or government official to resign.” “How could he (Cornelius) know he ought to cease being a soldier in order to become a Christian unless the apostle plainly told
him?" "Besides, Peter wrote two epistles after this and said not one word condemning government or soldiering." "Therefore, under such circumstances how could the converts of Christ know that it was wrong for them to participate in government, bear arms as soldiers, unless they were plainly so commanded then?"

No comment is needed to establish the fact that Bro. Green so argues, but using his own language, I will ask him: "Why argue against demonstration?"

**Vengeance**

"Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God: for it is written, vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord." Rom. 12:19.

By this time and in view of what has already been pointed out regarding Bro. Green's writings with all his contradictions and inconsistent statements, readers will not be surprised to know that in trying to justify the work of a combat soldier, Bro. Green quotes a part of this verse: "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord" to show that if God may so act, Christians are justified in taking vengeance. See page 34. The full verse teaches a distinction in what they are to do and specifically states that vengeance belongeth unto God. Shame on any man who will so pervert the scriptures!

**The Spirit of Christ**

Bro. Green devotes one full page to this subject under the heading: "The Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of a Soldier," yet not one quotation from Christ or the New Testament and not a single reference to any act of Christ is mentioned in his entire page written about it. He points out how God hates and punishes, overlooking, no doubt, his previous statement that "The Christian fights from principle in all things, not from hatred." To argue that because God takes vengeance, so also may the Christian, is to pervert scripture and argue exactly opposite to the teaching of Paul when he used these words. See Rom. 12:19, "Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God: for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the
Lord." This passage distinctly denies the very argument Green makes, and shows that God himself makes a distinction between what He may do and what He wants His servants to do. Green argues that because God does such, Christians are thereby justified in doing it also. It does not take a Solomon to observe how Green, instead of teaching according to God's word, is diametrically opposing it.

No faithful disciple of Jesus Christ conceives him as one engaging in physical combat or inflicting physical injury, because his character and spirit are clearly portrayed to us in a wholly different light. According to the word of God, he was despised, rejected, stricken, wounded, bruised, oppressed, and afflicted, yet "When he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously" (I Pet. 2:23). True enough he suffered death to make possible the redemption through his blood, but none of the abuses he endured, need have been without resistance of some kind, had it been according to the spirit of Christ so to act. Peter says, "When ye do well and suffer for it, ye shall take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps." Then follows: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again." Here is a spirit of non-resistance, which we are admonished by an apostle to follow. The spirit of resistance would require that when one is reviled, to revile back, or be called "yellow," in modern slang. Bro. Amis thinks the Lord would not want his disciples to be so called. Wonder where he got the idea. The spirit of Christ applied in our own lives would provoke the world to designate us as "yellow," and I regret to say some preachers have also so stigmatized their brethren.

Whenever I can sincerely conceive Jesus taking up arms to defend a political entity, so as to preserve some of this perishable world for me and my descendants to use during our sojourn here, then will I cease to advise my brethren to refuse to slay their fellow-creatures on order of some earthly
authority. Bro. Green says, “resist not him that is evil,” is moral teaching, and if that be so, to violate it makes one immoral and no Christian should allow himself to become immoral just because the government, or any other organization or being, so orders him. Just how any one can conceive any authority being able to nullify a command of Christ, is far beyond any valid conception of true discipleship. Christ was tempted to use force, evidently, since he “was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin,” (Heb. 4:15). If he met such temptation with non-resistance and also “without sin,” may we ask whether resistance in meeting them, would also have been “without sin”? Hardly would conduct be sinless in one sense and also sinless in the opposite sense. The temptation to resist is one of the hardest to overcome. Bro. Amis says, “There is a vast difference between having a ruffian smite a man on the cheek, and seeing the same ruffian pinch his wife’s cheek or chuck her under the chin,” and thereby gives us the key to his errors and that of others like him. It shows that he is being governed by his feelings rather than the word of God. Nothing in God’s word will justify any such estimate or discrimination! The thing that made him write that was the fact that one offense is more likely to arouse his anger than the other. It is poor teaching that takes into consideration how a man may feel, as a criterion of what his Christian conduct should be. “The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God,” and we are seeing, too, that the anger and wrath of Brethren Green and Amis, did not produce any consistent doctrine.

Bro. Amis also gets himself into difficulty trying to use this verse to advantage in promoting his doctrine. “God said, ‘I will repay,’ (Rom. 12:19): then begins immediately in the next chapter to tell of one avenue through which he will repay. The civil powers will make repayment in temporal affairs, both through capital punishment and force of arms,”—Amis.

Now, if God acting through the civil power is taking vengeance, why would not Christians acting through the civil
power also be taking vengeance? Yet God told them not to do it and that it belonged to him. This acknowledgment of Bro. Amis, breaks down all their arguments based on Rom. 13, to justify slaying men because the Christians who did so were acting in and through the civil power which is ordained of God. Now, Bro. Amis has helped out no little in defeating this very argument, by connecting it with Rom. 12:19. If God takes vengeance through the civil power, then Christians likewise would do so and vs. 19 tells them not to do so.

Self-defense

Both Bro. Green and Bro. Amis base much of their argument on a purely imaginary basis—that of self-defense. Whether they willingly manufactured this in support of their theory, or confused the teaching of the New Testament with the laws of Missouri and Texas, I cannot say. Bro. Green accuses his opponents of “overlooking the principle of self-defense,” and of course, if they stick to their Bibles, they must. This principle of self-defense is an assumption wholly unauthorized by God's word. Not only is there no precept, but not a single example of such in all the New Testament. On the contrary, we have a plain command of Jesus Christ not to resist him that is evil and also a clear-cut example of a disciple who did not defend himself against an unlawful mob—the example of Stephen, Acts 7.

Bro. Green becomes so blinded by adherence to his “principle of self-defense” that he writes as follows: “If to be a Christian now I must be a non-resistant now, to be a Christian then meant being a non-resistant then. Where is such a command? There is none. Those who so argue now offer their inferences and deductions but cannot bring one plain text that states their contention.” That is the challenge of a man who has spent some twenty-five years preaching for churches of Christ, yet a 12-year-old child ought to know the text and where to find it. Mt. 5:39 says, “Resist not him that is evil,” and with no word of more than two syllables in it, the passage ought to be plain enough. I shall supplement Bro. Green’s request with one clear-cut example: that of Stephen, Acts 7. The world (and I regret to say some (20)
preachers) would call Stephen “yellow” for so acting, but the word of God says he was “full of grace and power.”

Now, let Bro. Green find one plain text that tells Christians to resist. In his language we may truthfully assert: “There is none. Those who so argue offer their inferences and deductions but cannot bring one plain text that states their contention,” as they themselves know full well.

I doubt seriously whether Bro. Green lacked the necessary information as to the existence of such a plain text as Mt. 5:39 or of the well-known example of Stephen. His difficulty rests, I am sure, on mental blindness due to an emotionalism as obvious as that of any religionist who wants to feel something as evidence of pardon. Anger, wrath, malice, and like sins are truly works of the flesh. Men read of the brutality of the nazis and the Japanese and of the atrocities they have committed, then allow their feelings to determine their course of conduct rather than New Testament teaching calmly and deliberately examined. Whether Stephen felt like returning some of the stones that struck him, we know not, but we do know that he resisted not and even prayed for them that stoned him to death. The record shows beyond a doubt that his conduct was thoroughly approved by his Lord. Resentment against atrocities and brutality does not justify turning aside from the teaching of the Lord. Some people feel that instrumental music is a good thing in the worship, but we refuse that as evidence for its use. They want that kind of music, and some brethren get angry and want to avenge atrocities and other evil-doings, contrary to the simple, plain command of Jesus and the unquestioned example of Stephen. If such brethren could divest themselves of such feelings and use their minds and hearts unhampered by such feelings to determine just what God’s word says, there would not be found such contradiction and inconsistency and even perversion of the scriptures in their teaching.

“Two Supreme Powers”

The above heading is in quotations because it belongs to Bro. Green and not to me. God forbid that I ever use such language when God himself is referred to as one of them.
Notice what Bro. Green has written: “Jesus tells us (Lk. 20:25), ‘Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.’ These are the two supreme powers, 1 Pet. 2:13—‘whether it be to the king as supreme’ . . . The civil power which regulates all temporal things, and the divine which regulates all spiritual things. These two comprehend all others and are the ‘Higher Powers.’ Let all gospel preachers take note. The “Higher Powers” (Rom. 13:1) refers to civil rulers and Green now has God as one of the Higher Powers, as erroneous an exegesis as one can imagine. Furthermore, in 1 Pet. 2:13, any gospel preacher ought to know that the word, “supreme,” is used to distinguish the king from governors under him, yet Bro. Green uses the expression to place him on an equality with God—as one of two supreme powers. “Supreme” with reference to God has a wholly different meaning than the use of it in 1 Pet. 2:13, which to quote fully rather than in part as did Bro. Green, reads: “Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether to the king as supreme; or unto governors as sent by him for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well.”

If Green is right in saying that all temporal things are to be regulated by the civil power as supreme, then Paul ought to have commended the Corinthian brethren for going before the civil magistrates to settle their differences in secular affairs, rather than scold them for it. He says: “Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another.” Yet Green asserts that God has ordained that the civil power regulate all things temporal. Paul further writes (1 Cor. 6): “Dare any of you having a matter against his neighbor, go to law before the unrighteous, and not before the saints?” Too bad that Paul did not learn from Green that the brethren were doing exactly as God ordained! And again verse 5, Paul adds: “What, cannot there be found among you one wise man who shall be able to decide between his brethren?” According to Green no wise Christian would have considered handling secular affairs, since he affirms that such belongs to the civil power. I sur-
mise the readers will be more inclined to think Paul knew what he was doing and that Green is wrong again.

While on this subject of what Bro. Green chooses to call "the two supreme powers," it ought to be added that this is an error fundamental in the doctrine of those who agree with Green. They assume a divided allegiance for the faithful Christian. Never was a more sacrilegious doctrine devised than that. God is supreme above all others and allegiance to Him transcends any allegiance to be imagined. The Roman Catholic doctrine of papal supremacy is no more an affront to God than that. "Ye are not your own; ye were bought with a price," says Paul. In fact, the one thing a Christian ought to take care to avoid is any allegiance that may at any time involve him in a conflict with his allegiance to his God. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers," (II Cor. 6:14) has a general application rather than just to marriage, and ought to guide us so as to keep us from allegiances other than that to our Lord. In fact, it is our allegiance to God that requires us to be in subjection to the powers that be, rather than another allegiance. A Christian who lives according to God's word will find no need for any other authority in matters pertaining to his religious and moral life. Morality is a proper by-product of a religious life worth being called such. Religion is the only basis of a worth-while moral life, which will stand the acid test. It is a flimsy doctrine that degenerates into a mere formula for worship and the first principles. A genuine Christian life is regulated by divine precepts and approved examples, so that all his relations with his fellowmen are so guided, whether social or moral. Listen to Bro. Green, if inclined to think I may be exaggerating: "This is not a question of what a sinner must do to be saved, or of worship, or of procedure in the church, but of what he can do in the field of the common life of men, in the social state, which is governed by moral law. He has to settle it by the same method he settles all other questions in life, 'is the thing itself right or wrong?'" Thus does he imply that our moral life and relations one with another, are not provided for in God's word, as are matters relating to salvation from sin, worship, and
church procedure. Such a view of Christ's religion is a
degenerated formality such as prevailed in the days of
Malachi. To say that every matter must be decided on
whether or not the thing itself is right or wrong, settles
nothing without an agreement as to how such determination
is to be made. How must we decide whether or not a thing
is right or wrong, except by God's word? Green says such
matters "have to be settled by the same method he settles all
other such questions in life, 'Is the thing itself right or
wrong?'" And I shall add that God's word is the criterion
by which the righteousness or unrighteousness of an act must
be determined. That is why we have to "resist not him that
is evil," God's word so determines. This is moral teaching,
too, according to Green. Then here is one thing in moral
teaching we know is right, for God so commanded. The only
law I know of to govern morals, is God's word.

Bro. Amis declared that "making a living is as much a
part of a man's Christian duty as is the praising of God."
May we not also add that keeping the moral teaching of God
is as much a part of a man's Christian duty as is the praising
of God, and if so, then how can they say they would refuse
to obey the government if commanded to forego observance
of the Lord's Supper, yet resist him that is evil if the
government so commands when God and Christ say: "Resist
not him that is evil" and Green affirms that is moral
teaching?

Green affirms there are "two supreme powers, but Amis
says that the government is "a part of Christ's rule over the
whole world," and that "the spiritual duty of Christians
includes the temporal, as well as serving God in His temple,
in worship, in character building, and such sacred service
as God requires." Compare this with Bro. Green's position
as shown above.

Romans 13

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers;
for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be
are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power,
withstandeth the ordinance of God, and they that withstand
shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a
terror to the good work but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same; for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience sake. For, for this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing. Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor.” Rom. 13:1-7.

"Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king as supreme, or unto governors as sent by him for vengeance on evil doers and for praise to them that do well.” 1 Pet. 2:13, 14.

These are the scriptures relied upon more than all others to prove that a Christian is commanded to enter the military service as combat soldiers: to slay, and to destroy with bombs, bullets, flame, and sword. And if it could be shown that there existed no exceptions to the instructions given by Paul and Peter, they would have a proof. Not only is it not possible to produce any proof that there are not exceptions, but we know that the very apostle who made the strongest utterance, Peter himself, did on an occasion refuse to obey the civil authority (Acts 4:19, 20). Even Green and Amis admit exceptions to these two passages. Green refers to it some twenty times or more, and mostly as proof of what he desires to prove. Amis makes the same use of it. As I shall now proceed to show, their admission of the existence of exceptions to this obedience to the “powers that be” and “every ordinance of man,” actually lets their basic scriptural proof slip right out from under their whole structure.

If, as they say, the application of this passage hinges on whether or not an act is in harmony with the teaching of God's word, then obviously we cannot refer to these passages as proof of such an act's being in harmony with God's word. In other words, if these passages are applicable only after an act has been identified as one to which they are applicable,
then certainly they cannot be used to establish their own applicability. Thus are the passages on which they have relied most, lost to them and in being forced to allow the exception of Acts 4:19, they have been driven from their chief proof-text.

Nevertheless, Bro. Green has blundered so much in dealing with Romans 13, a review of some statements he has made, will be in order. For instance, he entitles one paragraph: “Government as Defined in Romans 13.” Any casual reader of this chapter would recognize instantly that Paul is dealing with a Christian’s relation to his government rather than defining civil government. Else did Paul furnish us with a very poor definition of government. Of course, it is very obvious that Bro. Green was preparing the way for an unauthorized assertion that all governments are not within the scope of Romans 13. Paul left no doubt about that, however, for he says plainly, “For there is no power but of God.” Amis does not try to get around this statement but readily admits it as stated. Listen to Bro. Robert Jones: “If the government becomes an apostate institution, if it falls into the hands of rulers who are not a terror to the evil works, but to the good, then I should not in any way support it.” (Remember Bro. Green’s statement that he could pay taxes to an aggressor government and participate in it because he holds the institution itself is right?) While Green would support an apostate government, Jones says he should not in any way support it. I cannot find just where in the Bible Bro. Jones got his idea. Remember that Paul said: “There is no power but of God,” and that includes all governments: Russia, Italy, Japan, and all others. If we believe in taking God at his word, then we ought to cease concocting theories about some governments not being ministers of God and ordained of God: “there is no power but of God.”

One grave difficulty Bro. Green and others encounter is that Christians may in obedience to their government, find themselves in war in direct combat with each other, each endeavoring to kill the other. This is so inconsistent with all New Testament teaching that it becomes an insurmountable obstacle to their doctrine.
The following clipping is indicative of what might happen:

“One of our soldiers lay wounded in New Guinea. Four Japanese soldiers found him and carried him gently to another place in the forest. They said, ‘You will be safe here. Your countrymen will soon arrive and care for you. We are Christians and hate war.’” Even some Japanese, it seems, with their limited opportunity to learn the Bible recognize the inconsistency that such a theory as Green holds, may entail. It makes the man who is told to love even his enemy, become the slayer of his own brother in Christ, and we do not have to overdraw the picture to show the possibility, even the probability, of the occurrence of such a horrible deed. Bro. Green feebly seeks to reply by saying: “No genuine Christian has ever done this as pictured, for no Christian ever starts a war,” a perfect example of deliberate evasion.

Furthermore, we must never forget that at the very time Paul wrote Rom. 13, Nero was emperor of Rome and was as absolute in his power as Stalin or Hitler ever got to be. Moreover, this Nero became one of the most cruel tyrants of all history. Yet Paul said of his government: “He is a minister of God.” Perhaps, it was not merely a coincident that such a ruler reigned at the time Paul thus wrote, in view of what these brethren now try to make of Paul’s instructions. I wonder whether or not Bro. Jones could have had anything to do with the government of Rome at that time—the time Paul wrote Romans 13. At one time Green affirms that God will not recognize a sinner, then admits that God did recognize Cyrus, whom Green also says was a sinner. He stoutly affirms that it is wrong to serve in the army of an aggressor nation then says the early Christians did serve in the army of Rome and that Rome was “a conquering power.” That certainly ought to rule Bro. Jones out as well as Green, for Jones will have nothing to do with an apostate government and according to Green a conquering power is an apostate government. Consequently, these brethren have placed themselves in an attitude of refusing the very government in power at the time Paul wrote. Likewise, both of them assert that the early Christians were in the armies of this conquering

(27)
power, contrary to the expressed views of both Green and Jones.

At one time Bro. Green quotes Rom. 13 as referring to persons, then another time affirms that it refers only to the institution of civil government. They have executed a finished job of mutilating this fine old passage from Paul, but careful and conscientious readers will not be impressed with their varied views and contradictory statements.

Finally, it ought to be pointed out that the passage refers solely to the relation of a citizen to his own government, and not to the relation of one government to another, and makes no reference to wars between nations. This passage does not have reference to wars between nations as some have used it, and the Bible is significantly silent as to Christians and carnal wars.

**Cornelius: Acts 10**

Any intelligent reader can read what the Bible says about Cornelius and know that not one word is said to enable one to determine whether he continued in office or ceased to be a soldier. The record simply does not say. It offers not one thing for or against the subject of this discussion. Bro. Green writes one and a half pages on this subject and makes some statements that are ridiculously absurd. Note this one: "How could he know he ought to cease being a soldier unless the apostle plainly told him? And how could Peter keep from telling him, when, according to verse six, Peter was to tell him what he 'ought to do.'" An answer in kind would he to say: "Peter was not told to tell him what he was not to do." What I wrote under “Inconsistency No. 1” will show the absurdity of his statement. May I add here: "How could Paul have known he was to cease persecuting the church unless Ananias plainly told him? And how could Ananias keep from telling him when he was to tell Paul ‘What he must do’? But suppose for argument's sake that Cornelius did remain in the army, as Green and Amis both want to prove. Then he remained in the army of "a conquering power" (Green), and therefore was where a Christian ought not to be, also according to Green, who said: "I have never
said the Christian can go to war, in the sense of being the aggressor.” Amis wrote: “War for conquest has no ground for justification.” There we have it now: Poor old Cornelius remaining in the army of an aggressor nation and consequently wrong according to both Green and Amis. Why get Cornelius into such a predicament? The facts are that he was never in any predicament at all; Green and Amis merely assumed that he remained in the army because such an assumption was needed by them, but they overlooked that their teaching elsewhere had previously condemned Cornelius if he had remained in the army of an aggressor nation, called by Green “a conquering power.” “Truth is never so embarrassed.”

John 18:36

“My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.”

Here is a plain passage no one need have any difficulty understanding, yet in all my experience I have yet to find a man of Bro. Green’s persuasion who when asked why Christ’s servants did not fight on this occasion, would give exactly the same reason Christ gave. Bro. Green modifies it thus: “He ordered his acts to fit his mission,” as if Christ did not have words to express himself thus. This is a fair sample of the answers one gets when he asks why they did not fight. Bro. Green laments much over the fact that his brethren seem to have overlooked “the principle of self-defense,” as he calls it. Perhaps, many have overlooked it for the same reason Stephen passed it by, and for the same reason the servants of Christ did not fight that he should not be delivered to the Jews; namely, his kingdom is not of this world—a fact that still holds true, and therefore still a good reason why his servants do not fight. Can self-defense be a more worthy cause for fighting than defending an innocent man who is attacked by an unlawful mob bent on murder? According to the principle of self-defense these servants had the right to fight that mob.
It is proper here as elsewhere, to let Bro. Green defeat his own argument. Grasping at what he thinks evidently is a way around this plain reason Christ gave, he declares that inasmuch as Christ said his servants would fight if his kingdom were of this world, then all that remained for them was to have citizenship in an earthly kingdom—"a political government," and he says, "Then we have his word for it that they may fight." Such a conclusion is not mere shortsightedness, it is total blindness. Does not Bro. Green know that these servants already possessed citizenship in a civil government? Under the heading: "Paul a Citizen of Two Kingdoms," he says: "Paul was a citizen at one and the same time of both the kingdom of Christ and the Civil Government of Rome. If Paul can stand in both relations, so can I. If not, why not?" This is very true, but it is also true that these servants of Christ stood in both relations and as citizens of the civil government had the very right, Green affirms they would have had if Christ's kingdom were of this world. He inserts the parenthesis (a political kingdom) after the word, world, and thus shows he meant that they only needed to be citizens of a political government to fight. Then inasmuch as they were at that very time citizens of "a political government" and did not fight, Bro. Green has to be wrong in his interpretation. As we stand today: Citizens of the United States and of the kingdom of Christ, we are exactly in the same relation these disciples were who refused to fight for the greatest cause on earth. Why? Because Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and not as Green argues: that they needed citizenship in "a political government," for this they had. They stood as citizens of a political government in the face of what Green calls "a wicked aggressor against an innocent victim," and according to Green's and Amis' idea of good citizenship, they failed utterly to do their Christian duty. Too bad Bro. Green did not realize that these servants had citizenship (as he affirmed of Paul and himself) in two kingdoms already, before giving us his imaginary picture of what they could have done had they been citizens of a political government. If Green and Amis are right, why could not these servants of Christ have crushed
Non-Combatant Service

There are many forms of service which a soldier may do without thereby having to perform an act unrighteous per se. In fact, there are so many non-combatant jobs for every combat soldier, that it is most surprising for Bro. Green and Bro. Amis to make the charge that Christian boys hinder the government by asking for such work. If any one is tempted to answer that, there would be no army if all should ask for such service, then we refer to the scriptures to show conclusively that the time never will come when there will be many people with such convictions. Just as long as it remains true that "narrow is the gate and straitened the way that leads to life and few there be that find it," just so long will conditions prevent very many from asking for non-combatant service because of conscientious religious convictions.

One of the most helpful forms of non-combatant service and one peculiarly adapted to the Christian's attitude, is that of an aid man. It seems that no one could object to binding up the wounds of any man and removing him to a place where proper medical aid can be provided. True enough this type of service is as dangerous as that of the combat soldier, but no argument is here being offered with reference to providing a conscientious objector with freedom from danger, but rather a kind of service he can perform in subjection to his government without having to do anything contrary to what a Christian may do. Deeds of mercy and kindness to wounded men, including enemy civilians and enemy soldiers, is a good work for a Christian to do. The good Samaritan so aided a wounded man and there is nothing in the story to indicate that he first took time to determine whether the man would later do right or wrong. A man was wounded and needed help and he helped him. In awarding the Medical Badge to officers and enlisted men in this type of service, the citation says, "For having shared daily with the Infantry the hazard and hardships of combat."

In view of these facts, it is wholly unfair and even unrighteous for Bro. Green and others who teach as he does,
to charge that conscientious objectors are such to avoid danger. When a man makes such accusations and writes sarcastically about the boys who object to combat service, it impresses one rather strongly that the writer himself is thus reacting to a none too courageous spirit within himself.

On October 8, 1945, it was announced from Washington that a conscientious objector had been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for outstanding bravery in aiding his wounded comrades during the fighting on Okinawa. If this action by the War Department does not make certain preachers blush with shame, then I know not how it may be done. This boy refused to bear arms and was transferred to the battalion medical detachment. According to Bro. Green he so acted “to save his own skin,” but according to the War Department he deserved and got the Nation's highest military decoration.

On the other hand it is lamentable that instances may be found where this matter of objecting to combat duty, is actually a subterfuge to secure what may seem to be less dangerous service, and such conduct deserves the severest condemnation. One lady requested me to aid her nephew in making out his registration papers so as to get the classification of a conscientious objector, then a few days later told me they had about decided to do nothing about it as it seemed to be about as dangerous as any other form of service. Needless to say I informed her that such was not the attitude of a conscientious objector, and made no further effort to assist.

**Praying for Rulers I Tim. 2:1**

Bro. Amis thought he saw an argument in this passage he could use, and said “Again I ask: is there anything for which a Christian should pray that he is not duty-bound to work for?” The answer is so simple that it scarcely need be given. The very same passage says: “I exhort first of all that supplications, prayers, intercession, 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.” Yes, we are to pray for *all men*, but there are many I should not work for, and neither should brethren.
like Green and Amis. The answer was in the first sentence of his text, yet Bro. Amis was so blinded by his preconceived notion that he asked the question a second time. Matt. 5:44 says, “pray for them that persecute you” and if Bro. Amis ought to work for them as a consequence of his praying for them, then he would become his own persecutor. Nothing short of emotional blindness can account for all these evidences of erratic thinking and weakness. Human beings are as much possessed with a fighting instinct as they are with a mating instinct, and it is just as necessary for Christians to suppress improper conduct resulting from one as well as the other. Followers of Christ ought to be “slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.” James 1:19, 20. Bro. Amis asked: “Can I pray for something wrong?” as if that clinched his argument. Would a persecutor of Christ's disciple be wrong? Mt. 5:44. Are “all men” right? I Tim. 2:1.

Walking by Faith

“For we walk by faith, not by sight.” II Cor. 5:7. The faith which comes of hearing the word of Christ and by which a Christian walks, or regulates his manner of life, is far more than a mental acquisition by which one becomes expert at theorizing on the precepts of a dead teacher. It is that by which a trustful acceptance of a living Lord dominates and controls one's every way of life through the confidence in Him as both able and willing “to do exceeding-abundantly above all that we ask or think.” Such a conviction governs the conduct of the child of God, and thus he walks by faith, a belief of God's word that carries with it full conviction and trust in Him as the Savior of men.

The demons also believe and tremble in one sense of faith. (Jas. 2:19). That sense is an acceptance of certain facts relative to Christ and religion. When people become so excited as to what may happen to them in event they take God exactly at his word, then it is time to take an inventory as to just what kind of faith one has. The New Testament abounds with assurances that God cares for his own and that
he is able to do what he wills and fulfill his every promise. The same God that has any special care to offer a soldier on the battle field, as Bro. Amis declared, also has power to protect and shield the family of his servant who takes him at his word and follows it. No better proof of one's love for God is to be found than a willingness to accept what he has promised and therefore follow his teaching. There is no misunderstanding of what is meant in Mt. 5:39, and to ignore its plain teaching, is tantamount to an acknowledgment of a lack of faith. Such murmuring and crying out were manifest among God's people in the Wilderness, and Paul refers to such as evidence that God will be displeased with such faithless conduct on our part. 1 Cor. 10:7-11.

“What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who is against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things.” Rom. 8:31, 32. “Seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.” Mt. 6:33. “And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.” Rom. 8:28.

A man might as well resort to stealing for his family's needs, as to resort to force for their protection contrary to Christ's teaching in Mt. 5:39. To violate God's command in one respect is no worse than to do so in the other. As for the ruffian that is to abuse my wife and children, I have never seriously been concerned about such a thing ever happening so long as we trustingly follow the Lord, doing what he has commanded even when to do so means going contrary to all human experience and all human intelligence. Nothing short of that attitude can be properly recognized as faith that saves. Both the Old Testament and the New are full of examples of such faith. In particular, Abraham is held out to us as the supreme example of faith. Yet when he was promised a son contrary to all human knowledge and experience, “he waivered not through unbelief.” And of all things humanly unreasonable he was ready to sacrifice his only son by promise, through whom were the promises of blessing to future generations, just because God had told him
to do it. That is faith, and thus do men walk by faith. All this noise about the criminal's attack, discounts the God we worship as a divine being, and relegates our faith to the grade of the Japanese who hold to a divine emperor who lost the war. God is able, according to the scriptures, and also by the same evidence he is willing to take care of his own. I believe that and so act, hence can eliminate one worry that seems to disturb some brethren. The God I serve is a divine being and therefore no human device or prowess is able to thwart his care for us; otherwise, he should be only another Hirohito. Nothing hinders ready acceptance of such passages as Mt. 5:39, as much as a faithless heart. "O, Ye of little faith," has a very definite application just here.

At times the righteous suffer according to God's will and purpose. Paul had his thorn. Hence, it is not to be expected that God will so care for his servants that no inconvenience or suffering will be allowed. If such is necessary for their good, then God, better than any one, knows it and grants it.

The Need for Teaching

In view of the number of young men who as Christians faced the important decision as to engaging in war under the government's system of selective service, either ignorant of the true teaching or without sufficient faith to stand for their real conviction on the matter of slaying men, we ought to give vivid attention to teaching openly and freely on what God has taught regarding it. As indicated in the preceding chapter, we have not deepened faith sufficiently in the hearts of those taught but rather many teachers have been content to regard faith as a superficial thing, the acceptance of a doctrine rather than a conviction of such strength as will govern and dominate one's conduct under all conditions and circumstances fearlessly.

Most of our preachers know the truth on this question but for one reason or another we have neglected to teach as much on this part of God's word as upon other portions. If any have been guilty of such neglect just because there are brethren among us who object to it, then it is very plain that such a teacher is not a servant of Jesus Christ (See Gal.
1:10). On the other hand, if a failure to teach is due to our error in judgment, then by all means let us now take necessary precaution to prevent this ever happening again. Let the preachers speak out boldly on this subject so that never again will our young men come to such a period, untaught and without sufficient faith in Christ to enable them to stand against all that worldly people can do—not to mention the ugly efforts of some preachers to incriminate them.

Instead of designating these young men as murderers as Bro. Green insists we must do (another opinion that might be wrong), they must be taught the truth as revealed in the New Testament and nothing should be allowed to prevent such teaching. It is comparatively easy to condemn conduct on which general agreement seems to exist, but to subject ourselves as teachers to criticism, and offend certain brethren who for lack of faith advocate taking matters into their own hands rather than submit to God's clear instruction, requires courage and preachers should manifest it. To excuse ourselves on the ground that to teach on this question might cause trouble among members of the same congregation, is just another alibi to ingratiate oneself with his “clientele.”

The truth must be preached if we are faithful to Christ, where the question of doing right or doing wrong is as obvious as this matter of taking human life. It is not a matter of opinion or of individual judgment, but something on which we have clear teaching in God's word and hence something not to be neglected in our preaching.

**Debating the Issue**

Bro. Green has asserted that this issue is a live one and will so continue to be even after the war. If so, then let us make it live enough to discuss it in open debate. It is possible that some one may charge that this review falls short of making proper reply to Brethren Green, Amis, and Jones, then to offset such a charge in advance I hereby offer to debate the question with any one of the two: Green or Jones, and due to the death of Bro. Amis more than one year ago, I offer to debate it with Bro. Rue Porter who has been recommending and distributing the book Bro. Amis wrote. If we could
debate this question in some centrally located place such as Fort Worth, where Bro. Robert Jones preaches, or Spring­field, Missouri, where Bro. Amis lived and taught, I believe there would be found a large number of brethren who would approve and also attend the discussion.

If we have among our schools any officials or teachers who teach the doctrine espoused by Green, Jones, and Amis, then too it is suggested that they prove their doctrine in an open discussion rather than teach it to our young people in a closed classroom. Objection to discussing the issue with me is not a necessary deterrent to a discussion since there are many others available who are more able to discuss it than I am. Nothing will determine so well who is courageous as the challenge for a debate on the issue. Let these men who have belittled the courage of our young men who sought exemption from combatant service, now manifest their own courage by accepting the challenge to debate this question. Let brethren everywhere remind them constantly that they have been challenged. The author of this book has not forgotten what happened among such brethren after the last war, and with all their boisterous condemnation of the conscientious objector, they certainly ought not to be allowed to become as quiet as they did following World War I, but be required to meet the opposition face to face in public debates in many places so that sincere brethren may have the opportunity of knowing just which doctrine will stand the test of God’s truth.

As to the statement of a subject for debate, let the man who advocated combat service for Christian boys in World War II, affirm that it is according to the teaching of God’s word to obey such commands as were officially given soldiers serving in that capacity. He said it was right to do it, then why quibble over the wording of a proposition when the actual issue has already thus been definitely established?

In addition to Brethren Jones, Green, and Porter, there are among us the following preachers who definitely have committed themselves to this doctrine of combat service for Christians: Cled E. Wallace, P. W. Stonestreet, Joe H. Blue,
W. E. Brightwell, Foy E. Wallace, and others less well-known. Surely, these men can choose from among their number, or elsewhere, some one to represent their side and whom they regard as qualified to uphold their doctrine in debate. If they will do so, I guarantee to find a qualified man to deny their doctrine. Many brethren want to see a thorough sifting of this issue, such as only a frank discussion will provide. They also have the right to expect that those who espoused this teaching during the war will not refuse to defend it in open debate, written or oral. One of these men has already refused to debate the question on the ground that what he wrote "was before the war was over," and that he now wishes "the brethren would hush about it," and further that he "is willing to drop the question and hold it as private opinion." Any sectarian could offer as sound reason as that for not debating any question. Furthermore, his tolerant attitude is slightly late in manifesting itself.

(Upon request to the author a copy of this book is obtainable without cost by any full-time evangelist or elder of a church of Christ, as long as the supply lasts.)