

10-1947

Bales-Stonestreet Discussion on the Christian and Carnal Warfare

P. W. Stonestreet

James David Bales

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

ACU LIBRARY



0 3064 0003 1598

The Christian and
Carnal Warfare

Debate



DAVIS-STONESTREET

BALES - STONESTREET DISCUSSION

on

The Christian and Carnal
Warfare

▼ ▲ ▼
LIBRARY

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
ABILENE, TEXAS

A Written Debate Between

P. W. STONESTREET

and

JAMES D. BALES

111

First Edition — October, 1947
2000 Copies
Price \$1.00 per copy

Order from
JAMES D. BALES
707 E. Race Street
Searcy, Arkansas

REST
261.63
B184c

21455 James D. Bales
4F.48

*To all students of the Bible who are
interested in the subject herein
discussed, whether on one side
of the question or the other,
this volume is respectfully
dedicated by*

THE AUTHORS

PREFACE BY JAMES D. BALES

The issue herein debated is one of the most vital facing the brotherhood for it determines the way in which Christians shall conduct themselves with reference to certain of their fellow creatures. Therefore, careful and prayerful study of the Scriptures should characterize all who seek the mind of Christ on this subject. It is to be hoped that this debate will help in such a study for in it positions are challenged and thought is stimulated. No person should take either position on the authority of either writer. He should search the Scriptures daily to see which position is right. Only as *you* can see the force and scripturalness of any argument should you accept any particular point. Make your decision on the basis of the truth, and not on the basis of a like or dislike for either author or either position.

The writer does not pretend to have offered the last word or the last argument which can be offered for his position. Others may have approached the subject from slightly different standpoints, or they may have used and emphasized arguments which he has not used. However, he has set forth those which are convincing to him and which sufficiently sustain the position. Each argument must be considered on its own merits, and a fallacy in any particular argument would not destroy any other argument.

This issue is not under discussion in the church of Christ only. Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others may be found on either side of the issue. Nor is this discussion limited to this country. It has been an issue in England, Russia, Canada, and even in Japan and Germany.

I have endeavored to keep my spirit in harmony with Christian love, which, however, permits a person to be plain and to differ sharply with a brother if necessary. I appreciate the personal attitude of Brother Stonestreet. It has helped keep the atmosphere of the investigation clear of personalities.



JAMES D. BALES

It is the writer's prayer that the truth on this subject will stand out in this debate regardless of whether it is for or against the writer.

James D. Bales

February 13, 1946
Searcy, Arkansas

CONTENTS

	Page
First Proposition	1
First Affirmative, Stonestreet -----	1
First Negative, Bales -----	15
I. Genesis 9:6 -----	15
II. Titus 3:1 -----	20
III. Characteristics of a Just War -----	22
IV. Acts 5:29 -----	23
V. The Relevancy of Daniel 2:44 -----	23
VI. Mail Service -----	24
VII. The Roman Government -----	24
VIII. The Roman Army -----	25
IX. The Setting of Romans Thirteen -----	27
(A) Two Different Parties -----	28
(B) Romans Thirteen Teaches Non- Resistance To a Pagan Dictatorship ----	28
Second Affirmative, Stonestreet -----	30
I. Gen. 9:6 -----	32
II. Titus 3:1 -----	38
III. Characteristics of a Just War -----	39
IV. Acts 5:29 -----	41
Second Negative, Bales -----	43
I. No Power But of God -----	43
II. Divine Missions and Divine Approval ----	44
III. The Three Words -----	45
IV. No Cancellation of Obligation -----	47
V. Collective Action -----	47
VI. Two Kinds of Evil? -----	47
VII. Genesis 9:6 -----	51
VIII. The Suffering of the Innocent -----	54
IX. Similarity To Seventh-Day Adventist's Arguments -----	54
X. John 18:36 -----	55
XI. Priests and Pilate -----	56
XII. Titus 3:1 -----	56
XIII. Characteristics of a Just War -----	56
XIV. Citizenship Has Nothing To Do With the Issue -----	58
XV. Acts 5:29 -----	58
XVI. The Passage which Brother Stonestreet Did Not Produce -----	59

Christian Nation -----	183
Rom. 12:19 -----	184
"Negative Commands" -----	185
Question -----	185
Free-Moral Agency -----	188
"Scriptural Divisions of Evil" -----	188
Exchange of Questions -----	188
Right To Be an Objector -----	190
Matthew 5:38 -----	190
Obligation of the Affirmative -----	190
"Motives" -----	190
Third Negative, Stonestreet -----	191
Personal and National Enemies -----	191
John 18:36 -----	194
The Nation and the Church -----	195
Assumed Authority Versus Governmental Authority -----	197
Romans 12:19 -----	197
Fighting in an Army of Aggression -----	198
1 Timothy 2:1, 2 -----	199
Fourth Affirmative, Bales -----	201
How Stonestreet Argues -----	202
Summary of the Affirmative Arguments -----	208
Fourth Negative, Stonestreet -----	211
Misconstructions by Bales -----	213
Summary of Affirmative Arguments Reviewed -----	218

FIRST PROPOSITION

The Scriptures teach that a Christian is to obey the civil government under which he lives in performing its divinely-ordained mission, including combatant military service, conscience approving.

Affirmative: P. W. STONESTREET

Negative: JAMES D. BALES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

By the "Scriptures is meant the Bible; by "teach" is meant what is set forth by express command, necessary inference, or approved example; by "combatant service" is meant to render unto Caesar the man power that is Caesar's; and by "conscience approving" is meant the only fallible guide that the infallible guide requires the Christian to follow.

This global war furnishes an occasion for many observations. One is: In all dispensations of the world's history, God has authorized as a penalty for and a restraint against a well-defined evil that people be killed; but in no dispensation has any person, band, nation, or group of nations, been divinely authorized to *murder* anybody. Hence, among some general truths recorded by Inspiration, we read of: "A time to kill, and a time to heal," etc. (Eccl. 3:5), but we do not read of a time to murder. Already it should be clear to the most casual reader that the word "kill" in the command, "Thou shalt not kill" is used in the sense of *murder*.

Thus killing is forbidden, except as God has provided for it as a restraint against, and a punishment for, murder. Without that divine provision for humanity to restrain humanity and thus preserve by force the fundamentals of the moral law, nothing could save civilization, except a miracle, which is not promised in this age of accomplishing

moral ends by moral-law means, natural ends by natural-law means, and spiritual ends by spiritual-law means. Miracles *performed* were to confirm the *oral* word of God spoken through men, while the same miracles *recorded* are to confirm the *written* word of God.

In this age of the world, we have nothing but the written word of God; and I am obligated to prove my proposition only by the Scriptures (what is written). So it is not to be proved or refuted by any imaginary thing that God could do, but only by what is written and applied to this age to be practiced. The one-talent servant's experience shows the fallacy of depending on the unwritten law of God for accomplishing ends that God has left to the province of man. His unfaithful course was based on the Lord's ability to reap where He had not sown and to gather where he had not scattered. (See Matt. 25:24). While the duty will become more specific as this discussion progresses, it is proper to notice, first, the following general and fundamental principle of law:

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." (Gen. 9:6).

Notice the divine and eternal reason assigned for that law: "for in the image of God made he man." Man is still made in the image of God; and just as the divine reason for that law has no dispensational bounds, neither does the law itself have dispensational bounds. Also, "man" is specified as the avenger of blood in that text; hence, as surely as a Christian is a *man*, so surely is a Christian obligated, under that text, to avenge blood in some way. But we shall see, through subsequent teaching of the New Testament, that no one is justified in taking the law in his own hands, but that the Christian is obligated only indirectly through the civil government.

Man's divine appointment to the mission of avenging blood is co-eternal with another law of God to which man is

subject, as follows: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken," etc. (Gen. 3:19)

Thus, in general terms, Gen. 3:19 is fundamental to man's physical sustenance on earth, while Gen. 9:6 is fundamental to God's moral law; and just as *man* does not cease to be subject to the law of Gen. 3:19 after becoming a Christian neither does he cease to be a "man" after becoming a christian and therefore subject to the law of Gen. 9:6. Logically, a Christian "man" can no more escape responsibility under one of these laws than he can escape subjectivity to the other. But conscience is not always governed by logic and truth, and yet it must be respected, which is the reason my proposition has somewhat to say of conscience. It is plain that to some extent and with some otherwise able teachers, conscience on this subject has overcome logic, often making it necessary to respect conscience and assail its possessor's logic. The fundamental nature and eternal aspect of these laws preclude the radical idea that Christ taught anything in the sermon on the mount or anywhere else contrary to either of them. Moral: A theory that assumes that it is sinful for a Christian "man" to be subject to an eternal law of God, reflects on the righteousness of God's law, regardless of one's conscience or good intentions.

The eternal mission divinely assigned to "man" in Gen. 9:6 is not an indifferent thing; hence, it is not to be governed by the law of expediency, which applies only to indifferent things (things which may be done or left undone), except of course, as the fallible guide (conscience) may strangely protest. Therefore, performing that mission lawfully cannot be intrinsically wrong; and a thing that is not intrinsically wrong and violates no law of expediency, not even so much as coming under the law of expediency, cannot be wrong for a Christian "man" to do, which is made more definite under plain commands of the New Testament to which we are

headed. Thus the preservation of the fundamentals of the moral law are divinely left to the province of man, to be enforced by carnal weapons when necessary; and to paraphrase Mr. Lincoln's immortal utterance, the fundamental aspect of the moral law is divinely provided for the people, to be preserved by the people, on behalf of the people; for Gen. 9:6 commits it thus to the people's hands.

Let us observe and keep constantly in mind that the principle of divine law (Gen. 9:6), upon which the claim of this writer is based, has never been repealed. With its death penalty it was divinely given long before the legal enactment of the precept, "Thou shalt not kill"; and just as it was an underlying principle for the Mosaic precept, so is it an underlying principle for the same precept, "Thou shalt not kill" as given by Christ, and for the same reason, there being no such thing as a law worthy of the name without a penalty for its violation. By this truism, had the penal aspect of the law belonged exclusively to the Mosaic economy, it would have been abrogated, or would have passed into history, when the Mosaic law was fulfilled by Christ. In that case, all that would be left for the Christian would be simply the precept part of the law, "Thou shalt not kill"; and as a consequence, this writer would not be engaged in this discussion. But since Gen. 9:6 did not come with the law that applied exclusively to national Israel, it did not therefore pass into history with that law when it was completely and forever fulfilled by Christ on the cross of Calvary. Hence, it applies to the Christian "man" now under Christ, through the civil government, with all of its ancient life and power for the same reason that it applied to the Israelitish "man" under Moses, through the religio-civil government — Israel.

Because neither Patriarch, Israelite, nor Christian is specified in the ancient law, but simply "man" is specified, it is therefore, by this well-established law of language, made general in its applications; and hence, as it was an under-

lying principle for the patriarch and Israelite, so is it also an underlying principle for the Christian; and that is the very reason this writer is emphasizing it. Hence, regardless of bald assertions, wild speculations, or sickly sentimentalism that have been or may yet be expressed to the contrary on this subject, please do not charge it up to Christianity, for that doctrine is not responsible for it.

No power, of whatever nature, is divinely authorized in this age to enforce a single law that belonged *exclusively* to the Mosaic economy, for Christ fully and forever fulfilled every jot and tittle of that law. Consequently, death penalties for Sabbath violations, witchcraft, etc., peculiar to the Mosaic dispensation, are wholly irrelevant to a scriptural discussion of this subject. Yet some noncombatant enthusiasts try to make a point on such fulfilled acts, making no distinction between law that was fulfilled and a law that is eternal. We are not reasoning from a law that was fulfilled nineteen centuries ago, but a law that is as eternal as "man" himself.

Under the eternal principle recorded in Gen. 9:6 the divine penalty of capital punishment applies in this Christian age to those who violate the divine precept, "Thou shalt not kill," not because it applied also to such criminals under the Mosaic economy, but because Christ, by his own authority, perpetuates the same precept. There was no need to restate the penalty in the same form of expression, because it has never been repealed. Penalties for violating *some of God's laws* are divinely reserved for the next age and man is not divinely commissioned to inflict them, but "man" is divinely named as the executioner of the penalty for murder; and that penalty is fundamental to God's moral law. We have already noted that the Christian "man" is divinely and eternally implied in that law, just as the Israelitish "man" was also implied but not specified. But as this discussion progresses, we shall observe that the Christian's divine obli-

gation is through the civil government, but we do not want to get ahead of the story, so please be patient. The very nature and result of murder precludes the wisdom, both divine and human, of reserving punishment for it for a future age; and by murder is simply meant unlawful killing, whether it is done by rapid or slow process. Hence, may the Christian "man" be alert to his divinely-imposed duty.

By civil government is meant the earthly or temporal governments of the world, of whatever form — such as the United States, England, Germany, and Japan — the powers alluded to in Romans 13, etc. So far as the Christian's relation to it is concerned, we are not logically concerned with the remote history of its origin. So, whether its history runs back through the Roman empire, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, the Babylonish, to the building of the tower of Babel in rebellion against God on the plains of Shinor, or whether it partakes of God's government among the Jews through the writings of Moses — whether its history runs back one or another, or both ways, makes no difference, for the basis for our reasoning begins many centuries this side of the most ancient governments; it dates from about 58 A.D., when the inspired revelation was penned in Romans 13 for the Christian dispensation that such powers are divinely ordained to their divine mission — "to thee for good. But . . . an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." (Romans 13:4), to which Christians sustain an important relationship by inspired command. This is definitely our starting point, because there were no Christians in the world prior to the Christian era to sustain any kind of relationship to any kind of government.

True, people were in covenant relationship with God under previous dispensations, but they were not Christians, which is the fact to be observed in this discussion. Incidentally, not only does inspired history not record any divine warning against people in covenant relationship with God

participating in the affairs of temporal government in previous dispensations, but with respect to the Jewish economy, God gave specific instructions for the conduct of such temporal affairs. Indeed, we observe a divine choice with respect to *form* of government — that of judges instead of kings — in the history of national Israel; but that is the width of the poles from restricting his people then from participating in the affairs of temporal government. That principal has only a spiritual application now, having no reference to the form of civil government that meets divine sanction now. Reference is here made to that history, not because it has any bearing on this discussion, but because it is erroneously held to have a bearing on it.

Even if such temporal powers did originate in rebellion against God, what of it? The fact that they were subsequently ordained of God, given a divine mission, and Christians are commanded to obey them in the light of that mission, makes their divine sanction henceforth depend upon their performing that mission and not upon their origin. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee," said the Psalmist in praise to God. Such powers being ordained to a mission gives them a chance for divine approval; fulfilling that mission, guarantees that divine approval. All such powers are ordained in this age. Some are fulfilling their mission, while others are not; some are *abusing* their power, while others are *using* it in harmony with their divine mission. Throughout the history of such powers during the Christian era, their downfall or prosperity has turned on their fulfilling or failing to fulfill their divine mission, for the word of God is not a dead letter but is living and active, no less in temporal affairs than in eternal affairs.

Inasmuch as the prophecy of Dan. 2:44 was fulfilled in the destruction of the kingdoms there referred to and thereby that prophecy became history, so far as its reference to temporal powers is concerned, that Scripture has no ref-

erence to temporal governments existing now. Therefore, there is nothing in the Bible to indicate that such governments will not be co-existent with mankind on earth. Assuredly there is much in human nature that suggests they will be needed as long as man inhabits the earth. Beyond that period we are not, in this discussion, concerned with their destiny.

Centuries before the Christian era, the mission of civil governments was well established by performance, and that mission became *divine* upon sanction. Some rulers of such powers did that which was evil and others did that which was good in the sight of Jehovah, showing that they had the exercise of will and choice between good and evil relative to moral principles; and the advent of Christianity assigns no new obligation peculiar to Christianity to that mission, neither did it cancel any part of their established mission that was good in the sight of Jehovah. Hence, such powers with an established mission with a choice for weal or woe, are the very powers "ordained of God." (Romans 13:4). Thus, the Roman letter is addressed to Christians and tells, among other things, the nature of the civil government's mission that is divinely approved, especially that part of it that pertains to the fundamentals of the moral law, for epistles tell what they *imply* no less than what they *specify*.

Much of the temporal government's mission is left wholly to human judgment — such as the mail service, the preservation of national resources, regulation of the monetary system, etc. — and while all such provisions, protection and blessings are in the final analysis dependent upon military force; yet, it is only the purpose in these pages to deal especially with the divine mission of the civil government at which the conscience of some of its citizens protest. By its very nature and purpose, the province of the temporal government is to restrain only that form of evil upon which the public and national welfare depends. If it should attempt

to punish for and restrain against other forms of evil, it would thereby become a *religious* institution, which would be unscriptural, because it is not the *church*; and hence, that mission is not divinely sanctioned for it. But in dealing with forms of evil with which it is scripturally and logically concerned, its mission is divinely sanctioned, as follows:

"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 Peter 2:13, 14).

Thus, relative to the only form of evil with which the civil or military government is logically and scripturally concerned, it has a divine mission. In general terms, it is "for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well."

Could anything be plainer? Of course, if a civil government gets its mission reversed and persecutes "them that do well," as the historic Roman government did when it commanded the apostles not to teach any more in the name of Christ, then Peter's decisive reply, "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29), would be just as fitting now as it was then. That which made that command of the Roman authorities the word of men was the fact that it was outside the government's divine mission; but conversely, had that command been in harmony with its mission divinely approved, it would have been the word of God, as much so as any man has ever spoken for God. If not, why not? No wonder Peter replied as he did. He knew the prohibition to teach in the name of Christ was not a prerogative of government divinely assigned, but was simply man's word. Not only was that Roman command wide of its mission, but it even had a religious significance, which made it doubly erroneous, for the church is the pillar and ground of the truth—not the civil government. The only interest the civil government, as such, can scripturally have concerning

the truth is to keep tolerable order while it is preached, allowing every one the moral right to accept it or reject it, as one may elect. (Incidentally, there is no scriptural reason for desiring that Christian men be in civil offices or places of authority, but there is every reason for desiring men who are willing and able to enforce the laws.) The only religious institution that exists by divine authority in this age is the church of which Christ is head. Institutions founded by man are not evil until given a religious veneering, then they become rivals of the divine or counterfeits of the genuine.

While vengeance has ever belonged to God (See Deut. 32:35), there are two aspects of God's vengeance. One is against certain forms of evil that is divinely reserved to be wreaked exclusively by God; the other is against certain other forms of evil in which human instrumentality is divinely used and has ever been used. That which is thus accomplished through human instrumentality, yet according to God's law, may be faithfully ascribed to God. (Illustration: We read of God hardening Pharoah's heart and also of Pharoah hardening his own heart. Both statements are true and there is no conflict. The import is that God is the author of the law by which Pharoah hardened his heart.) Just so, when Christians "give place unto the wrath of God," concerning that aspect of God's vengeance that God has committed to "man," whether Patriarch, Israelite, or Christian, it is not merely that one's personal vengeance that is thus wreaked, but it is also God's vengeance, because God is the author of the law by which it is accomplished. The Christian is forbidden to wreak vengeance in a purely personal capacity. Of all people on earth who should be able to make this scriptural distinction between acting in an *individual* capacity and in a *collective* capacity, the Christian should be most adept; for according to religious law, concerning a personal grievance, Christ authorizes the Christian to take a stern course against another only after the grievance has

been put before the church for *collective* action. (See Matt. 18:15-17). Thus, may this principle be impressed once and for all, that even in church affairs, *collective authority far exceed individual authority.*

Accordingly, we read: "Avenge not yourself, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God, for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord." (Romans 12:19).

This *positive* command to "give place unto the wrath of God" is in perfect harmony with the *negative* command: "neither give place to the devil" (Eph. 4:27). To quote Romans 12:19 on this important subject and then stop is to pervert the text, for the New Testament does not conclude the subject with that text. By further investigation, we see that Christians are not assuming the prerogative of God when, in harmony with God's revealed law and in obedience to his commands concerning vengeance, they pursue a course accordingly; but not to observe God's law and commands concerning vengeance, would be to "give place to the devil," for as surely as the New Testament is the word of God, the devil is to be resisted with both the sword of the Spirit and also the literal sword; and as to which is to be used in a given case, depends on the form of evil involved and whether or not the resistance calls for collective resistance at the government or individual resistance, for human agency is no less involved in the operation of God's law of vengeance against a certain form of evil than it is in the operation of God's law respecting the gospel for saving souls. In neither case are we logically concerned with these two powers of God (the gospel and vengeance), except as revealed to us in the Scriptures and as we sustain a relation to them by inspired command.

Since the Roman letter had already been directed to Christians (Chapter 1, verse 7), the emphasis on "your-selves" in 12:19 is most significant. Here is what Webster

says it signifies: "You and not another; you, in your own person or individuality. When used as a nominative generally accompanied by *you*, it expresses no opposition; as *you* must do it *yourself*: you yourself must do it; that is, you must do it personally," etc. Thus, it is plain, there is an important difference between doing a thing in a personal capacity, of our own initiative, on the one hand, and in doing the same thing under command of the government and the teaching of the Scriptures, on the other.

We have a similar negation expressed in Titus 3:5 concerning being saved by God's mercy. There the significance is on "ourselves": "not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us," etc. A human theory claims that the Titus text precludes the necessity of man doing anything at all in the matter of being saved by God's mercy, just as another human theory claims that the Romans text forbids the Christian doing anything in the process of executing God's vengeance through his "powers that be." Both interpretations are erroneous and for the same reason: Neither takes into consideration the whole counsel of God, respectively, on the two subjects.

How, then, are Christians to "give place unto the wrath of God" relative to the form of evil inflicted on the world by the Axis powers in precipitating this global war? Just two verses further on, we are told: "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 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 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 honor." (Romans 13:1-7).

"Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every good work," etc. (Titus 3:1).

In the foregoing quotations from the Scriptures the words "submit," "obey," and "be ready" are used in setting forth the Christian's relation to the civil-military government. In the light of the Saviour's statement that man is to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," the words are most significant. The teacher is not, therefore, justified in stressing the word "submit" to the exclusion of the others, just because that word could be construed to teach only passiveness concerning the government's divinely-sanctioned mission, but faithfulness demands that all three of these terms be stressed. Accordingly, we notice them, because each one has its own circumstantial and psychological application, as follows:

1. "Submit." Its meaning of yielding shows that it involves giving up something. Hence, as it expresses an attitude toward *human or temporal affairs*, it is especially applicable under circumstances when, because of religio-political combines, Christians were and are persecuted because of their faith. Thus, as that word is applied by humanity to humanity, we submit only to objectionable conditions and things. But the way it is being misapplied, some Christians have themselves in the ridiculous attitude of submitting to being saved from a sinking ship, a burning building, or Nazi bondage, at the hands of the government, etc.

2. "Obey." This word has a more general application; and while it, too, expresses a scriptural attitude toward the civil-military government, it does not imply the bending, mental process on the part of the obedient that the word *submit* suggests. While service rendered under each of these words may be precisely the same, it is not done under the same mental frame. The text or context in which these words are used shows that service under either is conditioned upon doing only that which is in harmony with the government's divinely-sanctioned mission. Duty would call for suffering martyrdom rather than violate that mission.

3. "Be ready unto every good work." This also expresses a scriptural attitude toward the civil-military government of willingly cooperating in that which is good or approved—according to its divinely-sanctioned mission.

In the realm of religion, that which marks the logical limits to the Christian's duty to obey church or ecclesiastical authority is the divine mission of the church. Likewise, and for exactly the same reason, the civil-military government's mission, divinely-sanctioned, marks the logical limits to the Christian's duty to its authority; for God sanctions nothing in the moral realm that a Christian may not do, except in the realm of expediency, and we have already observed that this subject does not so much as come under the law of expediency, because it is not of the class of indifferent things.

But without valid reasons, the *fallible guide*, conscience, may protest against such service; in which case the Christian is enjoined to heed that protest, for no one can obey God in any matter with a conscience protesting against that obedience. Thus, my proposition is proven by what the Scriptures teach—not by what conscience dictates. But here we rest our case till we hear from our good friend, Brother Bales.

FIRST NEGATIVE

It is pleasant and profitable to study with a brother who manifests such objectivity and tolerance. May prayerful study characterize this investigation.

(1) Definition of terms. (a) The proposition makes clear the meaning of combatant service as combatant service in the army. The definition which makes it mean "to render unto Caesar the man-power that is Caesar's" assumes the very point the opposition must prove; i. e., that Christians owe Caesar military service. Jesus' statement concerning Caesar had no reference to military service. (b) Does the term "Christian" include women? Should they kill if the government commanded it?

(2) All Christians agree that not every command of a government should be obeyed. All are conscientious objectors at some point. The question is *where* should one object.

(3) What am I denying? I am *not* anti-government. (a) All powers are of God (Rom.13:1). (b) All have a divine mission of wrath. (c) Christians obey them when it does not violate God's will for *Christians*. (d) Conscience enters into acceptable obedience. (e) *I deny* that Christians are to take vengeance even as agents of a government.

As we examine the arguments bear in mind that the opposition is trying to prove that the *Christian* must, under some circumstances, bear the sword.

I. Genesis 9:6

This was prior to the Christian era. The proposition is concerned with what a Christian should do and no amount of reasoning concerning "eternal laws" can put anything in the new covenant, that became of force after and not before Christ's death (Heb. 9:15-17), which was not given with reference to the new covenant. Thus neither this pas-

sage, nor Eccl. 3:4-8, can tell us what it is *time* for a *Christian* to do.

Read (1) What follows *if* his argument is right? (a) Capital punishment. But what does that have to do with combat service in the army in a war? Does this authorize bombing crowded cities when one is certain that the aged, women and babies will perish? Is bombing babies, even German babies, lawful killing? If it is unlawful, if it is killing one who has not shed blood, then Brother Stonestreet's argument demands the death of such bombers. (b) Christians should kill those who persecute and kill Christians. The Christian is a "man" and persecutors who kill Christians are murderers; therefore, Christian men should kill these murderers. The church in Jerusalem, when persecuted, should have called on Rome to execute those who killed Stephen and James. If Rome failed to do it the Christians should have done it so that God's eternal law of Genesis 9:6 might not be violated. Furthermore, when Rome persecuted Christians, Christians should have killed Nero. Someone must enforce God's law if the government refuses to do it. This cannot be refuted *if one clings to this argument*. Furthermore, Brother Stonestreet thinks that Rome became an outlaw power when she persecuted Christians and therefore, on his logic, she should have been punished. Who would punish her if Christians did not? The government would not plan to punish itself.

(2) The argument is not sound. As an argument for combat service in the army it breaks down entirely when we remember that Brother Stonestreet argues that a *murderer* must be killed. (a) The military does not consider the enemy soldier as a common murderer. When he surrenders he is treated fairly well, receives wages while in prison and he is sent home after the war. Stonestreet's argument would maintain that if the enemy soldier had killed American soldiers before his capture, he should be executed. *Does he*

believe that all enemy soldiers who have killed Allied soldiers should be executed? If he does not, he does not believe his own argument. (b) Genesis 9:6 has no reference to international wars, but to killing someone who has killed. War leads one to kill those who have not killed, as well as those who have. It also leaves unpunished multitudes who have killed. Are the bombers killing murderers when they drop thousands of tons of bombs on cities which include multitudes of women and children, some of whom are bound to be killed? Does a blockade, which helps starve women and babies, have as its purpose the killing of murderers? Does it discriminate between the innocent and the guilty? It does not, therefore war does not enforce Gen. 9:6. (c) according to this argument, if a bomber kills a baby, and they know that some of them will do it when they bomb cities, or if a soldier kills a soldier who has not killed, such a soldier should himself be killed. The man he kills may have been forced, or thought he was, into his army and he may think he is defending his country against killers. (d) The analogy between Genesis 9:6 and war is not true even in a general sense, unless one is sure that he kills murderers only and that he himself is innocent. Historians seldom say that one party to a war is entirely innocent and the other party entirely guilty.

↳ (3) Does "The fundamental nature and eternal aspect of these laws preclude the radical idea that Christ taught anything in the sermon on the mount or anywhere else contrary to either of them" (P.W.S.)? This is a dangerous approach. It determines, before one even goes to the New Testament, that Christ could not have repealed certain things. To find out what He can do, one *must* go to the New Testament. Does he deny the authority of Christ by making this assumption that this is of universal application and that Christ, therefore, could not have taught differently. This assumes the entire question which is being debated, even before *Christ's* new testament is considered.

(4) If Genesis 9:6 does set forth an eternal principle, it does not teach who is to be the avenger today. The New Testament alone could decide the question for today.

(5) Genesis 9:6 abrogates Christ's teaching concerning His disciples or Christ abrogates it for His disciples. If it is binding on the Christian "man," *he has no right* to exercise mercy, he must always exact strict justice. Matt. 5:38-48 and Rom. 12:14, 17-21 have no meaning for they cannot have any reference to the conduct of the Christian man for he is under the iron law of Genesis 9:6. We cannot do unto others as we would that they should do unto us. We must do unto others what they have done unto us and unto others. James said that some had "condemned and killed the just: and he doth not resist you" (Jas. 5:6). The theory based on Genesis 9:6 says that he should have resisted them; and if he failed to do it, those who were left after his death should have killed his murderers. After all, the "just" was a man, in the image of God, who had been killed by man and the Christian man is under the law which necessitates the destruction of the murderer!

This argument abrogates the cross whereon the godly died for the ungodly and made possible the forgiveness of murderers. The Jews and Romans killed the just man, Jesus, and such murderers must be put to death. The government would not do it for the government was the offender. Who would punish these murderers, what *man* would shed their blood, unless the Lord's disciples did it? The Lord's disciples had not heard our brother's theory; so, instead of telling these murderers that Christ could not abrogate the eternal law of Genesis 9:6, they told them to repent and be baptized into Christ unto the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:23, 37, 38; 3:15, 17, 19, 26). We also ask: Should Saul of Tarsus have been killed?

Which abrogated which? Christ said not to take an eye for an eye (Matt. 5:38-48), but Brother Stonestreet main-

tains that this law of strict justice must be followed and it must be death for death.

(6) The argument on Genesis 9:6 would demand that any government that puts to death, unjustly, any of its citizens should be punished either by those citizens, or by other governments. Should we punish the Russian government for what it has done to some of its citizens in times past? If not, why not?

(7) There is a striking similarity between some of Brother Stonestreet's arguments and those of the Seventh-day Adventists. (a) "Notice the divine and eternal reason assigned for that law: 'for in the image of God made he man.' Man is still made in the image of God; and just as the divine reason for that law has no dispensational bounds, neither does the law itself have dispensational bounds." (P.W.S.). The S. D. A. say that the Sabbath is a memorial of God's rest after creation, and that therefore it stands as long as creation stands. Creation still stands, therefore

Read } (b) Man "is specified as the avenger of blood in that text; hence, as surely as a Christian is a man so surely is a Christian obligated, under that text, to avenge blood in some way." (P.W.S.). The Sabbath was made for man (Mk. 2:27). The Christian is a man; therefore . . . As long as man is man, the S. D. A. argue, the Sabbath was made for him. Of course, the real question is: *Made for what man?* One then studies the Bible to see to what man it was given. For example, God took woman, after making her, and gave her to man. She was made from and for man (Gen. 2:22-). Brother Stonestreet is a man, therefore Eve was made for him. A man must be born again to enter the kingdom (John 3:3, 5). Adam was a man, therefore Adam had to be born again. But the question as to what man is settled when we investigate the context and the dispensation under which it was given. (c) Like the S. D. A. Brother Stonestreet has much to say about eternal law; fundamentals of

the moral law; laws so fundamental that Christ could not abrogate them.

(8) We remind the reader that sacrifices were given to man before the law of Genesis 9:6 (Gen. 4), that circumcision came before Moses; but what does that or Genesis 9:6 have to do with us?

(9) My authorization for labor is taken from the New Testament, not from the Old (Eph. 4:28; 2 Thess. 3:11-12).

(10) Brother Stonestreet's admissions that Genesis 9:6 does not furnish the Christian with authority to take life. "We shall see, through subsequent teaching of the New Testament, that no one is justified in taking the law in his own hands but that the Christian is obligated only indirectly through the civil government." Genesis 9:6 says nothing about this, so evidently he does not regard it as authority which proves his proposition. He also realizes that the proposition can be proved "only by what is written and applied to this age to be practiced." (P.W.S.) This, again, sends us to the New Testament. "Christ, by his own authority, perpetuates the same precept." (P.W.S.). So the issue is: Where does He perpetuate it in the New Testament? In speaking of Romans 13, Brother Stonestreet said: "This is definitely our logical starting point, because there were no Christians in the world prior to the Christian era to sustain any kind of relationship to any kind of government." Therefore, Genesis 9:6 in itself has no reference to the Christian era.

II. Titus 3:1

It is assumed, not proved, that the good work here embraces sword-bearing. *If it does embrace sword-bearing* does it not embrace sword-bearing for Christians in other good works, some of which are mentioned in Titus? (1) Stopping the mouth of false teachers (1:11). (2) Dealing with liars (1:16). (3) Dealing with those who deny

God by their abominable works (1.12). *These things endanger civilization as well as one's salvation.* (4) God's peculiar people are the ones who make up the church (2:14; 1 Pet. 2:9). These, the church, have been redeemed and they are to be "a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14). Two verses after this Paul said to be ready to good works. The "them" of 3:1, to whom the instructions concerning good works were given, was the church. If this passage arms Christians it arms the church for the church is made up of the peculiar people, whom He has redeemed that He might "purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (2:14); the church is being addressed when the "them" of 3:1 are exhorted to do good works.

In Titus 3:1— Paul listed a number of things concerning which Christians are to be put in mind. (a) Subjection to powers. (b) Obedience to magistrates. (c) To be ready to every good work. (d) To speak evil of no man. (e) To be no brawler. (f) "But gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." Is bombing a city or bayoneting an enemy manifesting gentleness and meekness unto *all* men? Is not the soldier's treatment of *some* men exactly the reverse of this? It is impossible to see how this exhortation could be carried out if 3:1 inculcates killing some men.

What kind of evildoers were these Christians faced with, and unto whom they were to manifest gentleness and meekness? "For we ourselves *also* were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." (3:3.) This describes the kind of people they were faced with and toward whom they manifested gentleness and meekness. These hateful men evidently violated both of Brother Stonestreet's classifications of evil, and according to his theory, the rod of iron and not gentleness should have been used on them.

These Christians had formerly been such men. What had changed them? The enforcement of the "eternal" law of Genesis 9:6? No, it was through the love of God, manifested in Christ and His cross (Titus 3:4), whereon the Just suffered for the unjust. If we manifest the spirit of verse 2 toward them, it may be that we can redeem them.

Titus 3:1 has no hint that the good work of the Christian is government service. What about 2 Tim. 2:21, "prepared unto every good work"; 3:8, "careful to maintain good works"; 2:14, "zealous of good works." "In all these passages it is the voluntary good works of the Christians that are enjoined." Being ready to every good work is one of a *series* of injunctions which Paul made and it is no more related to obedience to magistrates than the exhortation to meekness and gentleness refers to governmental service.

III. Characteristics of a Just War

Brother Stonestreet believes that Christians may fight in just wars only. *Please list the characteristics of a just war.* When such are given the following questions are in order. *First*, does it have to be just in its method of prosecuting the war as well as in its cause? *Second*, has this country or Britain ever fought an unjust war? If so, list one or more. *Third*, should Christians have refused in such wars. *Fourth*, if this country or Britain, has ever fought an unjust war, would not your position of Rom. 13:1-5 and Genesis 9:6 make it necessary for you to contend that God would punish, sooner or later, these countries by other countries. For if one country must be punished for its unjust wars, so must every other country. *Fifth*, were the wars of Rome, under which government Romans 13 was written, which established and maintained her Empire, just or unjust wars? We are full of questions, but they are vital, not idle ones. They help us to understand our brother's po-

sition. In answering you may refer to them by section division (III), and number, such as (1), (2), etc.

IV. Acts 5:29

The *Jewish* authorities did not have their command obeyed. Brother Stonestreet realizes that any command from any government which would prohibit our preaching the gospel must be nullified by Christians. He wrote that "the only interest the civil government, as such, can scripturally have concerning the truth is to keep tolerable order while it is preached, allowing every one the moral right to accept it or reject it, as one may elect." Does he imply that: (a) When persecuted because of religion we are to call on civil government and resist the prosecutors through it? Are we to put up with persecution only until we can get the government to function to put down our persecutors? If so, just when is it that we are to pray for and do good unto our persecutors? (b) Is it wrong for civil governments to hire gospel preachers to act as chaplains under its supervision? Is such "wide of its mission" and of "a religious significance"?

If civil government is to be called on by the church to help put down its persecutors, and if it takes for its use and supports the gospel preachers, just how does it still keep from being, what the church is supposed to be, the pillar and support of the truth?

We plan to notice in our first affirmative the fact that the gospel is preached by word and deed and that any command which prohibits, by its very nature, such preaching must be met with the answer—We must obey God rather than man. War against an enemy commands warriors not to preach to enemies but to kill them.

V. The Relevancy of Daniel 2:44

Rome was the fourth kingdom. The very kingdom that Christ's kingdom was smiting was the one to which Paul

said submit (Rom. 13). These two kingdoms were built on principles which were antagonistic to one another. If not, why was Christ's kingdom represented as smiting it? Resistance, however, to Rome was not with carnal weapons but with spiritual weapons. In spite of the fact that prophecy (Dan. 2:44) and the facts of history show that Rome was antagonistic to the kingdom of Christ, God's power is so great that He overruled Rome as a vessel of wrath, such as was Pharaoh (Rom. 9:17, 22; 13:1-).

VI. Mail Service

Civil powers have absorbed many functions which are not related to the exercise of wrath on evildoers. There is no need to discuss these now for our brother grants that they do not come within the "purposes of these pages."

VII. The Roman Government

To emphasize *that which Romans 13 teaches in a democracy, with reference to the obligation of a Christian to the government, it also teaches under a dictatorship*, we shall characterize briefly the Roman government under which Paul wrote. If Romans 13 binds the Christian to carry the sword today *it does so because it so bound in Paul's day*. Unless it taught the carrying of the sword then, it cannot teach it now. If it taught such service then, it taught such under a dictatorship, and therefore it would teach similar service today for Christians under a dictatorship. In other words, this passage does not make a sword-bearer of a Christian in a democracy and a conscientious objector in a dictatorship. If Romans 13 makes any Christian a sword-bearer, it makes all Christians in all countries sword-bearers.

Now let us consider Rome, under which government Romans 13 was written. Rome had some good characteristics, but all in all she was thoroughly pagan. We present

briefly some characterizations which we have presented, with documentation, in *The Christian Conscientious Objector*.

(1) Rome was pagan. (2) Rome was governed by dictators. (3) These dictators came to power through deceit and violence. Nero, who ruled when Paul wrote *Romans*, came to the throne through the intrigue of his wicked mother who deceived others and shed blood that Nero might have the throne which would have lawfully passed to another. Nero later had her killed. He was grossly immoral. He persecuted Christians. It was *under and of* his government that Paul wrote *Romans 13*. (4) Civil and religious life were inextricably interwoven in the Empire. The Emperor was both the civil ruler and the great high priest. Augustus, for example, held four great priesthoods and was the pontifex maximus. The Emperor participated in pagan religious rites, and was also an object of worship. (4) Rome carried on continual wars of aggression and suppression. (5) She violently suppressed those who tried to throw her yoke of bondage from off their native land. (6) Rome opposed Christianity from the time that she found out really what it was. Antagonism was inevitable for Christians placed Christ above Caesar and refused to worship state gods. (7) Rome was the Empire which was smitten by the little stone (*Dan. 2:44*). (8) Divorce and various revolting immoral practices flourished among some of the leading magistrates and rulers. (9) Around 60,000,000 slaves were held within the confines of the Empire, according to the estimate of some. Yet, God overruled Rome so that she was an agent of His wrath. If He overruled her, and He did, no nation today, regardless of how wicked it is, can move beyond His overruling power.

VIII. The Roman Army

If *Romans 13* teaches sword-bearing now, it taught it in Paul's day. If it taught it then it taught sword-bearing

for Rome. If it teaches combatant military service now, it taught it then and thus it taught it with reference to the Roman army for it was the army of the government under which Romans 13 was written. If it taught combatant military service in the Roman army, it teaches Christians today, whatever country they may be brought up in, to render such service to that country. And if it did not teach combatant military service then, in the Roman army, it cannot teach such service today in the army of any government.

What characterized the Roman armies? (1) Coarse brutality was often present. Sometimes officers put to death every tenth man when they could not find the one who had done a certain crime. (2) The armies often destroyed cities, even some which did not resist them. They often plundered, ravaged and burned conquered territories as well as massacred multitudes and enslaved others. (3) The armies engaged continually in wars of aggression in one part of the world or another. (4) Armies of occupation were left to guard these territories, which had been conquered, and these conquered peoples were expected to help pay the cost of these armies. (5) All aspects of army life were inextricably interwoven with some sort of pagan rite or oath. An oath in the name of a pagan god was taken on enlistment and other oaths were taken from time to time. (6) Soldiers were sometimes used to imprison and kill Christians as well as to persecute the church as a body.

Some of these things characterize Japanese armies. We do not approve such, of course, and we do not want anyone to get such an impression. But we must emphasize that these things are no more a characteristic of Japanese armies than of those of Rome. And yet, Brother Stonestreet does not believe that it would be right for Christians to fight in the Japanese army. When he proves (?) that Christians in this country should fight, and denies that those in Japan should fight, he proves (?) it by passages which were written

under a pagan dictatorship whose armies more closely resemble Japan's than American armies. *Remember that what it binds now it bound then and that what it binds now in a democracy, with reference to obedience to government, it bound then under a dictatorship.* To fight in an army in Paul's day meant that one had to fight either for or against Rome. Brethren are agreed that Paul prohibited fighting against Rome. Thus if it approved fighting at all, it approved it for a pagan, totalitarian, conquering dictatorship.

Logic will not let our brethren have it both ways. They must either deny that Christians should have fought for Nero, for Rome (and thus lose their arguments which are based on passages which were written under and with reference to Rome); or they must teach that it is right for Christians under dictatorships today to fight. (In other words, that it is right for Christians there to fight against what Christians here fight for.) *Which position will Brother Stonestreet take.* Either is fatal to his position.

IX. The Setting of Romans Thirteen

Let us take first notice that: (a) This passage teaches now what it taught in Paul's day. If it teaches sword-bearing for the country under which we live, it taught it for Rome, the country under which Paul lived. (b) This passage teaches in every country just what it teaches in any country.

The setting of this passage is significant both with reference to the time and the country under which it was written and its place in this epistle. Paul told Christians to bless their persecutors; to recompense to no man evil for evil; to avenge not themselves; to feed the enemy if he is hungry; and to overcome evil with good. The cause of disturbance is not to be in us (Rom. 12:14, 17-21). However, even then all will not be at peace with us. What are we to do then? (a) Leave vengeance to God (12:19). (b) Do good to the

very enemies who deserve the vengeance (12:20-21). Paul then recorded one way *in which God takes vengeance*, i. e., through the "powers that be" (13:1-). This did *not* tell them how they — Christians — were to take vengeance, or that they were to take it for governments. He is simply informing them that God, to whom they have left vengeance, takes it through all human governments. God thus takes the very vengeance He prohibits them taking (12:19). After telling Christians to submit and to pay taxes, Paul instructed them to have that love which worketh ill to no one (13:8,10). Christians live under the law of love (12:14, 20-21; 13:2, 10), and this law prohibits our taking vengeance even on such wicked people as may plague the earth today. It prohibited their taking vengeance on such a wicked government as that of Rome.

(A) Two Different Parties

The powers of 13:1 and the church, the Christians, to whom Paul wrote were two different parties. Those in subjection were the Christians and those in power were the pagan Roman rulers. The "he" of verse four is not the same party as the "thou" of verse four. *Thus Paul's teaching concerning God's use of human government is not Paul's teaching as to God's use of Christians and the church.* He had told them how to treat their enemies, and now he tells them one of the means through which God takes the vengeance which is left to Him. Rome knew nothing of this. She was never addressed by the Lord. If He had addressed her, she would not have believed the message. He simply overruled her.

§ (B) Romans Thirteen Teaches Non-Resistance To a Pagan Dictatorship

The passage which the opposition views as its main support really teaches the doctrine of non-resistance for which

I stand. In so far as her intentions were concerned, and in so far as human eye could see, Rome was an enemy of the church. (a) Any government, such as described in VII and VIII (which see), would oppose Christianity for Christ challenged her totalitarian attitude which assumed complete control of a person's life. (b) Rome considered the church as an outlaw group when she discovered that it was not just a Jewish sect. (c) She had crucified Christ. (d) If any thought as Brother Stonestreet thinks, they would have used Gen. 9:6 on her.

Christians realized that such was the nature of corrupt Rome and that Rome was the fourth kingdom of Dan. 2:35-44 which Christ's kingdom was smiting. The question in their minds was not whether they should fight for Caesar, but as to whether or not they should obey Caesar at all. Surely if any Christians wondered as to whether or not they should carry the sword at all, they would wonder whether or not they should carry it against, not for, Caesar. It is also likely that the unrest of the Jews against the Romans (See Pendleton and McGarvey on *Romans*) would be reflected in the Jewish element of the church. How should Christians treat *this enemy* which would soon burn some of them to death? How were they to treat this government of which vile Nero was the head? Paul said to submit, to pay taxes, to obey. In other words, do not resist this pagan dictatorship. Is it not strange? *What Paul used to teach non-resistance for Christians to a pagan power, brethren use to prove that Christians should resist pagan powers which are similar in many ways to Rome.*

With reference to military service with the sword, it had only two possible uses for Christians in Rome. First, for Rome; second, against Rome. Human reason, and the position of my opponent, would say: Use the sword to punish Rome's corruption and to strike a blow for human freedom, i. e., for the freedom of millions of slaves and scores of conquered countries. But Paul said not to rebel against Rome.

This left the military sword for one use only, if it were for Christians at all, and that was for Rome. If they used it for Rome, and they were to if they used it at all, they would have to use it for a pagan dictatorship to help it keep its conquered territories and to extend its conquests. *This is the very kind of military service which my opponent says that Christians should not render.* Christians in Japan, he says, should not fight and yet Rome's army in its use was more like the Japanese army than the army of the United States. He fails to show wherein this passage, written under a pagan dictatorship, teaches military service for those who oppose a pagan dictatorship but not for those who live under it. *What it teaches now it taught then* and if it teaches sword bearing now it taught it then for a pagan dictatorship. Such brethren must either give up their argument for sword bearing by Christians, which they base on this passage, or they must argue that Christians under pagan dictatorships today must fight for their country. In other words, they must maintain that it is scriptural for Christians there to fight against what they think Christians here are to fight for. Which position will you abandon, Brother Stonestreet?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Expressions of good will are heartily reciprocated, for on the score of personalities, there is no controversy.

Referring to a part of my definition to the proposition, Brother Bales says: "The definition which makes it mean 'to render unto Caesar the man power that is Caesar's assumes the very point the opposition must prove; i.e., that Christians owe Caesar military service.'"

Granted. But the mere proposition is not supposed to do more than assume! Proof that the manpower of the Christian belongs to Caesar is furnished by the very authority that also furnishes proof that the money and honor of the Christian belong to Caesar. The composite of the

teaching of the passages of the following citation proves, either by specification or implication, that the manpower of the Christian belongs to Caesar at the command of Caesar: 1 Peter 2:13, 14; Romans 13:1-7; Titus 3:1; 1 Tim. 2:1, 2.

Christianity is ever safe in the hands of its author. Hence, there is no danger of moral commands divinely directed to Christians being antagonistic to Christian conduct, for Christ is the author of both. All the commands found in the foregoing citations are directed to Christians. Note their nature: "Be subject to," "be obedient" to, "be ready unto every good work" of Caesar. Compare those commands with another inspired command concerning another power of a different nature, thus: "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." (James 4:7.) Because of the sharp contrast between those commands, no one should confuse the two. Thus, the Christian's attitude toward the civil-military government, as taught in the Scriptures, is just the opposite of the attitude commanded toward the devil. Why, to teach that it is morally wrong for a Christian to use his manpower in obeying the civil-military government in performing its God-sanctioned mission of wreaking God's vengeance upon that class of evil-doers, who challenge the free-moral agency of man and thus assail the foundation of civilization, is to transgress the commandments of God because of tradition. Such teaching has no counterpart in the New Testament.

It will be understood that much more space is required to fully answer than to ask questions. As it is incumbent upon the affirmative to answer the questions of the negative, and not having space to answer them all in detail, it is my purpose to notice them either specifically or in principle. For example, sometimes a question is hypothetical or conditional. In such cases it is my purpose, as a rule, to answer only that which is basic. If by this procedure any particular question of importance to the negative is overlooked,

it will receive special notice if my attention is called to it. To aid in identifying this reply with corresponding subject matter of the negative without quoting so much from it, different sections of the affirmative are numbered according to the order followed by the negative, especially the major heading, as follows:

I. Gen. 9:6

Concerning the eternal principle: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man," Brother Bales says: "This was prior to the Christian era. The proposition is concerned with what a Christian should do and no amount of reasoning concerning 'eternal laws' can put anything in the new covenant, that became of force after and not before Christ's death (Heb. 9:15-17), which was not given with reference to the new covenant."

So was the following principle given before the Christian era, but it is still of force for another eternal reason: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out it wast thou taken." (Gen. 3:19.) Thus, Gen. 9:6 is no less fundamental to God's moral law than Gen. 3:19 is fundamental to man's physical sustenance on earth; and just why one so sensible as Brother Bales and so well versed in the Scriptures would overlook this logical parallel might be considered the eighth wonder of the world. Indeed one wonders whether he concludes that that which is fundamental to God's moral law is immoral for a Christian to engage in. Assuredly, that which is fundamental to the precept, "Thou shalt not kill" is just as moral as the precept itself.

It is but a truism that eternal principles, like the above two, that did not come with the New Testament, are not subject to the conditions of the new covenant becoming of force. True, that which was peculiarly a part of Christ's

will (the New Testament), did not become of force till Christ (the testator) died, which principle is true of all wills, whether divine or human. But just as Gen. 3:19 was of force before, and is of force after, Christ died, precisely the same is true of Gen. 9:6. Certainly, as Brother Bales says: "No amount of reasoning concerning 'eternal laws' can put anything in the new covenant," etc. But due reasoning does take cognizance of the eternal truth that eternal principles are now of force, nevertheless.

By his argument that the eternal principle of Gen. 9:6 is not of force today, Brother Bales betrays the characteristic error of the school of thought that he represents on this subject in failing to distinguish between things that are different. All of that school of thought with whom I have come in contact make the same blunder in failing to observe that important distinction. But be it said to the credit of Brother Bales that he is doing on the subject in general better than any one that I have ever read after on that traditional error. Being thus representative of that school of thought, it is reasonably safe to conclude that when he has been successfully met, that school of thought has been met.

On this point, he fails to distinguish between that which is bequeathed by will to become of force after the death of the testator; and that which is given unconditionally during the life time of the benefactor. His error on this point is far-reaching, which accounts for my using so much space on it. In fact, it is a fundamental error to many of his otherwise plausible arguments and reasonable questions, which I shall therefore not notice specifically unless special attention is called to them.

Illustration: Christ gave his "Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage Law" before he died on the cross. That law was therefore not subject to the terms of his will to become of force after his death, because that law, too, was based on an eternal principle, being true from the beginning;

while deviations from that eternal principle were only temporary, only for dispensational and generations reasons, but such "suffered" (tolerated) departures from that principle were not strictly lawful from the beginning. But saving souls, by the terms of the gospel, became of force only after Christ's (the testator's) death. Why this difference? Because one is *eternal* and the other is *dispensational*; one is *moral* and the other is *religious*; one has *ever been* applicable to mankind; the other has been applicable only *about two thousand years*.

This distinction is in accord with the inspired admonition: "Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright (rightly dividing) the word of truth." (2 Timoth. 2:15.)

Then to handle aright the word of truth is to handle it according to its own inherent provision, for no other method would be right. Hence, on this subject, we are to set aside all traditional ideas of right and wrong, good and evil, moral and immoral and be governed only by the word of truth. Surely Brother Bales will realize that if he wanted to make a friend a present of a gold watch now during his life time and bequeath the same friend one hundred dollars, the watch would be available immediately, while the one hundred dollars would not be available till after his death. The same is true of the gospel and Gen. 9:6.

Let us distinguish between *principles of law* and *law itself*. Contrary to Brother Bales' reasoning, Gen. 9:6 is an underlying principle of law. Laws themselves vary according to dispensation, while principles do not. For example, under Moses it was lawful, and also according to that eternal principle, to kill people under certain conditions. Likewise, under Christ it is lawful, and also according to the same eternal principle, to kill people under certain conditions. The only difference, so far as human instrumentality is concerned, is: Whereas under Moses, God's People

(Israel) were *in direct authority* in the grim business, while under Christ, God's people (Christians) *are under authority* in the same grim business, by inspired command; the civil-military government being in direct authority. But then as now, procedure must be lawful or else it will be sinful, for "sin is lawlessness"; the opposite of law.

Since that procedure was fundamental to the preservation of the moral law then, it is fundamental now; since it was intrinsically right then, it is intrinsically right now; since it was in harmony with the precept, "Thou shalt not kill" then, it is in harmony with that precept now; since God's overruling power then did not justify people in disobedience, God's overruling power does not justify people in disobedience now. Therefore, there is not a logical reason for refusing to obey the powers that be to the extent of their divinely-sanctioned mission.

Brother Bales says: "Genesis 9:6 has no reference to international wars, but to killing someone who has killed."

Again he fails to distinguish between a law and a principle. Soldiers in support of their governments in violating their divinely-sanctioned mission are accomplices in the crime, partakers in the guilt, whether they have personally done any killing or not. The principle is sufficiently broad and general in its meaning to permit laws of individual, local, national, and international application. It is unfortunate that some civilians get killed by governments in performing their God-sanctioned mission. Except as done by out-law nations and soldiers, such killings are accidental. War is not the only human tragedy in which the innocent suffer with the guilty, but that truth is universal in other experiences of life. It therefore has no logical bearing on the subject under discussion, for the affirmative is no more obligated than the negative to explain it, and I do not intend for Brother Bales to make a successful get-a-way with that sophistry.

HALL - P
- 53

Brother Bales tries to show a "striking similarity" between some of my arguments and Seventh-day Adventists' arguments. But his claim for similarity breaks down completely on three counts.

1. He fails to properly distinguish between *principles* and *laws*. A principle may merely relate to God and not involve man, while another principle may involve man through law. As between what is said of God resting on the seventh day after six days of creation in Gen. 2:2, 3, and what is said of "man" being made in the image of God as a reason for "man" being divinely commissioned as the avenger of blood in Gen. 9:6, that difference is obvious.

2. Creation was a divine reason for God's rest on the seventh day. But no divine command of law for man was based on that principle of truth. No man was ever divinely commanded to keep the Sabbath-day because God rested on the seventh day or because of God's creation. God's creation was a divine reason for God's rest only, not man's. Later Moses gave a dispensational law (not a law based on an eternal reason) for another reason that applied to a particular race for a special reason. The Jews were commanded to keep the Sabbath-day holy, not because of God's creation and rest, but because God had led them out of Egyptian bondage with an outstretched arm. That special law, while ever-lasting for that dispensation, was forever fulfilled and nailed to the cross when the only dispensation that commanded it completely passed into history.

3. Thus there is no logical "similarity" between two arguments: the one based on what *God says*; the other based on what *uninspired men claim*. But I would not be too severe with Brother Bales, for he is doing a better job than any one I have ever read after in defense of his claim, the proof for which is based only on human traditions, a misconception of what Jesus taught on the subject, and the dictates of conscience.

Contrary to Brother Bales' hypothetical and ironical reasoning in criticizing my setting forth the New Testament law based on the eternal principle of Gen. 9:6, it is in accord with the teaching of Jesus, except in the minds of students who fail to observe the conditional meanings of Jesus' statements that are absolute only in form. For example, among the many words of the spiritual vocabulary that are derived from other well-known realms of God is the spiritualized word "kingdom." Accordingly, we read: "My kingdom is not of this world: if it 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." (John 18:36.)

The hypothetical "if" in that text is most significant, just as it is in uninspired statements. *If* (and mark that "if") Christ's kingdom were of this world, it would not be a spiritual kingdom, its king would not be a spiritual king, its servants would not be spiritual servants and its cause would not be a spiritual cause. In that case Christ's kingdom would be a rival kingdom of worldly kingdoms; as it is not a worldly kingdom, the converse is true: it is not a rival kingdom among worldly kingdoms. Also, "if" Christ's kingdom were worldly, Christ's servants would fight that its worldly king should not be delivered to the Jews. That settles it. So servants of Christ who have not renounced citizenship in a worldly kingdom are supposed to fight for the worldly cause so far as their spiritual relationship is concerned, especially to the extent that the worldly government follows its divinely-sanctioned mission.

Conclusion: No divine command is needed to perpetuate such a well-established rule of citizens fighting in obedience to worldly kingdoms, but such a command is necessary to terminate that well-established rule. Only homogeneous governments, not heterogeneous governments, can be rivals for the allegiance of mankind. To the extent that an earthly government partakes of the spiritual gov-

ernment, there is ground for rivalry. Our Savior's statement quoted above, was preceded by Pilate's significant statement to Christ, thus: "Thine own nation and the chief priests delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done?" The interests of "the chief priests" show the unscriptural religious aspect of the civil.

So the points of rivalry are always either the unscriptural religious aspects of the *civil*, or else the mistaken civil aspects of the *spiritual*, government. One or the other of these human errors has always caused the rivalry between Christ's kingdom and worldly kingdoms since the occasion of the birth of Jesus, beginning with Herod's undue suspicion of that most notable birth in all history. There are two current schools of thought now—the one Premillennialism and the other represented by the negative on the proposition under discussion—that also fail to effectively make the mental transition from the worldly meaning of the word "kingdom" to its spiritual significance.

II. Titus 3:1

"It is assumed, not proved, that the good work here embraces sword-bearing." (Bales)

Reply: It is a general statement. Therefore no one has a logical right to limit its application. What God has made general, let not man make specific.

"If it does embrace sword-bearing does it not embrace sword-bearing for the Christian in other good works, some of which are mentioned in Titus?"

Reply: No. Punishment for one great class of evil is divinely reserved for a future age; and so far as is revealed "man" is not involved in it. (See 2 Thess. 1:7, 8.) This punishment is for those who "know not God, and . . . obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus," etc. This class of sin and evil is in sharp contrast with that great class of evil referred to in Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14, etc. May we

remember that handling aright the word of truth involves the recognition of the divine divisions in the word of truth according to the word of truth, not according to human traditions.

Concerning those things that pertain to the gospel, Brother Bales adds: "These things endanger civilization as well as one's salvation."

Reply: But those "things" endanger civilization only indirectly or conditionally. Innumerable millions have failed to obey the gospel and yet did not wreck civilization. Besides, the Christian is to proceed lawfully, regardless of results, for "sin is lawlessness"—not according to law. "Fealty to God and equity to man" are accomplished only through God's two powers: that of the gospel and also that of force through the temporal government in harmony with its divinely-sanctioned mission. They are not rivals as ordained of God, but only as misconceived and misused by man.

III. Characteristics of a Just War

"Brother Stonestreet believes that Christians may fight in just wars only. *Please list the characteristics of a just war.*" (Bales)

Reply: Fighting against the character of evil, at the command of the government, referred to in Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14, etc., is precisely the characteristics of a just war. If Brother Bales' discernment of good and evil is dependable for deciding against fighting in a war to overcome that kind of evil, that only settles the question so far as his conscientious scruples are concerned, based on his powers of discernment. But that does not settle the question with reference to the judgment of others who may elect to support the government and fight in obedience to its command because they identify the far-reaching evils of the

current Axis powers with the evils of Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14, etc.

"*First*, does it have to be just in its method of prosecuting the war as well as in its cause?" Reply: Yes, officially; but in so great a task involving so many men, mistakes occur and perhaps many individuals step beyond the limits of justice for which those who are supporting the cause scripturally are not responsible. Proof: All that is necessary and unavoidable in obeying God are involved in that obedience. This maxim is true whether it relates to one realm of God or another. "*Second*, has this country or Britain ever fought an unjust war?" Reply: Whether that question is answered one way or another, it has no logical bearing on the subject, for I voluntarily state the personnel of government is not perfect and they could have engaged in unjust wars. "*Third*, should Christians have refused to fight in such wars?" Yes, especially those who considered the wars unjust. "*Fourth*, if this country, or Britain, has ever fought an unjust war, would not your position of Romans 13:1-5 and Gen. 9:6 make it necessary for you to contend that God would punish sooner or later, these countries* by other countries?" Not necessarily by other countries. I have never assumed that God's power is thus limited. "*Fifth*, were the wars of Rome, under which government Romans 13 was written, which established and maintained her Empire, just or unjust wars?" Reply: Some, if not all, were unjust. By the significance of the inspired command to "submit," the Christian is to be passive, even if and when persecuted by the government under which citizenship is held, *only to the extent of not being a partaker of the evil of that government*. Also, by the significance of the inspired command "to obey," the Christian is to be active in the good work of that government in the noble effort to overcome, by force of arms, the evil designs of other governments that would imperil the safety of its citizens. Yet, even that obedience

is divinely limited by the government's divinely-sanctioned mission.

Notice the unselfish attitude of the Christian under that inspired teaching: Rather than *get in* authority when he is only *under authority* in the use of force, the Christian is to be passive even when persecuted by his own government, on the one hand; yet, for the sake of "them that do well" the Christian is to obey the same government in the use of force against "evil-doers" who are engaged in the form of evil against which God has prescribed force. Thus, the Christian is instrumental in both great powers of God: that of force, as well as the gospel. There is no scriptural reason for the Christian to feign an inferiority complex in his relation to the civil-military government by the over-use of the suggestive word "submit" when he is not being persecuted by his government, just as though that is the only word that expresses the Christian's relationship to the government. On the contrary, Christians are to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Accordingly, under current conditions in the United States of America, let us use other scriptural terms also; such as "obey," and "be ready unto every good work" of, the government.

IV. Acts 5:29

"Brother Stonestreet realizes that any command from any government which would prohibit our preaching the gospel must be nullified by Christians." (Bales) Reply: Exactly! But under such conditions, Christians must be ready to suffer martyrdom if necessary. (Here is where the word "submit" is fitting in its entire significance.) But why would Christians be justified in refusing to obey that command of the above citation and at the same time be scripturally obligated to "submit" to martyrdom, if necessary, rather than use force of their own initiative? Because

of Peter's inspired example recorded in the text cited above; because the circumstance involved a clash of God's two powers: that of the gospel and that of force; and God's powers do not clash, except as abused or perverted by man. Likewise, when the government commands the Christian to use force in accordance with its divinely-sanctioned mission and the Christian refuses to obey, that too, involves a clash between God's powers or realms, for which inspiration is not responsible, but only uninspired conscience, which as a Christian, one is obligated to respect, but not the judgment upon which it is based.

Quoting from the affirmative, Brother Bales adds: "He wrote that 'the only interest the civil government, as such, can scripturally have concerning the truth is to keep tolerable order while it is preached, allowing every one the moral right to accept it or reject it, as one may elect.'" Then Brother Bales inquires: "Does he imply that: (a) When persecuted because of our religion we are to call on civil government and resist the persecutors through it?"

Reply: If it is necessary to call on the civil government, Christians may do so; and if the government should deputize Christians to quell that form of evil by force, the Christians should respond. This is not defending the Christian religion at the hand of the sword, which would be unscriptural, but it is defending the free-moral agency of man to be religious if he so elects. "Are we to put up with persecutors only until we can get the government to function to put down our persecutors?" Reply: Yes; the Christian is not *in* authority, but *under* authority, to use such force. Brother Bales hypothetically inquires further: "If so, just when is it that we are to pray for and to do good unto our persecutors?" That is a good question right to the point, and I reply: Any time. Doing good to people is not necessarily pleasing them, especially persecutors. Why, the best thing that could happen to persecutors would be a

righteous thrashing, that they may correct their course before it is too late. When persuasion fails to correct people, God has provided force. Of course Christians are to proceed lawfully, for "sin is lawlessness" or contrary to law. Brother Bales further inquires, thus: "(b) Is it wrong for civil governments to hire gospel preachers to act as chaplains under its supervision?" Reply: No. The government, as such, cares nothing for the purely religious aspect of such services. The government, as such, (the phrase "as such" is full of meaning; be careful with it) is only scripturally interested in the morale or moral effect such chaplains may have in the army, neither of which is peculiar to Christianity. An occasional individual personnel of government may be personally motivated in a sectarian or religious sense, but this is in spite of military government and not because of it.

Having exceeded the space allotted the affirmative in the first installment, I am supposed to compensate for it by cutting this correspondingly short. So if the affirmative has overlooked any question by failing to answer it either specifically or in principle, Brother Bales will please call my attention to it, and I shall be glad to notice it.

BALES, SECOND NEGATIVE

Before noticing Stonestreet's second affirmative, we want to notice other issues raised in his first affirmative.

I. No Power But of God

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. 13:1.) We observe: *First*, Christians do not have the right, in the face of this statement, to declare that one power is an outlaw power and that another is not. The term "outlaw" governments is without New

Testament sanction. There is *no* power but of God. The powers that *be*, not those we prefer, are ordained of God. This is exactly what it says regardless of whether or not it is read today under a democracy, or in Paul's day under a pagan dictatorship. *Second*, even when such a power put Christ to death, it was still overruled by the Lord and given authority by Him (John 19:10-11). *Third*, this is only one of many passages which teach that worldly governments are overruled by the Lord (Isa. 10:5- ; Jer. 25:9-12; Heb. 1:6; Dan. 2:35- ; 4:17, 25; Rom. 9:17, 22-23). *Thus Stonestreet's theory of outlaw governments falls.* The same passages which show that one is ordained of God today show that the others are ordained of God.

II. Divine Missions and Divine Approval

"Such powers being ordained to a mission, gives them a chance for divine approval; fulfilling that mission, guarantees that divine approval." (Stonestreet) He has overlooked the fact that a government may have a mission "to do that which is evil in itself, (and for which they are later punished), but intended by God to serve his purpose." (a) God sent Assyria on a divine mission of wrath and then punished her (Isa. 10:5-12). (b) Pilate and the Jews were on a divine mission (John 19:10-11; Acts 4:28). Did their fulfilling that mission guarantee divine approval? (c) Vessels of wrath fulfill a divine mission but they are fitted to destruction (Rom. 9:17, 22). *These powers are exactly such powers as are described in Romans 13.* Their mission was equally divine with the powers of Romans 13. The wrath of man shall praise Him (Psa. 76:10), but that does not guarantee divine approval on such vessels of wrath.

God overruled so that the persecution against the church was His chastisement on Christians (Heb. 12:5-11). But that did not mean that He rewarded persecutors or that it would have been right for Christians to have assisted in such

a divine mission. In the Old Testament God overruled and meant for good what men meant for evil—in the case of ✓ Joseph (Gen. 37:35; 45:7; 50:20). Today God overrules so that strong delusions are sent as a punishment on those who take pleasure in unrighteousness and do not love the truth (2 Thess. 2:10).^{*} Since these strong delusions are: (a) sent of God; (b) as a punishment on evildoers, why wouldn't it be right (on Stonestreet's logic) for Christians to preach such strong delusions to these people?

This abundantly illustrates my point that God has agents which are not Christian and whose work does not constitute a pattern for Christian conduct. The powers of Romans 13 are such agents.

His truth may abound "through my lie unto his glory," said Paul (Rom. 3:7), but that lie would still be sin for we are not justified in doing evil that good may come (Rom. 3:8).

III. The Three Words

(1) Submit. Some of the Christians were Jews whose homeland was under the heel of the dictator. Thus Christians in that condition were told to submit to the pagan dictatorship which had conquered their country. Would Stonestreet teach Christians in occupied countries to submit to dictators? Paul did. Will Stonestreet further argue that submission involves carrying the sword? If so, he would have to advocate carrying it for such a pagan government as the one under which Paul wrote. It is my conviction that we should submit to the government under which we live in all things which do not violate our obedience to God. Stonestreet has not proved that carrying the sword is involved in that submission.

(2) Obey. Obedience must be rendered in those things which do not violate Christian conduct. Killing enemies is not treating them as the Christian wants to be treated and

as he is supposed to treat enemies. Thus Christians must not carry the sword.

The government to which we are to submit is the same government which we are to obey. We cannot say that we shall submit to one type of government, but that obedience also is due another type. The dictatorship to which Paul told the Romans to *submit* was the dictatorship which he told them to *obey*.

(3) "Be ready unto every good work." See my first negative, argument II. In the second affirmative Stonestreet failed to meet my answer. Before he can use Titus 3:1 as a sanction for war, he must prove that making war is one of the "good works" to which the Christian must be ready. This general statement about good works cannot be used to prove that a specific thing, making war, is a good work for Christians any more than 2 Thess. 2:10- or John 19:10-11 could be shown, by Titus 3:1, to be a good work for a disciple of Christ. On the same basis he could argue that it is a good work for Christians to proceed against enemies of the church with fire, scourges, plagues, and such like (Rev. 2:23-27; 6:4; 4:16; 8:5, 7, 8, 10-12; 9:2-5; 10; 14; 17; 11:4-6, 13; 14:10-12, 20; 15:1; 16:2, 6, 7, 18; 18:1, 6-9). If Babylon, in Rev. 18:1-8, refers to the Catholic Church we should proceed against her with the torch, according to his logic.

How does Stonestreet know that Rom. 13:4 refers only to one class of evildoers, and if so how does he know to what class it refers? Will not murder, etc., be punished in eternity? How does he know that punishment for one class is reserved for eternity? Since both classes receive punishment in the world to come, who can deny that both will receive some punishment here? Farther on we shall show that he has made a division where the word of God has not made a division.

IV. No Cancellation of Obligation

If "the advent of Christianity assigned no new obligation peculiar to Christianity to that mission (of rulers, J.D.B.), neither did it cancel any part of their established mission that was good in the sight of Jehovah." (Stonestreet) Reply: (a) this still does not prove that Christians are to execute wrath; even if all that he says is true. (b) Established missions of governments were to punish false teachers; adulterers; idol worshipers; God's people (Isa. 10:5-); and such like. Stonestreet's logic sanctions all of these missions for Christians for after all Christianity did not "cancel any part of their established mission that was good in the sight of Jehovah"!

V. Collective Action

If Rom. 12:19 refers to Christians just as individuals (and not to them both as individuals and as a church, for it was to the church in Rome that the epistle was written, 1:7), couldn't the argument be made that since there is a difference between individual and collective activity, that it is right for the church as a whole to go to war against its enemies, but not for Christians to do it as individuals on their own initiative? Furthermore, since the church as a group, as well as individuals, is given the instruction on obedience and submission, should the church go to war against evildoers if commanded to do so by the government? *What argument is there, on Romans thirteen, which is used to justify individual Christians in going to war, which cannot also be used to justify the church, as a church, in going to war at a government's command?* We are confident that the arguments which would prove one prove the others.

VI. Two Kinds of Evil?

Brother Stonestreet should prepare two lists of evils: (a) Those on which the sword is to be used. (b) Those

on which the sword is not to be used even if we are commanded to use it on this class of evildoers by the government. When this is done questions are in order. *First*, since Rom. 13:4, 5, does not make a distinction as to the kinds of evildoers where is the Scripture which justifies his classification of evils? How does he know which evil is to go into which column? *Second*, are there any evils which could be put in both lists? *Third*, do some of these evils belong in one list under some circumstances and in the other list under other circumstances? *Fourth*, do the evils, which are to be punished with the sword, ever have their cause, their root, in the evils which are not to be punished with the sword? *Fifth*, since his classifications of evil still leave the evident fact that both types will be punished in eternity, how does he assume that both types do not receive some punishment now?

The following sins bring the wrath of God, and it is not said that all of His wrath against some of them is reserved for eternity. Fornication; uncleanness; inordinate affections; evil concupiscence; covetousness; all ungodliness; holding the truth in unrighteousness; persecuting Christians; interfering with gospel preaching; worship of the beast; reception of the mark of the beast; unbelief; generation of vipers; all unrighteousness; killing Christ; crucifying Him afresh (Col. 3:5-6; Eph. 5:5-6; John 3:36; Rev. 14:9-10; 1 Thess. 2:16; Matt. 3:7; Heb. 10:28-30; Rom. 1:18). Of some of these it is expressly said, "*For which things sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience*" (Col. 3:5-6). "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for *because of these things* cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience (Eph. 5:5-6). The governments are ministers of God to execute "wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. 13:4). "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven

against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18).

The wrath of God, which came on the Jews (1 Thess. 2:16), was due to their lack of obedience to God with reference to Christ and the gospel. Peter said that governors were sent for the punishment of evildoers (1 Pet. 2:14). In the same epistle he referred to such evildoers as those who had walked in "lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries" (4:3). The destruction of Jerusalem was in "the days of vengeance" (Luke 21:22). "Rejoice over her (Babylon, verse 2), thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her." (Rev. 18:20). "For true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand." (Rev. 19:2). If this applies to the Roman Catholic Church Brother Stonestreet's arguments would force us to use the sword on this evildoer. Those who teach false doctrine are also guilty of evil deeds (2 John 10).

If, as Stonestreet contends, the "very nature and result of murder preclude the wisdom, both divine and human, of reserving punishment for it for a future age"; then why cannot the same argument be made concerning hypocrisy; lying; adultery and such like? False teachers were punished under the Old Testament. These evildoers endanger morality and civilization. Punishment of them in the next world will not be any more effective in discouraging such evildoers now, than punishing murderers in the next world discourages murderers now. The argument he uses for one can be used for the other.

"Thus the preservation of the fundamentals of the moral law are divinely left to the province of man, to be enforced by carnal weapons when necessary"; (Stonestreet). Is murder the only sin against the moral law? Is it the only

one to be punished with the sword? Adultery, stealing, lying, coveting, bearing false witness, etc., are sins against the moral law. Rebellion against God is a sin against the most fundamental of all laws.

All types of evildoers should be punished, for Brother Stonestreet said that "there being no such thing as law worthy of the name without a penalty for its violation," it follows that all transgressors of God's laws must be punished. But this does not say when and by whom. We still ask for the authority for concluding that Christians are the agents of wrath who execute the penalty on these transgressors.

My understanding of Stonestreet's classification of evils is that he divides them into those evils which relate primarily to man and man and which endanger civilization (which evils, he believes, are to be punished with the sword); and those evils which relate primarily to man and his relationship to God (violations of God's laws in this type of evil are not to be punished by the sword, he thinks). Reply: (a) As we have said we would like a list of the first type. Are murder and war the only two? (b) All sin, in one sense, is sin against God and all sin against God, in its full fruitage, leads to sin against man. (c) Sins against God and against man are both contrary to sound doctrine (1 Tim. 1:9-11). Why punish with the sword only a part of that which is sin against sound doctrine? (d) David's adultery with Bath-sheba was sin against mankind, but also against God. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight" (Psa. 51:2-4). The son had sinned against his father; his goods; his body and with harlots (Luke 15:13, 30). He said, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee." (Luke 15:18.) Sin against man was sin against God. (e) Adultery is sin against man (1 Thess. 4:6). It threatens the foundations

of the home and of civilization. (f) Germany would have never sinned against humanity if she had not first sinned against God. The root of all sin against man is found in man's refusal to submit to God and to man's sin against God.

We shall now notice

Stonestreet's Second Affirmative

We endeavor to resist the devil with the weapons God has sanctioned for Christians, but that does not mean that carnal weapons are used on enemies of the gospel by Christians. Furthermore, we submit to and obey the government except wherein it conflicts with our allegiance to God. Stonestreet believes that in the case of such a conflict one must resist, by refusing to obey, the government. So *the real issue is not whether it is right to resist a government*. All are agreed that it is right at times and wrong at times. The issue is: Has God required us to use the sword for Caesar? If He has not, even Stonestreet agrees that one would be justified in resisting.

VII. Genesis 9:6

Stonestreet said that it was eternal, but the only way we can tell whether it is eternal or not is not by assuming that it is, but by going to the New Testament and finding it stated there. And if one can find it stated in the New Testament he does not have to prove it is eternal, nor be concerned about its statement in the Old Testament, for it would be sufficient that the New Testament bound it on us. Since I am under the New Testament I must refuse to be bound by the Old. If Stonestreet can find the command for *Christians* to execute murderers, as I can find the command for Christians to work, the debate will be over (Eph. 4:28; 2 Thess. 3:11-12).

Where was Gen. 9:6 given during "the life time of the benefactor?" The very reverse of it was given during His

life time (Matt. 5:38-48). Christ bound the reverse of it on His disciples. Let Stonestreet show where the principle of Genesis 9:6 is bound on Christians.

With reference to Stonestreet's illustration from Christ's law on marriage, we notice that Jesus recognized that Moses' regulation on divorce differed from His; but He also taught during His ministry that the law of Moses was still in force (Matt. 19:8-9; 23:2-3). Moses gave *dispensational* regulations and his dispensation did not end before the cross.

"For example, under Moses it was lawful and also according to that eternal principle to kill people under certain conditions. Likewise, under Christ, it is lawful and also according to the same eternal principle to kill people under certain conditions." (Stonestreet) He has not yet proved that *Christians* are required of God to carry the sword, and that is the issue in debate. *The real issue is not whether Genesis 9:6 is in force but whether or not Christians are the agents to carry out such a principle.* Furthermore, under the law of Moses people were put to death for blasphemy; adultery; false teaching, etc. Penalties such as beating; slavery; confiscation of goods; exile; imprisonment and death were mentioned. Why does Stonestreet limit the "certain conditions" to execution for murder? Or does he include what Moses included? How does he know under what conditions a person is to be put to death? "Since that procedure was fundamental to the preservation of the moral law then, it is fundamental now to the preservation of the moral law now; since it was intrinsically right then, it is intrinsically right now . . ." etc. (Stonestreet) Stonestreet surely believes that the moral law, as he sees it, prohibits more than just murder. Lying; adultery; stealing; false witness; etc., are all violations of moral law and thus our brother's logic embraces more than perhaps he would like for it to embrace. Furthermore, one could argue that since

the death penalty for blasphemy; for leading people after other gods; was fundamental to the preservation of the religious law then it is fundamental to its preservation now; since it was intrinsically right then; it is intrinsically right now. The logic is just as strong when used in this instance as when he uses it.

Brother Stonestreet thinks that the soldiers who support the enemy governments today "are accomplices in the crime, partakers in the guilt, whether they have personally done any killing or not." Then he calls on Genesis 9:6 to justify our killing them. Does the brother believe the conclusion which *must* be drawn from these two points? *All enemy soldiers must be killed on the battle field or executed after capture.* If he does not believe and contends for that he does not believe his own argument for war, based on Genesis 9:6, and he should not use it as an argument in this debate. Either back up and discard the argument or affirm it in its fullness.

As to the "accidental" killing of civilians we must disagree. Military strategy calls for the bombing of industrial plants and the homes of workers. A blockade against a nation has as its purpose the cutting off of the food of the entire nation that it might be brought to its knees.

All Stonestreet's emphasis on Genesis 9:6 makes us wonder how much of the pre-mosaical revelation is bound on Christians by him. Does he go to the New Testament to see what is and what is not? If so, then that shows that the appeal to Genesis 9:6 is not much of an argument for it could be established only by New Testament authority, and if it can be established by such authority there is no need to appeal to Genesis 9:6. Just appeal to the New Testament. Reader, re-read my first negative reply to the Genesis 9:6 argument and you will see that *it cannot be applied to or carried out in war.*

VIII. The Suffering of the Innocent

The question is not: Do the innocent suffer with the guilty. They do. The question is: *Shall a Christian do what he knows will make the innocent suffer.* There is a vast difference between *bearing* suffering as an innocent person and *inflicting* suffering on an innocent person. The Christian principle is not to make the innocent suffer with the guilty, but for the innocent to suffer at the hands of the guilty, on the behalf of the guilty, in an effort to save the guilty (Rom. 5:8, 10; 1 Pet. 2:24).

IX. Similarity To Seventh-Day Adventist's Arguments

(1) If Genesis 9:6 is binding on Christians because it was given to man to be enforced by man, Mk. 2:27, 28 binds the Sabbath, for it was given to man to be kept by man. The real issue: Given to what man. Show where it was given to the *Christian* man.

(2) *One* of the reasons the Jews were to keep the Sabbath was because of God's creation and rest (Ex. 20:10, 11).

(3) Stonestreet, an uninspired man, is the one who quoted Gen. 9:6 and then talked about "eternal" law. In his argument we have what man says, but where has he shown us where God said for Christians to take vengeance? And even if God had, which He has not, Genesis 9:6 would not be the place where He bound it on Christians.

Reader go back to my first negative, Argument I, point 7, and compare it with Stonestreet's answer and you will see that the striking similarity is still there. I have not spent so much time on Genesis 9:6 because I consider it to have any bearing on the issue in debate, but because Stonestreet and others think that it has bearing on the issue. But how he can so regard it, in the face of his admissions referred to in my first negative, Argument I, point 10, is more than I can understand.

X. John 18:36

The nature of the kingdom of heaven forbade His disciples fighting for Him. When we enter the kingdom its nature becomes our nature. This is a sufficient reason to keep members of the kingdom from fighting for or against anyone. The nature of the kingdom of heaven is always our nature so there is no time when we should fight.

Is it not strange that brethren, who make the argument made by Stonestreet, generally make an appeal for fighting on the basis that it is necessary to protect or to make possible the existence of Christianity. So they call on us to do what Christ said we must not do, and what they agree we must not do when they use the John 18:36 argument for fighting for a worldly government.

Jesus did not here legislate as to what citizens of a civil government must or ought to do. He simply stated a fact which prevailed in earthly kingdoms. He did not qualify it by saying that they fought for their government when it "follows its divinely-sanctioned mission." He did not mention "just or unjust" wars. Regardless of which side starts a war, after it starts both sides are fighting not only for their king but that their king be not defeated and delivered up to the enemy. Hitler's soldiers today could say: We are fighting now that our king be not delivered up. So if this passage sanctions fighting it sanctions it regardless of who started it and regardless of whether it is "just or unjust." "No divine command is needed to perpetuate such a well-established rule of citizens fighting in obedience to worldly kingdoms, but such a command is necessary to terminate that well-established rule." (Stonestreet.) It was just as well established, and especially in the world at that time, to fight for a government in a war of aggression as in one of defense. And Stonestreet's argument here perpetuates one as much as the other.

XI. Priests and Pilate

"The interests of 'the chief priests' show the unscriptural religious aspect of the civil." (Stonestreet.) He overlooked the fact that under the law of Moses civil and religious functions belonged to Israel and that in the times of Jesus the Sanhedrin was "the supreme council of the Jewish people." Furthermore, Pilate was part of an "outlaw" government when measured by Stonestreet's idea of an "outlaw" government. Even Pilate recognized that the priests possessed some authority for he said to take Jesus and judge Him according to your law.

XII. Titus 3:1

See point III, number 3, in this present paper; also argument VI on "two kinds of evils." There it will be seen that the general statement about "good works" cannot be used to prove that a specific thing such as sword bearing is such a work for Christians. That would have to be decided by a more *specific* statement and one made concerning bearing the sword. Furthermore, Stonestreet's effort to classify two kinds of evils, and punishment relative thereto, is a human theory and not a divine revelation. Regardless of whether or not these things endanger civilizations indirectly or conditionally, they are a threat to it and thus would come under his classification of the evils to be punished with the sword.

XIII. Characteristics of a Just War (Stonestreet, point III)

There is nothing in Romans 13:4 which designates the type of evil as classified by Stonestreet. He *assumes* that it has reference to some evildoers, and not to others, and then builds his case on that. Romans 13:4 suggests not the slightest basis for his arbitrary assumption. Officially,

he says, the method of prosecuting the war must be just. It is impossible for modern war in its methods to be just. Blockades and bombings do not distinguish between the innocent and the guilty. The way of war is not to ask, once a war has started, as to whether or not a particular thing is just, but whether or not it is effective. "Effectiveness" and "military necessity," not justice, becomes the standard. This is inevitable in modern war. To do what you know is unjust to some in order to reach or intimidate the guilty is to do evil that good may come and we are forbidden to do that (Rom. 3:8). Modern war also utilizes misrepresentations as a recognized weapon of war. The nature of modern war is that it cannot be just in its method of prosecuting the war, and therefore we do not see why Stonestreet endeavors to justify injustice.

The United States manifested injustice in her treatment of Mexico in the first half of the last century, and also with reference to Panama. As for Britain, if she has not fought unjust wars it would be impossible to do so. In many other respects none of us are without sin and all nations are certainly worldly although some are more so than others. If Stonestreet does not think that it is necessary to punish our evil with the sword of other countries, if he has "never assumed that God's power is thus limited," why does he think it necessary for this country to use the sword to punish the evil of other countries. Why not leave it to whatever power he implies in his statement that God's power is not thus limited.

He stated that "some, if not all, were unjust" with reference to the wars of Rome. Rome carried on wars of aggression continually as well as wars in conquered territories in order to keep them in subjection. Whatever Romans 13 teaches today with reference to this country it taught in Paul's day with reference to Rome. If it teaches combat service now, it taught it then. If it taught it then it

taught it for Rome and for unjust wars. And this is the very type Stonestreet said that we must not fight in. And yet he uses scriptures written under and of a government which continually engaged in such wars, to prove that today one may fight in a just war but not in an unjust one! He goes on to say that if the government under which we hold citizenship persecutes us we must be passive and submit. His theory does not justify that statement, for on his theory one would declare such a government an outlaw and promptly use the sword on it. Is it not strange? When the government under which we live persecutes us we are to be passive instead of following Genesis 9:6. But when another government fights the government under which we live we are to fight back. Why not fight, for the sake of them that do well, the government if it persecuted us? His own arguments prove that one should do so.

XIV. Citizenship Has Nothing To Do With the Issue

Romans 13 applies to a Christian regardless of whether or not he is a citizen; a subject in a conquered territory; or a slave. Our obligation to the government under which we live is based on a divine command and not on the basis of citizenship. Paul did not say submit because you are citizens, but because the powers are ordained of God. Most of the early Christians were Jews or other nationals who were not citizens, but were subjects. In A. D. 47 there were only 6,944,000 citizens of military age in the Roman Empire (P. V. N. Myers, *Ancient History*, p. 492).

XV. Acts 5:29 (Stonestreet's point IV)

Stonestreet's other arguments to justify war, could be used to justify killing the ones who persecuted us. After all, he could then argue that God's two powers would not be clashing in such a case for the persecutors have become outlaws! One could say that murderers must be punished;

that good works of this kind must be done, and such like in line with Stonestreet's arguments. One could say that he is defending his right to be a Christian, and not Christianity itself. Stephen's right to be religious should have been defended. If we fail to punish such a persecutor, are we not failing, as Stonestreet would say, to enforce the moral law?

If we are to pray for and do good to our persecutors "any time," it is difficult to see how we can bomb or bayonet them some of the time. We realize that doing good to people is not necessarily pleasing them, but it is never destroying them. How can we give persecutors a righteous thrashing, to correct them, when we kill multitudes of them in doing it?

We call Brother Stonestreet's attention to my first negative, Argument X.

XVI. The Passage which Brother Stonestreet Did Not Produce

Brother Stonestreet stakes his main arguments on such passages as Romans 13 and 1 Pet. 2. He assumes two things which he cannot prove but which must be proved to establish his case. (1) That the passages refer to governments at war with another government. "Actually, it is obvious that the normal business of judicial procedure and punishment of crime, making the individual punishment fit the crime, is what is here in mind." What does this have to do with bombing cities or trying to starve countries into submission, in which countries the innocent as well as the guilty suffer? In *The Christian Conscientious Objector* we have shown that the attempted analogy between the business of international war and the business of a policeman breaks down completely. (2) "That the Christian is here thought of as the agent of the government in inflicting vengeance. Quite the opposite is the case. Paul was writing to subjects, not to rulers." He told them that God overruled even the wicked, pagan rulers to be agents of ven-

geance. They, not the Christians, were God's agents for this purpose.

We have consumed our space. God willing, we shall, in the next paper, consider the arguments which we have not as yet noticed. Before concluding, we have some questions: (1) When does "love your enemies" apply? (2) Is it right to kill babies when such is inextricably interwoven with a military command? (3) Is it right to kill men for whom Christ died? (4) Are Christian principles the principles by which war is fought? (5) What should Christians in Japan do in this war? (6) Should women kill if commanded by the government? (7) Should a Christian ever be a conscientious objector to war? (8) Can a disciple of Christ do everything that God overrules human governments to do? (9) Should a Christian serve in an army of aggression? (10) Should a Christian serve in a dictator's army of occupation? (11) Should a soldier, when converted to Christ, continue to serve in such armies as mentioned in 9 and 10? (12) Is this war being fought to protect Christianity?

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

By P. W. Stonestreet

It is again the purpose of the affirmative to answer either specifically or in principle the questions and arguments of the negative.

I. Outlaw Governments

Referring to Romans 13:1, Brother Bales says: "Christians do not have the right, in the face of this statement, to declare that one power is an outlaw power and that another is not."

Note a definition of the word *outlaw*: "2. A person who habitually and defiantly violates the law; a bandit." (Webster.)

What is true of a person may be true of a ruler; what is true of a ruler may be true of a nation under such a ruler. In fact, "the powers that be" are so closely associated with, and so accurately designated as, their rulers that sometimes one is put for the other. For example, in Romans 13:4, the pronoun "he" stands for such a government. True, "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." But powers of God *with a human element* are subject to do evil; yea, the human side of any power is subject to various degrees of outlawry. Why, a Christian, *too*, belongs to God in a very special sense; but the impossibility of apostasy on the part of a Christian, even to the extent of becoming an "outlaw," is nowhere taught in the Bible. That doctrine of the impossibility of apostasy, just as the position of the negative on this proposition, is supported only by a human theory.

II. Divine Mission and Divine Approval

Since God has not revealed to Christians just how he will overrule in this or that case, this or that war, in this age of the world, the only guiding stars for the Christian in the matter are the divinely-sanctioned mission of government and the inspired commands relative thereto. Besides, the inspired commands for a Christian to obey God through the government preclude the idea of depending solely on God's overruling power. The one-talent servant tried that experiment with disastrous results. Behold to obey is better than depending solely upon God's overruling power and to harken than any righteousness of our own conception.

Since in some way "strong delusions" are sent as a punishment on certain ones "because they receive not the love of the truth," according to 2 Thess. 2:10, 11, Brother Bales asks: "Since these strong delusions are: (a) sent of God; (b) as a punishment on evildoers, why wouldn't it be right (on Stonestreet's logic) for Christians to preach

such strong delusions to those people?" Reply: Because God has not commanded it. May the negative be duly impressed with the important distinction between punishment in which human instrumentality is divinely used and in which it is not thus used. Possibly strong delusions are sent and Pharaoh's heart was hardened by God's fixed laws in which no human instrumentality, other than the subject, is used.

III. The Three Words

"(1) Submit . . . Would Stonestreet teach Christians in occupied countries to submit to dictators?" No, not as long as there is a vestige of the original government left to command them to go forward in resistance. But if the government no longer exists, I would teach them to submit, but then only passively, so as not to partake of the evil. "Will Stonestreet further argue that submission involves carrying the sword?" Reply: Not necessarily, but it does not preclude carrying the sword. It depends on the nature of what is to be done and the end in view. Because of the limited span or absence between human beings of earth, the word "submit," as thus applied, has a circumstantial or psychological application. It was especially fitting when used in Paul's day on this subject, and is equally fitting now under the same or similar circumstances.

"(2) Obey. Obedience must be rendered in those things which do not violate Christian conduct. Killing enemies is not treating them as the Christian wants to be treated and he is supposed to treat enemies." (Bales.)

Reply: The negative confuses God's golden rule with God's iron rule. By thus arraying them against each other, the negative assumes that God's iron rule is intrinsically sinful, especially for Christians. The two rules do not apply simultaneously to the same people under the same conditions. It would be sinful, even at the command of the

government, for the Christian to apply the iron rule, against an evil where only the golden rule is divinely called for; conversely, it would be equally sinful to apply the golden rule against that form of evil when God's word, by the process of elimination, calls for the iron rule. It is freely granted that both the iron rule and the golden rule are figures of speech for the sake of clarity and brevity. The Christian, as such, in his own personal capacity, never has a right to use the iron rule to its full extent; the Christian has this divine right only at the command of the government in performing its divinely-sanctioned mission. To conclude otherwise brings on a clash and confusion of God's good rules of which God is not the author.

"(3). 'Be ready unto every good work.' Before he can use Titus 3:1 as a sanction for war, he must prove that making war is one of the 'good works' to which the Christian must be ready." (Bales.)

Reply: It is a general statement. Therefore no one has a logical right to limit its application.

Referring of course to rulers who are performing their divine mission Romans 13:3 says: "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil." Also: "For he is the minister of God to thee for good," etc. (Verse 4). Yet, the negative would have us believe that Titus 3:1 does not refer to these "good works"; no, no, that would be contrary to the negative argument on this proposition!

The fact that God dealt with nations in a miraculous way during the time of national Israel, embracing his elect race, even wearing his name, is no reason that the nations of the world are being thus dealt with in this age. This is pre-eminently an age of accomplishing national ends by national means, moral ends by moral-law means, spiritual ends by spiritual-law means, etc. God still rules, but He rules by law. God can still perform miracles, but He has not promised them for this age.

Referring to Romans 13:4, Brother Bales says: "The 'he' of verse four is not the same party as the 'thou' of verse four."

The import of that statement agrees with its author's position: that the pronoun "he" stands for the government and the pronoun "thou" stands for the Christian, therefore the Christian is no part of the government. But observe his proof depends on the use of different pronouns, so let us examine that reasoning further.

Illustration: In Matt. 18:15, the first step of scriptural procedure in dealing with an erring brother in the church, as commanded, is: "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother."

There we have the same pronouns used representing two different parties, but both are a part of the church. Hence, just as these pronouns referring to different parties do not prove that both are not members of the church in the one case, neither do they prove that both parties are not part of the government in the other case. Furthermore, if an alien sinner was thus addressed the same pronouns would be used in the same sense. Thus, the logic of Bales' point on pronouns would preclude an alien sinner, too, from being a part of the government; and since there inheres in the idea of government both *authority* and *subjection*, the position of the negative on this point vitiates the idea of government completely, for it would be futile to have a government without subjects! Just as the church would not exist without Christians, neither would the government in its fullness exist without subject. Thus both texts (Romans 13:4; Matt. 18:15) show, respectively, a relationship to both institutions. Both point out lawful procedure and simply distinguish between authority and subjection. Thus goes Brother Bales' point on pronouns. That which proves too much, proves nothing.

"How does Stonestreet know that Romans 13:4 refers only to one class of evildoers, and if so how does he know to what class it refers?" (Bales.)

Reply: 1. It is known by the process of inspired elimination. The facts, commands, and promises of the gospel are well-known by non-sectarian and close-thinking Bible students. It is also well known that one can live now just as good moral life as Cornelius lived without rendering primary obedience to the gospel. (This does not teach salvation of the soul on mere moral grounds.) Since living such a moral life would not jeopardize civilization, even uninspired man can see the divine wisdom in reserving punishment for this great class of sin or evil for a future age, according to Inspiration's solemn warning recorded in 2 Thess. 1:7, 8.

2. Another step in this divine process of elimination, enabling the student to focus attention on a more definite form of evil, is: No one, saint or sinner, without a command of government divinely in authority, is commanded to use military force against any form of evil. But in that indirect way Christians are so commanded. Not all sins in the moral realm are to be thus punished because the government does not command it and also because such sins are not a direct threat against the peoples of the world. No wonder the school of thought represented by Brother Bales is confused: That school of thought has all forms of sin and evil scrambled together, making no distinction between them, just like a quack doctor would fail to distinguish between the different forms of disease; and yet, 2 Timothy 2:15 is right before them, enjoining handling aright or rightly dividing the word of truth.

IV. No Cancellation of Obligation

"Established missions of governments were to punish false teachers; idol worshippers; God's people (Isa. 10:5); and such like." (Bales.)

Reply: That was only for the period of national Israel, which was a kind of Religio-Civil Government. Such punishment for such sins was simply fulfilled when the dispensation that called for it passed into history. In this age, when the civil and the religious are separate, no mere religious sin is to be punished by force by divine authority.

V. Collective Action

"If Rom. 12:19 refers to Christians just as individuals (and not to them as individuals and as a church . . . , couldn't the argument be made that since there is a difference between individual and collective activity, that it is right for the church as a whole to go to war against its enemies, but not for Christians to do it as individuals on their own initiative?" (Bales.)

Reply: No. Brother Bales continually forgets that neither the individual Christian nor the church is *in* authority but only *under* authority in the use of military force. In spite of the question, the subject shows that the word "collective" was used in the sense of being commensurate with war conditions; that is, the national or international sense.

VI. Two Classes of Evil

"Brother Stonestreet should prepare two lists of evils: (a) Those on which the sword is to be used. (b) Those on which the sword is not to be used even if commanded to use it on this class of evildoers by the government." (Bales.)

Reply: God has already prepared them, and it is unfortunate that our brother has overlooked them. By emphasizing the divine process of elimination, according to the teaching of 2 Timothy 2:15, the affirmative has just pointed out the two lists under the general heading of III. THE THREE WORDS and the eighth and ninth paragraphs.

"The issue is: Has God required us to use the sword for Caesar?" (Bales.)

Reply: Romans 13:4 says it is "to thee for good," etc. So Bales should realize that the lawful use of the sword is for all: Caesar, Christians and non-Christians. It is alright to use anything lawfully, but it is wrong to use a good thing unlawfully. The Bible refers to both the lawful and unlawful use of the sword. The lawful use of the sword is to restrain the unlawful use of the sword.

The New Testament is replete with statements that are *absolute* in form but *conditional* in meaning. Here is one of that kind: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. 26:52.) How do we know that refers to the unlawful use of *the* sword? From the text and the context. The same verse prefaces the above statement with this one: "Put up again thy sword into its place," which shows that it has a place, even in its literal sense. The unlawful use of the sword *is vain*, but its lawful use by the government or at its command, it is *not used in vain*: "for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God." (Romans 13:4.) So by a well-established form of speech, both in and out of the Bible, whatever the government does through others, even through Christians, *the Government does*. If such work is according to its divine mission, there are no sins of which to be a partaker; if that work is contrary to its divine mission, like forbidding to teach in the name of Christ or punishing people for refusing to obey any law that is peculiar to Christianity, then the Christian must refuse to obey rather than become a partaker of that evil. If this calls for suffering martyrdom, it will not be the first time Christians have suffered for the name of Christ. Under such circumstances the word "submit" with all its inherent significance would be most fitting. Fortunately, in this country, there is no reason to anticipate such persecution. But if the Axis powers, with their evils of

conquest and enmity of the free-moral agency of man, are not stopped, we might expect anything.

VII. Genesis 9:6

"Where was Gen. 9:6 given 'during the life time of the benefactor'?"

Reply: "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was born, I am." (John 8:58.) The negative has confused eternal principles with exclusive gospel truths. The former are not subject to the death of the testator to become of force, while purely gospel truths are subject to law of wills becoming of force after the death of Christ (the testator). Besides, eternal truths are not governed by dispensations; only dispensational laws, based on such principles, vary to some extent.

The eternal principle of Gen. 9:6 alludes to both the lawful and unlawful use of the sword. The unlawful allusion is: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood"; the lawful allusion is: "by man shall his blood be shed." The reason it is eternal is: it has never been peculiar to any dispensation; hence, has never been abrogated in any sense, but is as eternal as Gen. 3:19.

A principle is often not so definite as law enacted under that principle. Yet from my implication that soldiers who indorse the evils of the course of a government are accomplices in the crime or partakers of that evil, Bales concludes that my position assumes that such soldiers should be executed even if they escape death in battle. No, no. Again he fails to observe that in addition to that underlying principle of Gen. 9:6, a course must also be lawful under the law of the particular dispensation that is current. Accordingly, the government does not, as a rule, elect to kill such soldiers when they surrender before they get killed in battle.

VIII. The Suffering of the Innocent

"The question is: Shall a Christian do what he knows will make the innocent suffer?" (Bales.)

That question assumes that one would know it, which may not be true. Besides, the question ignores the other side of the picture. It is probable that many times more innocent people would suffer if the blood-thirsty Axis enemies of civilization are not stopped. Comparatively it is perhaps true that more civilians have suffered as a result of not resisting such international evil than have suffered by resisting it. I say comparatively for the Nazi Fifth Column was not in complete control when Hitler started his war against the world except in a few small countries. So before the negative can sustain his point on behalf of the innocent, he must first prove that more suffer as a result of resisting such evil than as a refusal to resist it.

IX. Similarity To Seventh-Day Adventist's Argument

"(1) If Genesis 9:6 is binding on Christians because it was given to man to be enforced, Mk. 2:27, 28 binds the Sabbath for it was given to man to be enforced by man," etc. (Bales.)

Reply: But Gen. 9:6 is not binding merely because it was given to man, but also because it has not been repealed and has stood up under subsequent revelation and history of two succeeding dispensations, while the Sabbath day has not.

"(2) *One* of the reasons the Jews were to keep the Sabbath was because of God's creation and rest (Ex. 20: 10, 11)." (Bales.)

Reply: If we had nothing to go by but the passage cited the "similarity" would be "striking," but it breaks down under subsequent revelation and history of the two principles. For a principle to stand the test of being

eternal, *if it relates to man*, we must find it divinely sanctioned in law from its incipiency. So evidently the eternal phase of the principle upon which the Sababth is based relates only to God, while the temporal phrase of the principle related to the Jews.

“(3) Stonestreet, an uninspired man, is the one who quoted Gen. 9:6 and talked about “eternal” law. In his argument we have what man says, but where has he shown us where God said for Christians to take vengeance.”

Reply: It has been very definitely shown over and over in principle that according to a well established custom, attested to by the Saviour of the world, that man on earth fight for the causes of worldly kingdoms and that Christians sustain a relation to this cause so long as it is divinely sanctioned—they sustain this relationship by inspired command, doing all except placing them in any particular rank. Contrary to the positive law realm, in the moral realm everything is right except what is prohibited by the law of expediency, which does not so much apply in this subject, and what is specifically forbidden. Till I find a command in the New Testament telling us not to obey the government to the extent of its divinely sanctioned mission. I am justified in teaching as I am. It is now time for the negative to cite the Scriptures forbidding the Christian’s obedience to the extent of the government’s divinely-sanctioned mission.

X. John 18:36

“The nature of the kingdom of heaven forbade His disciples fighting for Him.” (Bales.)

Reply: Certainly the Spiritual King forbade the use of material weapons for Him; only the sword of the Spirit is to be for that cause. But that is the width of the poles from teaching Christians that they are not to use material weapons in fighting for a worldly king who may represent

a righteous, moral cause in accordance with the well established custom.

XI. Priests and Pilate

"It is granted that under the law of Moses civil and religious functions belonged to Israel," etc. But the essential point in the second affirmative on that subject is that it was the religious rather than any enlightened civil aspect of the kingdom that sought Christ's death. The idea of rivalry between the spiritual and the civil is based on a misconception of either one or the other or both.

XII. Titus 3:1

The point under this head has been met under a previous one.

XIII. Characterists of a Just War

Both sides of no war in all history have ever been just, precisely as both sides in no religious issue have ever been scriptural. All that is meant by a just war is when there is Scriptural, moral ground for one side to war against war, as in the present conflict on the part of the United Nations against the evils of aggression and intrigue.

XIV. Citizenship Has Nothing To Do With the Issue

"Our obligation to the government under which we live is based on a divine command and not on the basis of citizenship." (Bales.)

Reply: But he overlooks the fact that our divine obligation is, to some extent, contingent upon citizenship, because commands of the government are based on citizenship. This is further proof that Brother Bales fails to distinguish effectively between the religious and the civil. True, purely religious law is based only on inspired com-

mands, but our relation to the civil law is based on both divine commands and the uninspired commands of the government. When these two commands conflict, both the negative and the affirmative are agreed on what to do. The only point of difference therefore is—the circumstances under which they conflict.

XV. Acts 5:29 (Stonestreet's Point IV)

Without governmental leadership to command, the Christian cannot scripturally use military force; with that leadership, only the government's divinely-sanctioned mission marks the limits of such service, for that is God's order. Yet Bales inquires: "If we fail to punish such as a persecutor, are we not failing, as Stonestreet would say, to enforce the moral law?"

Reply: Even so, the Christian, as such, is not *in* authority but *under* in the use of military force.

I thank Brother Bales for calling my attention to his "first negative, Argument X."

Basing my argument on Romans 13 and 1 Peter 2, Bales in effect alleges that I assume: "(1) That the passages refer to governments at war with another government."

Reply: In the absence of any inspired specification of either war or peace, there is no logical right to conclude that the texts mean one to the exclusion of the other. Either one is therefore meant.

"(2) That the Christian is here thought of as the agent of the government in inflicting vengeance."

Reply: In the light of the government's divinely-sanctioned mission specified in those texts, there is no valid reason to conclude that service under commands within those limits is limited to merely what is *subjective* with the Christian, for what is *objective* is equally essential to national welfare. True, Paul is writing to subjects, not rulers, but governmental commands often relate to what is both sub-

jective and objective with the Christian. In the moral realm it is just as essential that the behavior of others be tolerable as the behavior of Christians. So, at the command of the government, according to the divine plan, the service of the Christian is involved in that worthy endeavor, except as conscience may strangely protest.

In the final paragraph of the negative instalment immediately preceding this is a list of 12 questions. Omitting a repetition of the questions, they are answered according to their numerical order, as follows:

(1) At a time so as to not nullify God's law of force, for God is the author of both. (2) Only when there are good reasons to conclude that such a course results in killing fewer babies than non-resistance. (3) Yes, when God's law of vengeance provides for it. (4) Not exclusively Christian principles, but moral principles. (5) Suffer martyrdom rather than follow their double-crossing, outlaw leaders. (6) Yes, if the government's command is in harmony with its divinely-sanctioned mission. (7) Yes, all Christians in Germany and Japan should be conscientious objectors in this global war that their blood-thirsty leaders started. (8) The querist must first prove that it is known just how God "overrules human governments" in this age in each instance. (9) Not unless the motive is to suppress aggression. (10) Not so as to be a partaker in its evils. (11) Except as provided for in those answers. (12) I trust not, but to protect all who have an inalienable right to accept or reject Christianity. Only the sword of the Spirit is to be used to protect Christianity, as such.

The affirmative position on the proposition now under discussion is in perfect harmony with the following inspired text:

"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 (peaceable- A. V.) life in all godliness and gravity." (1 Timothy 2:1, 2.)

The above text is most significant. The design of that prayer is not that we may not violate the Sermon on the Mount; no, our obedience under that law is not contingent upon the action of "kings" or those in low places either. No, no, its design is not that: it refers to national peace or a condition for which kings and those in high place are responsible. No king on earth has anything to do with peace as between individuals in an individual capacity. Think of the negative position that assumes that "kings and all that are in high place" have to do with Christians obeying the Sermon on the Mount! Christians, themselves, are responsible for that and not somebody else in a high place. Hence, national peace or war are alluded to in that text, which also involves Christians through the inspired commands for them to obey the government within the limits of its divinely-sanctioned mission.

According to Weymouth's translation, the design of that prayer is even more significant, thus: "in order that we may live peaceful and tranquil lives," etc. But if the Christian is not to obey the government in its lawful military endeavor, why the design of that prayer? If the Christian is not thus involved in war, he would be living a peaceful life any way. Thus, a peaceful life for the Christian from the national point of view, while desirable, is not binding by inspired fiat, but is contingent upon kings and those in high place anywhere in the world.

THIRD NEGATIVE

By James D. Bales

Wars which rage in the world are not wars between the Christian nation, the church, and unbelievers, but between worldly nations which are all more or less sinful. Stone-

street believes that Christians, under certain conditions, should engage in such wars. I do not.

I. Outlaw Governments

The powers that be cannot fall from grace, because they never were in grace. As long as they *exist* (Rom. 13:1), they are used of God. And when God can no longer make use of their wrath, He destroys them (Psa. 76:10; Isa. 10:12; Jer. 25:12). The very wrath which He overruled was finally the wrath for which He brought wrath on them. But even while the rest of the world considers them "outlaw" they may still be used of God to punish other wicked people, and all nations are sinful to varying degrees, and to keep order within their own realm.

On Stonestreet's theory Christians in Japan owe no allegiance; should pay no taxes; and in no way submit to their present government. Furthermore, they should use the sword on their own government for it is an evildoer, an outlaw, and the "lawful" powers have legislated that the sword should be thus used.

We have pointed out that Rome had all the characteristics which brethren today say makes a government outlaw. (1) Rome and the church were, in some manner, antagonistic (Dan. 2:44,45). (2) It helped crucify Christ (John 19:10-11; Acts 4:28). (3) It was at enmity with God and His Son (Acts 4:25,27 compared with Psa. 2). (4) Pilate was not always gentle with the conquered Jews. "Between his legionnaires and the Jewish people there was no love lost. His attempt to hang up some brazen shields as trophies in the Temple (Josephus, Antiquities, xviii. 3, 1); to use 'the Corban' or Sacred Fund for the erection of public tanks for the comfort of rich and poor (Ant. xviii. 3, 2); and to crush in blood the insurrection which this caused, must have increased the general ill-will." "Has he not at one Passover massacred upwards of three thousand Jews

'like victims' (Jos. Ant. xvii. 9, 3), and filled the Temple courts with their dead bodies? Has he not at another slain many thousands more (Ant. xviii. 3, 2; Bell. Jud, II: 9, 4), and 'mingled the blood of certain Gallileans with their sacrifices?' (Lk. 13:1). "(G. F. Maclear, *Historical Illustrations of the N. T. Scriptures*, pp. 15-18.) Did not another ruler, Felix, keep Paul in prison with the hope of extorting money? Of him, Tacitus said "he indulged in every kind of barbarity and lust, and exercised the power of a king in the spirit of a slave" (History, V. 9. Compare Tacitus, Annals, xii. 54.) Was not Herod deceptive (Matt. 2:7, 8) and a butcher of babies (Matt. 2:16. See also Josephus, Ant. xv. 1, 3, 6, 7; xvi. 4, 8, 10; xvii. 3, 6, 7). Religious liberty was interfered with for "the high-priest was appointed and removed at" the pleasure of the Romans. "Their will was absolute law. From their decisions there was, except in the case of Roman citizens, no appeal." Pagan temples were erected in territories which the Romans conquered. Gladiatorial combats were brought to Palestine by the Romans. Thus Rome had invaded Palestine; imposed heavy taxes; defiled the temple; murdered innocent Jews; and kept them under Roman bondage.

T. R. Glover, in *The World of the New Testament*, after mentioning the good points of the Roman Empire, pointed out its defects. (1) "No self-determination of races in that world—they are subjects, all of them. As Appian said (A. D. 160), 'in a word the Emperors were everything'." (2) The subjects had little protection against the Emperor when and if he decided to further wrong them. (3) Bad finance and over-taxation. (4) Economic, spiritual, and physical slavery. Contempt for marriage and for the life of slaves. (5) Government control even over religion. The Jews were allowed many freedoms in this respect, but as pointed out the Romans could and did interfere at times. (pp. 130-134.) These are some of the things which he mentioned.

These things have not been mentioned to imply that that Empire and dictatorship had no good points about it. Something good could be said by someone about any dictatorship that has ever existed. *It is mentioned to show that Rome was the very kind of power which Stonestreet labels as outlaw, and yet Paul said it was ordained of God.* This whole subject would be clear to the reader if he will remember two things. *First*, God has some servants who are not Christian. Rome was not Christian; no nation today is. These servants are not directly appointed by the Lord, and in many cases have not even recognized His existence (Isa. 10:7; Rom. 13:1, with reference to Rome). God simply overrules them. *Second*, God may use such non-christian servants, sometimes by overruling what they mean for evil, to do things which He does not command or permit His faithful children to do. For example, the crucifixion of Christ (John 19:10-11). "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." (Acts 4:26,28.) Yet, these very powers were ordained of God (John 19:10-11; Rom. 13:1), and used of God in these very wicked deeds. Stonestreet's theory concerning civil government would have forced him to have had a part in and to have sanctioned the action of Pilate and the others who crucified Christ. Stonestreet's heart will not sanction what his theory will.

Stonestreet believes that God used Russia. And yet, he must realize that Russia is dominated by a dictatorship which has been as ruthless as Hitler. It is estimated that today there are "from 15 to 20 millions of Russian citizens," in concentration camps in Siberia, "dying a slow death at hard labor" (*Reader's Digest*, p. 15, June, 1945). That

such a power may be still a power of Rom. 13, and thus used in some way by the Lord, simply illustrates my contention that even wicked powers are overruled to punish other wicked powers. Stonestreet's position would teach Russians to carry the sword to protect, as they did against Germany, and perpetuate their own government which is a ruthless dictatorship. His theory also implies that the "righteous" countries ought to use the sword to punish the evildoing of Russia.

II. Divine Mission and Divine Approval

We have already shown that a power may have a "divine" mission which involves evil doing (Acts 4:28, etc.). The thing that Stonestreet must prove, and which he has not, is that the *Christian* has a divine mission of wrath. Since the pagan dictatorship of Rome had a divine mission Stonestreet's position implies that he thinks it would be right for Christians to operate such a dictatorship as that of Nero's. Brother Stonestreet, would you think that it was right for a Christian to be a dictator in such an empire? You must think so, or give up your position on Romans 13.

With reference to 2 Thess. 2:10, 11, we know that human instrumentality is often employed for many people are deceived by such strong delusions as Christian Science. Brother Stonestreet is it right for Christians to send strong delusions because God sends them? Does the fulfilment of the divine mission by "strong delusions" imply God's approval of these strong delusions?

III. The Three Words

(1) There was a vestige of the original government left in Palestine, but Jesus did not tell them to command resistance against the Romans. Since "Render to Caesar" and Romans 13 were written under and of a government

which was of the type that Stonestreet thinks is due only a "passive" submission—that is, on his own logic, the only type of submission taught in these passages. These passages taught under such a government everything that they teach under any government today. However, since Stonestreet would contend that a conquering dictatorship was not ordained of God, he really should not advocate any kind of submission to it. He does not think that Rom. 13 would apply at all to such a power. Thus it is difficult to see how he believes that it applied to Rome.

(2) Christians need not always follow the golden rule. They may follow the iron rule when conditions demand it! This course of conduct is authorized by Stonestreet, but he cannot find any scripture authorizing Christians to follow the iron rule of doing unto others what they have done unto others. In advocating the iron rule, and in advocating the sinfulness of the golden rule, under some circumstances, Stonestreet confirms what I have long known, i.e., that Christian principles are laid aside for the duration when one goes out to kill his enemies. I agree with Stonestreet, he did reach this position by the "process of elimination," and it is the same process which could easily eliminate everything else the New Testament teaches. Certainly it eliminates the duty to assemble with the brethren every first day of the week; it eliminates seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness for it places a worldly war above all other duties during war time. It eliminates love of the enemy and also prayers for those whom you are about to shoot. We wonder whether these brethren would follow this process and eliminate conscientious objectors if the government labeled them as evil doers who interfere with the processes of justice.

(3) We need not repeat our argument on Titus 3:1. We remind the reader that we must determine elsewhere, than from this general statement, what is a good work for Christians. Christ's death on the cross was a good work for

us, it was to us for good, but it was not thereby right for Christ's disciples to crucify him. With Stonestreet's logic one could argue that since it is good for heretics to be cut off from the church, since heresy is evil and a work of the flesh as surely as in murder and sedition (Gal. 5:19-21); since governments bear the sword against evil doers (Rom. 13:4); that therefore it is right for Christians, as government agents, to put heretics to death. The logic here is just as strong as his logic for war.

Furthermore, wherein the government is a minister of God for good to the individual Christian, *it is also to the church as a whole*. So since the church itself is to be ready to every good work, one would have to contend that it is right for the church to become an armed camp for the government.

IV. Romans 13:4

The use of the pronouns; the context wherein it is clearly taught that God uses worldly governments to execute the vengeance which he forbids Christians to execute (12:19; 13:-); the fact that the state was then pagan; all show that the Christians and the powers that be are two distinct parties. The "thee" and "him" in Matt. 18:15 are not the same party, just so Rom. 13:1 is a different party from the Christian. The context shows that "thee" and "him," are both members of the church, but nothing like that about the government and the Christian is taught in Rom. 13. The church is the third party, in Matt. 18, and in this third party the "him" and "thee" are found; but what is the third party in Rom. 13 which embraces "he" and "thou." Furthermore, in Matt. 18 both parties, and the church, are given instruction; but God has given no specific instructions to the worldly governments. In an article in the *Gospel Advocate* (May 3, 1945, p. 244), Stonestreet, commenting on 1 Cor. 7:12-15, wrote: Paul's Epistle being directed to the church

(believers), the *unbeliever* is not directly addressed. Thus the exclusively Christian aspect of the teaching does not apply to the unbeliever, but only its general moral aspect." In Rom. 13 the unbeliever is not addressed, and since no epistles were written to the pagan governments, they were not informed by the Lord of His use of them. They would not have believed it anyhow. Furthermore, when Paul told Christians about God's uses of pagan governments, he was not telling them that God thus used Christians. *Christians have no more business doing the work God overrules governments to do than governments do in doing the work God has given to the church.* But if Christians can, as Stonestreet contends, do the work of the governments, there is no reason that the government cannot do the church's work. Why not contend that the "good" they are to do is the "good" the church is to do? There is as much authority for one as for the other.

V. Two Classes of Evil Doers

Stonestreet now talks about "divine" and "inspired elimination." But he does not produce a single scripture to support his classification of evil doers and the type on which the sword is to be used. This point is vital to his theory, and if he knew of a scripture supporting it he would produce it. He has not, because he cannot. God will avenge His elect (Lk. 18:7-8). When His elect, His people, are attacked their "common rights" are invaded and their freedom denied. Regardless of why the church is persecuted the rights of Christians are taken away from them. Thus Stonestreet could argue, on his own classification of evildoers, that the sword should be used against persecutors because they take away these common rights of Christians and thus endanger civilization. Stonestreet cannot produce any reason why, once Christians start out to kill evil doers, that they should not kill all kinds of evil doers. False

teachers, who teach that man is an evolved beast; that there is no God; that sin does not exist; should also be slain for they endanger civilization. As far as I am concerned, I see neither scripture nor reason in his classification of "evils" and the use which he makes out of it. You notice that he has still refused to list the evil doers against whom the sword should be used.

The fact that the civil and religious are separate today would not be enough in itself to imply that the religious sinners should not be punished by the government. When the brethren argue for killing enemies they say the church should not but that the government should. So the separation of the church and state, in their thinking, does not mean that the state is not to carry out the function in this respect which was carried out when they were combined: So what logic is it that says that it can be true in the case of murder and war, but that the same logic cannot hold good with reference to heretics and false teachers.

VI. A Number of Items

(1) Since Stonestreet says that "neither the individual Christian nor the church is *in* authority but only *under* authority in the use of military force," he cannot escape the conclusion that it is as right for the church to use the sword when under authority as for the individual Christian. However, Stonestreet's position implies that it would be right for Christians to control civil governments, and thus they would be *in* authority also. Furthermore, since whatever Romans 13 teaches concerning submission; paying taxes; etc.; to the individual Christian it teaches to the church as a whole, then if it teaches war for Christians it teaches war for the whole church. No argument can be advanced on Romans 13 for Christians to participate that cannot be advanced for the church to participate.

(2) Stonestreet should show me the lists, which he says "God has already prepared," of evil doers. His vagueness on this point is an indication that he has no *knowledge* of such a classification, and division of punishment, in the Bible.

(3) Sometimes it may be the Lord's will for Christians to suffer for well doing (1 Pet. 3:17); but that does not mean that Christians should make other Christians suffer; or that the action of the non-christians, who persecute Christians, is right.

(4) Peter wanted to put evil doers to death, with the sword, but the Lord told him to put it up (Matt. 26:52). The reason Christ gave him to put it up is the reason Stonestreet uses to authorize Christians to take it out at the command of the government. Those who came out against Christ were not authorized representatives of the Roman government (Matt. 26:47). The sword's "place" to which the Lord referred was its "sheath" (John 18:11).

(5) Where Stonestreet's theory prevails there will be no "suffering martyrdom." The Christian could always truthfully say that the persecution for the name of Christ also invades the common rights which are essential for civilization. Furthermore, since the persecution power would be regarded by them as "outlaw," Christians could use the sword on it for they could maintain that they were forming the new government to take the place of the apostate government. After all, someone would have to form it, so why couldn't they do it?

(6) "If such work is according to its divine mission, there are no sins of which to be a partaker" (Stonestreet). Stonestreet cleared Pilate with this statement, but Jesus said that Pilate had sinned (John 19:10-11). His statement would also clear all those mentioned in Acts 5: 25-28, but the apostles regarded them as sinners in need of salvation (Acts 2:23).

(7) If Christians became martyrs, as he thinks they sometimes should, then he is saying that under some conditions we cannot (a) protect ourselves; or (b) punish that class of evil doers who ought to be punished with the sword. If Stonestreet will stop here and think he will realize that "his" conscientious objectors will have some of the very same arguments brought against them which Stonestreet now brings against my position on non-resistance.

(8) Genesis 9:6. His use of John 8:58 would bind everything from Genesis to Malachi on Christians. If Genesis 9:6 has not been "abrogated in any sense," Matt. 5:38-48, has no meaning for it abrogates for Christians the law of an eye for an eye which is the law of Genesis 9:6. Furthermore, his statement here means that one does not have to wait for a government's command in order to kill and that we can kill when attacked because of our religion. Stonestreet argues that Genesis 9:6 makes it right to kill in war, and then he turns his back on his own argument and will not contend that all enemies should be executed. If it justifies killing some it justifies killing them all. And if the government elected that it should be done Stonestreet would have to argue that it was right. In fact, he should argue that it is wrong for governments to fail to execute all of these criminals. A few war criminals are being brought to justice, after surrender, but in order to get at those *few*, nations are willing to slaughter millions. Strange justice! If it was right to slaughter the millions, it is right to execute the millions who surrender after fighting for some time. I have the same right to spare *all* that he has to spare *some*. The principle that spares some could also spare all.

The brother is confused on Genesis 9:6. One moment it applies and the next it does not. First it is eternal, then it is subject to laws of a current dispensation. If it is subject to laws of this dispensation Genesis 9:6 has *no* information for us for we have to go to the laws of this dispen-

sation to make our decision. So why make it an important point in the debate.

(9) Christians know when they try to burn an entire city to the ground that many innocent ones will suffer. So the question is not shall we bear suffering, but shall we inflict it, both on the guilty and the innocent. The attitude of non-resistance may involve suffering, as it did for the early church, but it does not thereby mean that those who advocate non-resistance will be totally destroyed or that that way will bring the most suffering into life. It is likely that the church would have suffered more at the hand of Rome by resisting than she did by non-resistance.

(10) Similarity to Seventh-day Adventists arguments. It is still true that Stonestreet used the term "man" to embrace Christian man, and he made an argument based on this idea. It is still true that that argument works as well on Mk. 2:27, 28 as on Genesis 9:6. However, it is to be expected that those who go back to the Old Testament for their authority on disputed questions, are likely to have some arguments which are similar. We do not need an express statement abrogating Genesis 9:6; it would be enough that it was omitted from the new covenant. However, we have an express abrogation (Matt. 5:38-48).

(11) Our affirmative arguments will show where the Christian is commanded to take a course of conduct which forbids carrying the sword the government carries. Stonestreet does not think that the church should carry the sword. We ask him where he finds a command in the New Testament "telling us (the church as a whole) to not obey the government to the extent of its divinely sanctioned mission"? What about obedience to the mission of John 19:10-11; Acts 4:28? Where is the command not to put heretics and false teachers to death?

(12) To our replies on John 18:36 we need add but one question. Where does that passage say that worldly kingdoms fight to protect their kings only when the worldly

king represents "a righteous, moral cause in accordance with the well established custom." The well established custom is to fight for the king regardless of the "cause." There is as much authority in this passage to fight for a dictator as for a democratic president. The established custom is to fight for a country's interest and not whether it is right or wrong.

(13) Stonestreet's position on a "just" war is similar to that of Luther's and it works just as well in practice. Luther's theory of a "just" war has been used to justify Lutherans in Germany in fighting for their government in each and every war.

(14) Regardless of what the government bases its commands on, the Christian's submission to the government is not based on citizenship. The teaching of Rom. 13 applies to him even if he is a conquered subject or slave. We submit for wrath's sake; for conscience sake (Rom. 13:1-5); "for the Lord's sake" (1 Pet. 2:13). The citizenship issue has nothing to do with whether Christians have the *authority from God* to bear the sword.

(15) It is well to call to the reader's attention that many of the dangers, of filling the world with criminals and suffering, which he thinks my non-resistance involves; are also dangers which his non-resistance involves when he says that we can not fight the government if it persecutes us; or for the church.

(16) "In the moral realm it is just as essential that the behavior of others be tolerable as the behavior of Christians." The same argument could be used for the "religious realm"; furthermore, it is the religious realm which generally determines a man's attitude in the moral realm. So if the sword is used in one realm, why not in the other.

VII. Answers To Questions

(1) Jesus said love your enemies and he included even those who persecuted us as they persecuted the prophets

(Matt. 5:12, 44). Some of the prophets had their common rights violated and their lives taken. But Stonestreet thinks that when it goes that far Christians must obey a government and apply God's law of force. Love for your enemies is then abrogated. We find not New Testament authority for such a doctrine of "love" for enemies.

(2) His answer to question two sounds as if he advises Christians to inflict the lesser of two evils, as they see it. I find no authority for *Christians to inflict any evil*. It is extremely improbable that the way of redemptive love would result in as many babies being killed as war does.

(Question 4) This admits that Christians lay aside "exclusively Christian principles" when they war. (Question 5) I take it that he here absolves them from all obligation of submission. Logically he should contend that they should fight for the other nations against their own. If Christians there should refuse to follow their leaders into war, Christians in Paul's day should have done the same. Romans 13 was written under and of pagan Rome which was like Japan in many ways. Thus it must be admitted that Rom. 13 did not teach sword bearing then. If it did not teach it then it does not teach it now, anywhere or any time. (Question 6) It is likely that the next war will see women fight, as some have in Russia. Evidently the qualities which we have long considered to be those of a Christian woman, will have a difficult time in the next war. (Question 8) I can prove that God overruled Pilate (John 19:10-11; Acts 4:28). Does Stonestreet believe it would have been right for Christ's disciples to have helped crucify Him?

(Question 12) If we can fight to protect all "who have an inalienable right to accept or reject Christianity," why not fight South American countries where effort is being made to keep out non-catholic missionaries. Why not fight those who through false teaching do not give people much

of an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to accept or reject Christianity?

—VIII. 1 Timothy 2:1, 2

Christians are told to pray for rulers, but nowhere are they told to fight for them. We pray not only for kings, but "for all men" and for "all that are in high place." We also pray for our enemies (Matt. 5:44), but we do not fight just because they are the objects of our prayers. We should pray that righteousness prevail, but we do not use the sword to try to make it prevail. One might pray to be released from suffering, but suicide would not thereby be sanctioned. The *church* is to pray for peace. It is to pray according to the instruction in 1 Tim. 2:1, 2. The church is not thereby bound to a course of vengeance. Any argument, from this passage, for the individual Christian to fight is also an argument for the church to fight for this passage also embraces the church as a whole. We pray that the "word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified"; that we be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men who do not have the faith (2 Thess. 3:1, 2), that is, from those who oppose the faith and who would harm its preachers; but we do not thereby use the sword to insure these things. If we did, it would be fighting for Christianity, which we cannot do (John 18:36).

Paul's statement concerning prayer certainly embraced the idea of being free from persecution, from both Jew and Roman. He did not say or imply that if they were not permitted freedom from persecution that the church was to fight back. When we consider the condition of the church under Rome and among the Jews it is likely that freedom from persecution was more under consideration than the idea of national peace with other nations. The Christians peaceful life would be as much disturbed by persecution as

by a war, perhaps more so. And when we allow rulers to send us to war, we certainly are not living a peaceful life.

The negative does not assume that kings and those in high places have anything to do with Christians obeying the Sermon on the Mount. Furthermore, the passage, 1 Tim. 2, has not the remotest suggestion of Christians bearing arms. It embraces no more than the statement of Jeremiah, in so far as peace is concerned, to "seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace." (Jer. 29:7). Who would affirm that this meant that they should fight for their conquerors?

IX. Romans 13

Our suggestions on this passage will be briefly enumerated. We hope they will be helpful in suggesting ideas which the reader will pursue further.

(1) Stonestreet's position implies that it would be right for Christians to be in control of a dictatorship, since this passage embraced a dictatorship. It also implies that it was right to fight for a dictatorship. (2) What Romans 13 teaches the Christian it teaches the church. There is no submission there required but what would be proper for the church as the church to submit to. For example, the church pays taxes if the government requires it. Brethren admit that this passage does not teach the church to fight, therefore it does not teach the individual Christian to fight. To prove otherwise one would have to prove that this passage teaches one thing to the church and another thing to the individual. This cannot be proved. (3) It is not the origin or the character of the government, but the *existence* of it, which necessitates our submission. (4) We are commanded to submit, but we are not commanded to force others to submit. (5) The power is overruled for the good

of the Christian whether it be a democracy or a dictatorship. (6) Stonestreet's interpretation implies that it was the duty of Jewish Christians to fight with the Romans against their own countrymen and to help destroy Jerusalem and their own countrymen; in other words, to fight to perpetuate Roman rule over their own native land. (7) Pilate was part of the civil power ordained and used of God (John 19:10-11; Acts 4:25-28). We again ask, how can you escape the fact that your theory implies that disciples should have helped crucify Christ and that in so doing they would have been doing their civil duty. (8) Being ordained of God, in the sense of Rom. 13, does not mean approved of God. God simply overrules them, even when they know Him not. If it means "approved of God," then God approved the pagan Roman dictatorship which combined "church and state." (9) The evil we are not to resist, but are to return such good things as food and drink (Rom. 12:19-21); is the very evil God overrules governments to punish. They carry out at least part of the vengeance which we leave to Him (Rom. 13:1). When we are told to leave vengeance to God, we are thereby told to leave it to whomsoever He uses to carry out that vengeance. Therefore, we are to leave it to governments, not to do it ourselves or as their agents, for God overrules them for this work. To do otherwise is to fail to leave vengeance unto the Lord. (10) The nations, which included Rome, were walking in their own ways (Acts 14:16), but in spite of that God used them. They could not get beyond His overruling power. (11) God ordained, created, and perpetuates the laws of nature, but we do not thereby have the right to enforce penalties for the violation of those laws. (12) The only sword here mentioned is in the hand of the government, not of the Christian. (13) Brethren are agreed that obedience to a government is not unlimited. They even believe that when a government commands us to contradict a principle of Christian living we must not obey, even if the

Bible does not say in so many specific words that "Thou shalt not obey the government when it commands so and so." All we need to do is to show that what they require of Christians is contrary to what God requires of Christians. The teaching concerning God's use of civil government is not teaching concerning God's use of the Christian. Since Rom. 13 does not command Christians to carry swords, but only a general submission, the brethren must be convinced on some other grounds and passages that this submission includes obedience in carrying the sword. But where are the passages which prove it? Many passages show that the way of war is contrary to the way of the Christian life. (14) The ordination of governments is nothing like God's ordination of the church. In contrast to the governments, God has ordained but one church; governments are created by men but the church by God; the church had God's will and plan revealed to her, not so with governments; the church is the creation of grace, not so governments; the church has a mission of mercy, governments of wrath; the church will be saved for doing its work; not so the governments; the church is constituted of God's faithful children; not so governments. (15) When one thinks he is startled to discover just how far these brethren carry the idea of submission to governments. They allow governments to abrogate the world wide commission when they help kill part of the world to whom Christ has sent them to save; to make them treat enemies as they admit that a Christian personally should not treat them; to submit to an education which endeavors to drill hate into them; to be placed in circumstances where you know that it will often be impossible to obey Heb. 10:25; to be placed under circumstances where it is likely that multitudes of immature Christians will assemble for worship with sectarians; to go to any length in violence to exterminate or capture the foe—even to burning him in oil or gasoline or

suffocating him; to make us take life which we cannot restore; to make widows and orphans.

X. Titus 3:5

In a former affirmative this passage was used. In reply we emphasize that we are passive in so far as having done anything to justify our salvation. Our efforts are not the ground, the cause, of our salvation. It was not according to such efforts but according to His mercy that He saved us. This grace teaches us the conditions on which we may receive and retain mercy (Titus 2:11, 12-). In this passage Christians are the object of that grace, but Christians are not the government in Rom. 13 and thus when Paul told what God overruled governments to do, he was not telling what Christians were to do. Paul told them of God's use of the government not with the purpose of telling Christians to use the sword, but to tell Christians not to be insurrectionists and to submit to the government. *We* are not to carry the sword *because they* are ordained of God. This is not what Paul taught. He taught that we are to submit to them, not to rebel, because they are ordained of God. That conclusion, and not the bearing of the sword, is the conclusion drawn by Paul from the principle of Rom. 13:1. Our brethren have no right to draw a conclusion so opposite to Paul's teaching.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

By P. W. Stonestreet

War is grim business. I renounce its every cause. But that does not preclude obeying the government in its use of military force, with all its horrors, in its fight against war. In this world there is only one other course more horrible than resistance and that is the failure to resist such evils with adequate force when other means have failed to pre-

vent war. Such lawful resistance against such evil is not only in harmony with the Scriptures, but it is the lesser of the two calamities.

Hence, to indiscriminately renounce both sides of all wars, as the theory of the negative assumes, is to invite a worse calamity by ignoring God's provision of force through civil government. God knows the needs of humanity and he gave civil government the sword, with all that it implies, to use as a punishment for, and a restraint against, intolerable moral evils. In this age when no miracle is divinely promised to intervene, as was the case with Gideon and Joshua, it would be most unfortunate for any nation if any considerable percentage of its citizenry were to oppose at all cost lawful resistance against aggressors. Now, when military ends can be accomplished only by military means, a nation that refuses to lawfully resist would be an easy prey of designing out-law leaders of the other nations when such nations are so unfortunate as to be led by such men—leaders apparently devoid of all conscientious, moral and scriptural restraints. Yet this does not cancel blessings in prayer, but just as prayer is to be offered according to law (God's will), its blessings accrue accordingly. In all God's realms, the most common error among religious people is to confuse this age of law with former ages when law was often divinely contravened.

The Scriptures teach some things by express command and much more by principle without specifying minutely the innumerable courses that may be pursued under such principles. For example, from 1 Cor. 5:9-11 we glean an important principle. In thus giving instructions to the church, a plain line of distinction is drawn between keeping company with undesirable characters *in the church* and in keeping company with the same characters *in the world*. Paul explains: "not at all meaning" such characters "of the world . . . for then must ye needs go out of the world," etc. Neither are such characters to be judged by church

standards of judgment. While several sins are specified in the text, the principle is sufficiently broad to cover any moral sins. Thus the principle teaches that Christians are to live *in the world* with such characters that are in the world, for assuredly they are not to get out the world because of them without a fighting chance. All that is necessary to living in the world with such characters is implied in that privilege divinely assured. One thing necessary to that end is to lawfully hold such characters in restraint within certain limits. Sometimes this results in the necessity to use military force against them at the command of the government divinely commissioned to that task. The principle is precisely the same whether an individual, a band, a nation or a group of nations is being dealt with. Thus, when Adolph Hitler, whose will power was far in excess of his brain power, ran amuck with his trained hordes against civilization it resulted in World War II. It is indeed unfortunate that so many gallant men and women, both in the armed forces and civilian life of the United Nations, had to lose their lives in resisting the evils of that aggression, but no doubt the deaths and sufferings would have been many times more if it had not been resisted.

One thing that made that resistance more expensive, both in human life and property, was that it was too long deferred. Several years earlier, when Hitler and Mussolini first began to rattle the sword, they should have been lawfully cut down forthwith. But during those fateful years, the United States, the most productive and wealthiest country on earth, was sailing along on the unscriptural and dangerous policy of isolation. Likewise European statesmen were apparently asleep on the job, and it took the most destructive war in all history to wake them up on both sides of the Atlantic. The very idea of pursuing a policy of isolation during a period of the world's history when it is impossible to isolate is absurd in the extreme! This writer will never knowingly vote for a man or woman for the

congress of the United States who favors such delinquency in resisting such powers of conquest. Moral: In this age of the world, while might is not always right, might always wins. Hence the importance of the normally-minded nations of the world giving thought to might, thus distinguishing between God's power of persuasion (the gospel) and God's power of might (the civil-military government).

To this end I pray God's richest blessings on the conferees now engaged in the San Francisco conference of the United Nations that the charter they present to their respective governments may provide adequate force to quell all wars in their beginning. Also I pray God's richest blessings upon the statesmen of the United Nations whose duty it is to ratify that charter. Imperfect as all human endeavors are, I pray all may realize that we have all to gain and nothing whatever to lose in trying the experiment, for all previous means of preventing wars have been futile. It is reasonable to expect occasional uprisings by emotional and fanatical leaders to continue, but it is better to have ever so many of them to arise and quell them in the beginning than to stupidly allow a single one of them to grow into the proportions of the Hitler-Mussolini-Hirohito war.

Some Bible students who are longer on quotations than mental digestion are accustomed to quote: "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that ye be not troubled: for these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet." (Matt. 24:6) This and other passages are quoted as proof that wars cannot be prevented. But they fail to observe the significant phrase: "but the end is not yet." They do not know how many thousand years are involved in that phrase. The wonder is that the world has been so fortunate as it has since the advent of air travel providing for circumnavigating the globe in a few hours by both friend and foe.

Barring comparatively few leaders of thought in statecraft, among whom is that great humanitarian and far-seeing statesman, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, statesmanship has not kept pace with human ingenuity. We might as well expect modern cities to avoid local war without a police force as to expect the world to avoid world wars without some adequate means to quell them in the beginning before they grow so large. It is indeed a forward step, even though it is only a step, for the United Nations to agree to use in unison such a means to curb war. Such agreement should have been entered into about twenty-five years ago under the leadership of that giant mind, the late President Woodrow Wilson. He pointed the way and gave the world fair warning, but then statesmanship was overcome by politics. So the world now has another chance in the Providence of God; and the conferees at San Francisco and the departments of the several governments who have a chance to ratify the charter thus presented deserve the prayers and respect of all peoples of the world in their wise, timely, humanitarian and praiseworthy endeavor. Keeping tolerable order in the moral realm, by military force when necessary, has been divinely committed to man through civil governments; and may they have the courage and wisdom to meet that responsibility.

Note Brother Bales' strange statement: "On Stonestreet's theory Christians in Japan owe no allegiance; should pay no taxes; and in no way submit to their government. Furthermore, they should use the sword on their own government for it is an evildoer, an outlaw, and the 'lawful' powers have legislated that the sword should be used."

On the contrary, I have consistently and scripturally taught, as the affirmative installments under this proposition show, that Christians in Japan can scripturally "submit" *passively rather than heartily and obediently*. Yea, they can scripturally suffer martyrdom, if necessary, rather than be partakers in the evils of their government in its

cowardly, sneaking and evil attack on the United States on that "day of infamy," Dec. 7, 1941. Instead of using the word "submit" in season and out of season on this subject, as the school of thought represented by Brother Bales in this discussion does, the case of Christians in Japan furnishes an occasion for an object lesson on the correct application of the word "submit." Because of the illimitable span between God and man the word is always applicable with reference to God, but as it applies in human affairs it always has a circumstantial and psychological application according to its inherent meaning. Christians cannot scripturally and effectively just imagine themselves under a lawful government. Only when the United Nations set up a lawful government in Japan after the present outlaw government has surrendered unconditionally can Christians there have a lawful government to obey. While the negative has not agreed to aid in that worthy endeavor, may its personnel be indelibly impressed with the scriptural truth that the Christian is estopped from vengeance, except what has been committed to man at the command of the civil-military government.

Thus, except as a Christian may be at the head of a government, the Christian is *under* and not *in* authority in such affairs. This is God's order which is all my proposition obligates me to prove. God does not have two standards of morality set forth in the Scriptures: one for Japan and the other for the United Nations. With his splendid logical acumen, Brother Bales can appreciate the fact that God does not have different spiritual laws for the conflicting religious bodies of the world. For precisely the same reason God does not have two standards of morality by which, respectively, Christians in Japan and in the United Nations are to be governed. I can see how denominational preachers can be confused on this subject just as they are confused in assuming that God sanctions conflicting religious creeds, but it is indeed strange that one who is not set for

the defense of denominationism would be so confused. But I cannot do his thinking for him; I can only suggest it.

Brother Bales' quotation from Josephus and other historians, attesting to the evils of men in government, are wide of the mark. There is no issue on that *fact*. But he should know that the fact of evil men in government no more condemns government than the fact of evil men in religion condemns the church. In both cases the Christian is divinely taught to "discern both good and evil" and to follow that which is good. The fact that God ordained civil government for good is no guarantee that it always accomplishes that divine purpose, but it is only a guarantee that it *can* accomplish that purpose. Of course the free-moral agency of man is involved in all human endeavor, whether obedience is rendered unto God for weal or unto the devil for woe.

Divine Mission and Divine Approval

Brother Bales claims: "We have already shown that a power may have a 'divine' mission which involves evil doing (Acts 4:28, etc)."

His citation is a part of the prayer offered by the apostles, which reads in part: "The kings of the earth set themselves in array, And the rulers were gathered together, Against the Lord, and against his Anointed; for of a truth in this city against thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever thy hand and counsel foreordained to come to pass." (Acts 4:26-28.)

This was a special event in fulfillment of prophecy. Procedure was according to "thy hand and counsel foreordained to come to pass." Yet those people were not acting under divine decree, but under their free-moral agency, which made them responsible. It was an event in which

both divinity and humanity were involved. Christ gave his life as a sacrifice for sin; also He was crucified by sinful men. Proof: "Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (Matt. 26:53, 54.)

By that citation the negative would evidently have the reader conclude that this special event set a precedent for the divine mission of civil government for all subsequent time. But nothing like it had ever come to pass before nor is to take place again. Among the rulers involved in that matter the text specifies "the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel." So that event no more sets a precedent for civil government than for *Israel*—no more sets a precedent for civil government than for religious government.

Referring to ancient Rome, Brother Bales asks: "Brother Stonestreet, would you think it was right for a Christian to be a dictator in such an empire?"

His question involves a contradiction and I reply accordingly. Had a faithful Christian been the dictator it would not have been "such an empire;" it would have been a better one. There is not a syllable in the Scriptures against such service to humanity. True, "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called," etc., *which implies that some might be called*. Paul almost persuaded King Agrippa to be a Christian; and it is not even hinted that he would have had to abdicate the earthly throne to be a Christian.

Contrary to Brother Bales' contention, I cited 2 Thess. 1:7, 8, showing that punishment for the sins of not obeying the gospel is divinely reserved till the coming of the Lord. This certainly divinely eliminates that class of sin from the mission of vengeance in which man is instrumental and referred to in Romans 13, etc. I am sure the reader will see that divine classification of sin and evil, whether Brother Bales can see it or not. So the text of 2 Timothy

LIBRARY
ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
ABILENE, TEXAS

2:15 has a much wider application than the negative has so far made of it in this discussion.

"No argument can be advanced on Romans 13 for Christians to participate that cannot be advanced for the church to participate." (Bales.)

With the same logic he could say: No argument can be advanced on engaging in secular business "for Christians to participate that cannot be advanced for the church to participate." Behold where his logic leads to! Any explanation of the latter will also apply to the former. Besides, Brother Bales will have to wait till the government either commands or accepts the services of the church, as such, in military combat.

"Is it right for Christians to send strong delusions because God sent them?" (Bales.)

No. Neither the Scriptures nor the civil government command such service. That is something else that God has not commissioned man to do. Yet the affirmative on this proposition welcomes the effort of the negative to make it just as difficult to prove the proposition as possible, even though many of such questions are irrelevant.

The foregoing answers Brother Bales question that the affirmative position "implies that disciples should have helped crucify Christ and that in so doing they would have been doing their civil duty." It also covers in principle his question concerning the conversation between Jesus and Pilate recorded in John 19:19, 11.

God's Overruling Power

The New Testament does not teach that God's overruling hand is to alter the Christian's endeavor to accomplish results by law in any matter that God has assigned to man. But instead, Christianity anticipates the Christian's practical equipment to "discern good and evil" and to follow that which is good. Hence, it is not denied that God overrules

in human affairs, but it is denied that such overruling power excuses the Christian for not acting according to law just as if such acts were not overruled. Therefore, God having assigned punishment for, and restraint against, well known forms of evil to human instrumentality through the civil-military government, and having commanded Christians to "submit" to, to "obey" and to be "reader unto every good work" of such governments, only the divine mission of such governments marks the limits of the Christian's duty to render service through them, except as conscience may protest. Of course no one can obey God in any matter with a conscience protesting against that obedience, for conscience is the only fallible guide that the infallible guide teaches one to follow.

Absolute and Conditional Realms

By the *absolute* is meant that phase of law which is settled by inspired fiat. On this phase of law it is not in the province of man to decide what is right, for that is inherent in the law, which is wholly the prerogative of God. Hence, man's judgment, on this phase of law, is exercised only to determine what God's law is. Barring a choice of incidentals not wrong in themselves, no other factor is left to man's judgment in this realm of law.

This phase of God's law embraces all acts of public worship which are circumscribed in the New Testament. It includes all that is specified and excludes all that is not specified in the several texts. Otherwise acts of worship in the public assembly of the church would be unlimited, rendering the New Testament wholly useless so far as acts of worship are concerned. But this rule of inclusion and exclusion is a law of language that, in this age, applies only to acts of worship in the public assembly of the church.

By the *conditional realm* is meant that phase of law in which human judgment is not restricted to determining just

what is to be done, *but it is also to be exercised to determine the circumstances under which a thing is to be done.* This conditional realm embraces the subject of the proposition under discussion which involves the exercise of human judgment not only to decide what is to be done, but also under what conditions it is to be done. It calls for the exercise of human judgment in identifying the evils of the Axis governments in this global war with the evils referred to in Romans 13, etc., which involves the divinely-sanctioned mission of civil government. How one so sensible as Brother Bales can fail to thus identify that evil is indeed a mystery to the affirmative.

In this wide moral realm much more is covered by inspired principle than by express command. Had everything been minutely specified in this wide realm, the New Testament would have been so unwieldy large, it would not have been practical; and in that case there would have been no need to teach Christians to "discern good and evil," but to discern only what God has minutely specified to be done and not to be done, for all is good that is thus commanded to be done and all is evil that is thus commanded not to be done. But no such moral strait-jacket is thus divinely prescribed for the Christian in the this wide realm, but it is prescribed only for the acts of public worship.

Thus, there is an important distinction to be made between the absolute or positive realms of thought and action on the one hand, and the conditional or moral realm on the other. In the positive realm it is sinful to do that which is neither commanded nor specifically forbidden, while in the moral realm it is not sinful to do that which is neither commanded nor specifically forbidden, except, of course, as the divine law of expediency applies concerning things indifferent. But as the subject under discussion does not pertain to indifferent things, the law of expediency does not apply at all.

In the light of the negative installments so far under this proposition, it is plain that Brother Bales has confused the above two realms of law and action. Evidently he has overlooked the fact that the law of language that includes all that is, and excludes all that is not, specified in the text, applies only to the positive realm, not to the conditional realm. Now with no effort to definitely anticipate the negative, let the reader watch Brother Bales closely on that point. If in the light of all this array of proof adduced from inspired principles and commands of Scripture—if Brother Bales claims that the affirmative has not thus proved the proposition, as is the custom of the school of thought he represents, it will show conclusively that he fails to differentiate effectively between the two rules of interpretation and action set forth in the foregoing paragraphs. So may the reader watch that point closely, for it is significant.

Spiritualized Terms

All that is necessary to spiritualize a word is to apply it to spiritual ends. Thus when the Bible so applies words they are thereby spiritualized. When Christ announced his "kingdom" there is no evidence that there was another person on earth who understood its import. Neither the civil authorities nor Jesus' own disciples understood it. After nearly two thousand years, comparatively few understand it effectively. It is not enough to merely quote texts to that effect and use the word spiritual; it must be reduced to practice by practically differentiating between the earthly and the spiritual. No wonder the civil authorities were suspicious of that announcement. The spiritual realm thus used the vocabulary of the material realm and the civil authorities did not understand the spiritual import of the word. So they naturally took it to be a rival of the earthly

kingdom. No wonder Christ's disciples were not generally called to places of civil authority.

No wonder also the apostle Peter wanted to defend Jesus with the literal sword. He was not yet familiar with the material vocabulary being used to spiritual ends, so he was inclined to act according to the well-understood and never-condemned custom of the lawful use of the literal sword for temporal ends. But lo and behold! It developed that kingdoms of different realms, with so radically different natures, were not rivals in any sense, except as perverted by uninspired men. Even in the purely moral realm, while they both seek the same purpose, they are not rivals, for while the one seeks that end by *persuasion*, the other seeks it by *force*; and force is not to begin till persuasion ends.

It is utterly impossible for kingdoms of so heterogeneous natures to be rivals, except as those natures have been perverted by uninspired men. Only kingdoms of homogeneous natures can be rivals in the scriptural sense and then only when one or the other has, or both have, departed from their divinely-ordained mission. A theory that assumes otherwise brings reproach upon the kingdom of Christ, for He emphatically teaches that His kingdom is not of this world. Also the mission of Christ's kingdom, *as such*, is distinct from the mission of earthly kingdoms, for concerning that mission in general terms, Inspiration declares: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places." (Eph. 6:12.)

Note the significance of the word "but" in the foregoing quotation. It is used there in the sense of an adverse conjunction. Hence all that follows its use in that text refers to religious or spiritual wickedness in contradistinction to that which precedes it: "flesh and blood" or earthly kingdoms. Hence, "the world rulers of this darkness" refers

not to civil governments, but to false teachers of unscriptural religious doctrines.

Citizenship is another spiritualized word in that long list. One cannot hold citizenship in two earthly governments at the same time without a conflict in due allegiance. For the same reason one cannot hold citizenship in two religious or spiritual governments at the same time without a conflict in allegiance. But just as there is no rivalry between God's ordained earthly powers on the one side, and God's ordained spiritual kingdom on the other, except as one has, or both have, been perverted by men, neither is there any conflict in allegiance in holding citizenship in both at the same time. Hence the apostle Paul consistently, and with due allegiance to both, exercised his citizenship in the earthly government and emphasized his citizenship in heaven. Christians may scripturally do likewise today, for the Scriptures teach now just what they did in Paul's day.

Since there would be no government without citizens, the citizenry is an integral part of civil government. One implies the other, and vice versa. There is no command, implication or principle of Scripture that shows any citizen of an earthly government renounced that citizenship on becoming a Christian. Neither is there evidence of Scripture that any civil or military officer of the earthly government resigned that office on becoming a Christian. Therefore, in the absence of teaching of Scripture to the contrary, the well-established custom obtains for Christian citizens to obey the civil-military government in performing its divinely-sanctioned mission in lawful war and peace, for as already noted there is no conflict between the civil and the spiritual governments as they were each divinely ordained. Also, the general commands, implications and principles of Scripture cited and quoted by the affirmative on this proposition are in harmony with such conditional service, whether it pertains to war industry, buying war bonds, or combat.

So both by the statements and the silence of the Scriptures, the proposition is proved.

FOURTH NEGATIVE

By James D. Bales

The issue is not whether war is "the lesser of two calamities." It is my conviction that less disaster would result if one side entirely adopted Christian principles and tried to overcome evil with good. Some die either way one takes, however suffering and death are not added. One man is no less dead, and no more alive, because 1000 or 1,000,000 die with him. Even on our opponent's reasoning war is the lesser calamity *only* if his side wins, for if they do not their resistance to the enemy would have served only to increase his animosity. However, all this does not settle the issue as to what the *Christian* should do with reference to such enemies. The argument is cast out for it does not touch the issue. It could just as well prove that the church should fight persecutors because it is the lesser of two calamities. But the Christian has not been given the right to inflict calamity upon another, even to avoid that other inflicting calamity on him.

With reference to lawful resistance, the question is: What is lawful resistance for the Christian? It is that resistance which is permitted by Christ, and we maintain that the affirmative has failed to prove that God has made resistance with the sword, at the command of the government, lawful for the Christian. He still has not presented scriptural authority for *Christians* to use "God's power of might" on man.

In 1 Cor. 5:9-11 Stonestreet has gotten more *out* than Paul put *in* it. Paul told the brethren that they were to be stricter in their association with *brethren*, in that they were not to associate with a fornicator, than with people in the world. But who would argue that therefore we should kill

them, but not kill people of the world? No one that I know of, but it would be just as logical to argue from that principle that we should, as it is for one to argue from 1 Cor. 5:10 that we can kill people in the world if it is necessary to living in the world. Evidently Stephen and the early church did not know about this argument for they did not consider it right for them to kill and to do "all that is necessary to living in the world with such characters." Yet, Stonestreet's argument would have sanctioned it. On his argument there is no type of non-resistance, toward evil men, taught in the Bible for the argument under consideration leaves no room for it. And yet, who can deny that some kind of non-resistance to evil men is taught. His argument proves too much. Furthermore, his argument overthrows another argument which he makes wherein he maintains that "the Christian is estopped from vengeance, except what has been committed to man at the command of the civil-military government." We cannot do any fighting to guarantee that the ungodly permit us to live, *unless* commanded by the government to fight. This sets aside his sweeping conclusions drawn from 1 Cor. 5 wherein he says "All that is necessary to living in the world with such characters is implied in that privilege divinely assured." Now he says that nothing necessary to it is granted to us *unless* the government commands or permits it! In addition to this Stonestreet goes contrary to Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 5 in that Stonestreet believes we can *judge and execute* those that are without, and Paul expressly said "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth." (1 Co. 5:12-13.) Stonestreet vs. Paul.

The issue is not whether we should pray for world rulers. We are so commanded. But that does not prove that we fight for them. We pray for our enemies, but we don't fight for them.

Stonestreet believes that I have made a "strange statement" when I maintain that his theory means that Christians in Japan owe no allegiance to their government. His theory implies that they owe no allegiance to the present government. First, he says, that it is not a lawful government. "Only when the United Nations set up a lawful government in Japan after the present outlaw government has surrendered unconditionally can Christians there have a lawful government to obey." (Stonestreet.) *Second*, the scriptures teach that the *same* government that the Christian is to obey is the *same* one to which he is to submit. The same passages which require *any* submission to a government require *all* that is expressed by such words as "submit" and "obey." If any applies, all applies. It is the power ordained of God to which they are to *submit*, just as it is such a power that they are to *obey*. Whatever argument excludes obedience excludes submission. We are not told to submit to unlawful governments but to obey and submit to lawful ones. The scriptures say nothing about what Christians owe an unlawful government. Thus if their government is unlawful no obedience or submission is required of them. We have already pointed out that Stonestreet is in error, from the Bible standpoint, on "lawful" and "unlawful" governments; but if he was right he would have no authority to render any kind of submission to the unlawful government. Furthermore, what should they do if our lawful government says for them to fight their unlawful one?

Stonestreet is the one who is trying to uphold two standards of morality and he upholds them with reference to the Christian. He believes the Christian must live on one plane as a *Christian*, but that as a *citizen* he may live on another plane. He must follow the *golden rule* as a Christian but he must follow the *iron rule* as a citizen. He also maintains two standards when his logic maintains that the Bible teaches Christians under such a government in Japan not to fight, while it taught Christians under such a government

in Rome to fight. Stonestreet thus makes the same Scriptures, under similar circumstances, teach contradictory things. If these passages teach fighting for any country now, it taught such when it was written. If it taught such then it taught it for a pagan dictatorship in the type of wars by which it was founded, enlarged and perpetuated. Either it did or it did not teach war then. Stonestreet's logic sets up a double standard by saying that these passages taught war under a pagan dictatorship then, but not now under a similar dictatorship which fights similar wars. In addition to this Stonestreet might remember that governments and the church, with reference to their relationship to God, differ in the manner in which God has established them; in which God has established them; in that God has made known His will directly to one and not to the other; in that He has ordained but one church, but many types of governments (why not argue that only one type of government could be ordained of God for a dictatorship and a democracy are of such conflicting types that God could not have ordained both since they stand for different types of morality. Yet, God has ordained both for Rome was a dictatorship and America is a democracy); that the church is the object of mercy, a government is not; the church is composed of the redeemed, a government is not; the church must not be an agent of wrath, the government is; one who is in and does the work of the church will be saved, not so *because* one is in a government.

My purpose in quoting from Josephus, and other historians, concerning Rome and her rule *was not* for the purpose of condemning government. Stonestreet missed the point. The point is that all passages requiring submission and obedience to governments were written under and of a government which was more like Japan in her religious attitudes, wars and form of rule, than like the country in which we live. Therefore whatever these passages require they required under, and with relationship to, such a gov-

ernment. Thus if they required fighting then they required it for such a government and in such wars of suppression and aggression and therefore such fighting for such a government would be lawful now. Stonestreet does not believe such lawful now, so why should he use arguments which would teach (whether he realizes it or not) that such was lawful then? He cannot have it both ways. He must acknowledge that it is right for Christians in Japan to fight in this war, which is similar to those by which Rome built and perpetuated her empire, or he must acknowledge that the submission and obedience required in Paul's day under Rome did not include carrying the sword. My other point, in connection with the wickedness of Rome, was to show that even such a power was ordained of God in Paul's day, thus why not today? This is not to say that after God had accomplished His purpose through such a government that he would not use another nation, even though sinful, to punish her (Compare Isa. 10:5-12). We repeat: Nothing is embraced now with reference to submission and obedience to governments which was not embraced in Paul's day with reference to Rome and her wars which built and perpetuated her empire.

With reference to Acts 4:28, I was showing that God could use not only the good of a government, but that he could also overrule deeds which they did which were evil within themselves. And Isa. 10:5-12 shows that God may send a government on a mission of wrath, when in so far as that government knows it is prompted only by its own greed and lust for blood. This is not to deny man's free agency, but it is to affirm that the above principle is taught in both Testaments. If it is right to carry the sword for a government because it is ordained of God, and on what is in some sense a divine mission, then it would have been right to help crucify Jesus who died at the hands of the ordained power whose actions were included in the counsel of God (John 19:10-11; Acts 4:28). That is the point of simi-

larity that I was bringing out *and not that this act set a "precedent for the divine mission of civil government for all subsequent time."* And it follows that the scriptures and logic which show that Christ's crucifixion was not for disciples to participate in, just because it was ordained in some way of God, will show that Christians are not bound to a course of wrath just because governments are ordained of God as ministers of wrath.

In answer to my question about being a dictator, Stonestreet is saying that it is right for a Christian to be a certain kind of dictator, or he did not answer my question. We wonder what kind. So far as we know dictators may differ in the degree in which they exercise their power, but they do not differ in kind. My question did not involve a contradiction. The Roman empire in its heathen character, in all that I covered with the phrase "such an empire" (and I described elsewhere something of what "such" included), *was ordained of God*. Thus an empire and an emperor which Stonestreet would not approve for a Christian to rule as and over, were ordained of God. An empire which Christians could not rule over was still ordained. Thus it is clear that Stonestreet must agree with me that to be ordained of God *does not necessarily mean to be approved of God, in moral character or rule, or that it is for Christians to imitate*. Furthermore, this now puts Stonestreet in the position of contending that it was right for Christians to fight for the very type of emperor and empire which they could not be and which would not exist if they—the Christians—were rulers. As subjects they could fight for the type of government which they could not have if they were the rulers. This reminds us that Stonestreet accused the negative of contending for two standards of morality! Christians could fight to perpetuate as subjects what they could not perpetuate as rulers!

With reference to 1 Cor. 1:26 Stonestreet can offer no proof that this refers to rulers or to rulers continuing in

office after conversion. The statement, in this connection, to Agrippa carries no weight since we must go to where the Bible says something on a subject, not to where it does not say anything even when we think it should have said it, to see what the Bible teaches on that particular subject. In Acts 6:7 nothing is said that even hinted that the priests would have to cease from any of their functions as Jewish priests in order to be Christian. All that such an argument proves is that the Bible is silent on that subject *in that particular place*. Stonestreet might remember that Agrippa was one of the subordinate rulers in "such an empire" and that Paul did not hint that it would have been wrong for Christians to rule in or over "such an empire." Why then does he contend that it would not have been "such an empire" if a Christian had ruled over it!

On 2 Thess. 1:7, 8 he wrote: "This certainly divinely eliminates that class of sin from the mission of vengeance in which man is instrumental and referred to in Romans 13, etc." Well, *it* does not say so. It talks of their punishment then, but it says nothing as to whether any punishment would be received before that. Stonestreet is thus saying that no punishment is to be received before the final judgment for rejecting the gospel or failing to live by its precepts. Well, we need only say, he cannot prove it. Bible students generally regard the destruction of Jerusalem, at the hands of the ordained power of Romans 13, as a punishment on Israel for rejecting the gospel. Matt. 21:33-45 seems to support this position.

If we followed Stonestreet's type of argument on 2 Thess. 1 to its conclusion, we would argue that the sins of Romans 13 are punished now, therefore not any of them will be punished at His coming. Now if he contends that they can receive punishment both times—before and at His coming—then he has as much authority to say the same with reference to the sins connected with disobedience to the gospel. Stonestreet surely realizes that the Scriptures

teach that both of his classification of sinners will be punished at His coming. The murderer who is punished by man will also be punished at the judgment if he did not repent. So punishment is also reserved for such at the judgment, but would he argue that therefore there is no punishment for it now. Punishment will be for those who obey not the gospel *and* who know not God (1 Thess. 1:7, 8). Those who do not keep His commandments do not know Him (1 John 2:3-4). His commandments include many things, including the one not to kill (Rom. 13:9). So let Stonestreet follow his own logic and say that the murderer is reserved until judgment for punishment. Therefore, he is not punished now!

I have pressed Stonestreet to find out just what sins are to be punished by the powers of Romans 13. He is very vague on that. So far as I can gather from his writing he limits it to murder and to war. However, he gives no principle to us which proves that such should be the limitation. He does not give us a principle which would forbid many of the other death penalties of the Old Testament from being included. Stonestreet, not Romans 13, tells us what types of sins are to be punished with the sword. I wonder what he would do if he lived under a government which had the death penalty for poaching, or for a hundred and one things as they once had in England, for example. Stonestreet's logic and arguments prove much more than he himself is willing to accept.

My point was not touched wherein I pointed out that arguments which are advanced from Romans 13 for Christians to participate in war and kill can be advanced to show that the church should do so also. Whether the church goes in business or not does not settle the issue which I raised. In addition to this we might notice that the church does engage in much business. Lots and buildings are purchased; salaries are paid; a secretary is hired; printing

presses bought; and money put into bank where it draws interest.

Whether or not the government calls on the church does not change my argument. Instead of waiting until a situation arises before we see the principles involve, and the principles which we ought to follow, we should be prepared before hand as much as possible. I did not ask whether the government had called on the church to go to war, or whether it would do so soon. I simply pointed out that his arguments on Romans 13 could sanction the church in going to war at the government's command. Thus his arguments make it right in principle whether it is ever put into practice or not. And the conclusion to be drawn from this fact is that since Stonestreet does not believe that the church should fight there must be something wrong with his own arguments which, when carried to their logical conclusion, would sanction the church fighting for a country. A man should examine his logic more closely when he finds it sanctions that which he does not find it in his heart to sanction.

With reference to the strong delusions, I used this argument to prove that everything that God sends is not therefore right for Christians to carry out. Thus just because rulers of the world are sent as His ministers of wrath, it does not thereby prove that Christians are to carry out such missions of wrath. One can find where God sends strong delusions, but he cannot find where Christians are told to preach such. One can find where God sends governments as ministers of wrath—although they may not even be conscious of it—but he cannot find where God has sent, or authorized anyone else to send, Christians on missions of wrath. Such mission would conflict with the Christian's mission in life.

When the affirmative points out the evil of the enemy he does not raise a point of issue between us. I can see their evil, as well as the evil among other nations. Where

we differ *is over what the Christian should do about it*. Evils which are evident in the Axis were also evident in Rome, as well as in those who persecuted the church. But these evils do not justify Christians taking the sword any more *than it would have justified them taking the sword against Rome or the Jewish persecutors of the church*.

I realize, as well as the affirmative does, that some things are taught "by express command and much more by principle." This fact raises no issue between us. The negative, however, maintains that both express commands and principles, as to how Christians are to treat evil men and enemies, make it impossible for the informed, consistent Christian to treat them as war demands that they be treated. The realm of both the "absolute and conditional" forbids that the Christian should bomb, bayonet or otherwise kill enemies. I respect the "law of language," but that law cannot show wherein Christians are to kill.

If Stonestreet will read Lloyd E. Ellis' forthcoming treatise on the "ante-Nicene Fathers" and war, he will see more reasons why "Christ's disciples were not generally called to places of civil authority" than the reason which he mentioned. Portions of my book, *The Christian Conscientious Objector*, which deal with the Roman government and army present some of the reasons which Ellis brings out. Christians in Rome would have as difficult a time in such places of authority as would Christians today in Japan.

Peter had intended to use his sword not against civil government but against a mob which had not been sent out by Pilate. One of the reasons that Peter was not to use the sword on such criminals was that Jesus' kingdom was not of this world. The other two were that His death would be the fulfilment of prophecy (Matt. 26:54) and that those who took the sword would perish with it.

The Christian differs from the man of the world just as much as the kingdom of Christ differs from the kingdoms of this world. The same thing that keeps the king-

dom from fighting keeps the individual Christian from fighting. The church is God's kingdom which was established through His mercy and which is an agent of His mercy. In the Old Testament God's kingdom was used to execute wrath and thus his people who constituted that kingdom executed wrath. Today his kingdom does not execute wrath, its nature is contrary to such a mission, and the members of that kingdom do not execute wrath for they share the nature of the kingdom and its mission is their mission.

The church and the state are not at all ordained in the same way. As we have brought out they differ in mission; in the manner of their appointment in that the church was created by a direct act of God and informed by Him of its mission, not so with governments; God has ordained only one church, not so with governments for conflicting types have been ordained of him such as democracies and dictatorships; salvation comes to those who serve in the church, no such reward is held out for governments in their mission; the righteous church is the only one that is following God's pattern, but even a wicked government such as Rome may still be used of Him on a mission of wrath.

As to the question whether or not the church and worldly governments are rivals, the prophecy in Dan. 2:37-45 (which embraced Rome, the power under which Romans 13 was written) reveals that at least in some sense there was antagonism and thus rivalry. However, if all that Stonestreet says about their "heterogeneous natures" and their not being rivals is true it does not prove that Christians should fight. It no more proves this than the same fact proves that the church is to fight for kingdoms of the world because the church is not a rival, in the sense that a worldly kingdom is, of a worldly government. And I realize that the church cannot be a rival, due to its nature, of civil governments as one civil government is a rival to another.

The negative has already proved that the issue of citizenship does not determine whether or not the New Testament teaches Christians to fight for the government under which they live. Our submission and obedience to the government, under which we live, is based on God's command to us and not on our citizenship. Of course, the extent of a government's demands may be determined *by the government* on the basis of citizenship. But that is its business and not ours. Ours is to obey whether we are slaves, subjected people, or citizens. Even while merely residing in a foreign country Christians must obey that government. We are to obey because the powers are ordained of God (Rom. 13:1); because of wrath (Rom. 13:5); for conscience sake (Rom. 13:5); and for the Lord's sake (1 Pet. 2:13). So whatever the Bible binds on us with reference to governments it binds whether we are slaves, part of a conquered country, or citizens. So to argue the war question from the standpoint of what citizens owe, according to human reason, does not touch the issue as to whether it is scriptural for Christians to fight. When we became Christians the supreme allegiance is to Christ, not Caesar. Christ has qualified our allegiance to Caesar. Our allegiance is not unlimited, nor is its limits determined by what the world thinks a citizen owes. Wherever what the world demands of a citizen conflicts with what Christ demands, we cannot obey. And the failure of the arguments of Brother Stonestreet, as well as the scripturalness of the arguments which we present when we are in the affirmative, show that to require a Christian to war is to require something that conflicts with what Christ requires of the Christian. "Well-established customs" in the world must not lead us to override well-established scriptures.

Having noticed the points raised in Stonestreet's fourth affirmative, let us now consider, in review, some of the failures of the affirmative to sustain his proposition and the contradictions in which he became involved in his effort to

sustain his proposition. It is not enough to *say* that they have failed and that they are contradictory, but we have *proved* it.

A Brief Review of Some of Stonestreet's Arguments

Our opponent makes a lengthy argument on Genesis 9:6. We have shown that this law was not given during the present dispensation and that it was not given to the Christian. Not only so but in our first negative [Division 1, point (10)], we showed that by his own admission Stonestreet did not find it possible to contend that this passage furnished us with authorization to take life, but that it had to be done "indirectly through the civil government." If Genesis 9:6 applied to us it would furnish us directly, without reference to civil government, with authority to kill a murderer. Since he says that we do not have such authority he thereby admits that this does not apply to Christians. We also pointed out that even if the Genesis 9:6 arguments proved any thing today it would prove only that a murderer should be put to death. In our analysis of war and of the execution of a murderer it was clearly demonstrated that killing in war is not regarded as the execution of murderers. Too many innocent ones are killed and too many known guilty ones are set free for the analogy to hold. We further showed that Stonestreet himself would not accept his own logic on this passage, i.e., he did not believe that all enemy soldiers should be put to death on the battle field or after they were captured. Does the law cease killing criminals as soon as the whole mob surrenders? Of course not, they continue their indictment of the criminals and exact the penalties. The same logic whereby Stonestreet spares some enemy soldiers he should spare them all, and the same logic whereby he authorizes the killing of some he should contend for the killing of all. When we pressed him he would neither back up from his

argument nor back his argument up to the hilt. We did not ask whether any country would kill all enemy soldiers, but we asked him whether or not he thought that they should do so. Since he would not accept the conclusions of his own argument, why should one expect us to accept the argument. We also showed that his argument would not leave any room for forgiveness. The principle of Genesis 9:6 is the principle of an eye for an eye. If that is the principle to which Christians must submit then wherein can they extend mercy and forgiveness to the transgressor. In addition to this we pointed out that Stonestreet's argument on Genesis 9:6 was quite similar, in principle, to the Seventh-day Adventist argument for the perpetuation of the Sabbath.

The brother's argument on Titus 3:1 did not prove anything, as we have shown, with reference to Christians carrying the sword. We showed how that this argument involved the church itself in war and that it would have led Christians to contradict by their actions the very spirit which Paul exhorted them, in the same chapter, to have (Titus 3:2). The kind of evildoer toward whom Paul said that we must manifest meekness, for these evildoers were included in "all men," were such hateful ones as Stonestreet's theory would authorize Christians to execute (Titus 3:3). Paul's exhortation to good works was just one of a series of injunctions to Christians which were no more related to obedience to magistrates than the exhortation to meekness and gentleness referred to the fighting for a government.

With reference to his argument on Romans 13, and other passages which command submission and obedience to civil powers, we have shown the following. *First*, that what they taught concerning obedience was taught under a pagan power which carried on wars of suppression and aggression, in which any Christian soldier would have been involved if he had stayed in Caesar's army. What these passages teach under a democracy they also teach under a dictator-

ship. Thus if these passages teach war for a government now they taught it then and if they taught it then they taught it under such a government as now exists in Japan. Thus this conclusion would annihilate Stonestreet's other argument that Christians in Japan should not fight. Although he does not seem to realize it his logic would prove that they should fight against what he says Christians here should fight for in this war. *Second*, we have shown that the Roman army was just the kind of army in which Stonestreet does not believe a Christian should fight. Thus it does not go well with his arguments which, if they prove anything, prove that it was right for Christians in Paul's day to be in such an army. More than one of his positions must be given up because they contradict other positions which he has taken. *Third*, we have proved that Romans 13, in telling Christians that God overruled civil powers as agents of wrath, was not telling Christians that God used Christians as such agents. It was clearly pointed out that the Christian was one party and that the governments referred to were entirely different parties. Thus what was affirmed of the governments was not affirmed of the Christian. *Fourth*, we have proved that whatever submission these passages require of the individual Christian they also require of the church if and when the government requires such submission. There is no limit in obedience to which the individual Christian can go that the church cannot go. Both can obey until obedience would involve disobedience to God. But Stonestreet does not believe that the church should fight for kingdoms of this world, therefore he should give up arguments which logically would sanction such. *Fifth*, we proved that Romans 13 really taught the Christian the principle of non-resistance with reference to the very type of pagan government which Stonestreet thinks should be resisted with the sword by what he calls lawful governments. *Sixth*, we proved that Rome, under and of whom Romans 13 was written,

was the very type of power which Stonestreet today says is "unlawful." *Seventh*, we have also shown that the type of work for which God uses the powers that be is the very type of work which he has forbidden to the Christian.

We have shown that any argument against our position on conscientious objection which is based on the idea of protection of property or life, and which points out the disaster which they believe will follow my position, can be turned against Stonestreet's position on conscientious objection. He believes that we should be conscientious objectors when the church is attacked and when a government does not permit us to fight. If such arguments, as we have just mentioned, undermine my position they undermine his to the same extent. So he must give up these arguments or give up his position that there are times when Christians should be conscientious objectors.

We have also shown that the affirmative and the negative do not disagree over the right of the Christian to be a conscientious objector, or to refuse to obey some command of a government. Both agree that christians have this right. The disagreement is over just where one should object and refuse to obey.

With reference to John 18:36 we have shown that brethren usually end up by saying that we must fight to keep Christianity from being destroyed, and thus they contradict their own use of this passage. Furthermore, we have shown that since we share the nature of the kingdom of heaven, and since its nature is contrary to the spirit of war, that our nature must also be contrary to the spirit of war. We also pointed out that this passage did not say that men in worldly kingdoms fought only in "just" wars to keep their kings from being delivered up, but that they did so in both wars of aggression as well as defensive ones. So what worldly citizens do for their kingdoms in the world does not tell Christians what they are to do, and if it does it proves that wars of aggression also are right. But this

contradicts another argument of Stonestreet that wars of aggression should not be engaged in by Christians.

We have also pointed out that he could not prove his contention on his two-fold classification of evil. We showed that his arguments would justify the present punishment of both.

Since these things are true it is our conviction that the affirmative has failed. Let the reader weigh well the arguments and draw his own conclusion.

BALES' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

SECOND PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that the Christian's conduct toward enemies prohibits his taking the sword even at the command of the powers that be." Affirmative: James D. Bales. Negative: P. W. Stonestreet.

The term Christian indicates that the sole point under consideration is what God has required the *Christian* man or woman to do. By Christian conduct, I have reference to the way Christians are taught to treat others. By enemies, I mean any human foe regardless of the reason for his animosity. By sword, I mean weapons with which one destroys, or intends to destroy, if he cannot capture, an enemy. By the powers that be, I have reference to the civil governments of Romans 13.

These Things Are Not the Issue

In order that the reader may see more clearly what I am affirming, I shall point out several things which are *not* the issue. (1) The right of civil government to exist is not in issue for Paul unmistakably taught that God uses, or overrules, it in this present world (Rom. 13:1-4). (2) The issue is not whether any good results from the work of the civil government. Paul said that "he is the minister of God

to thee for good" (Rom. 13:4). This, however, no more proves that the Christian should carry the sword than it proves that the church should. Always remember that whatever Romans 13 teaches the individual Christian, in principle, with reference to obedience to civil powers, *it also teaches the church*. There is no duty required, on our part, of us as individuals that is not also required of the church if the government required the same thing of the church that it required of the individual member. Of course, the government might distinguish between what it required of one or of the other, but *it is to decide whether it is going to require a particular thing of the church or the member or both the church and individual Christians. This passage demands as complete obedience to the government on the part of the church as it does on the part of the individual Christian*. Whatever it requires the Christian, as an individual, to render to the government, it also requires the church if the government makes a similar demand. If the government requires the church to pay taxes; or have trustees for church buildings; or to sing at its meetings a song honoring the country, which was not wrong in itself; the church would obey and her obedience would be required by the same passages which require obedience to the government by the individual Christian. Thus *any* argument, which is based on any passage requiring submission to the government, which is used to sanction war for the Christian could also be used to sanction war for the church at the command of, and in the behalf of, a civil power. Thus if the Christians must fight, at the command of the government, because a government is a minister of God to thee for good, the church would also have to fight—if so commanded—for it is just as much such a minister to the church as a church as it is to the individual Christian. This fact cannot be refuted by saying that the passages requiring obedience to governments is based on the Christian's responsibility as a *citizen*, and since the individual not

the church is the citizen these passages apply to the Christian as a citizen and thus could not be applied to the church as a church. If this was true then no passages require any obedience of the church, as a church, to the government. But who would be so bold as to affirm that no obedience was required? On the other hand, he who would prove that some submission is required would have to prove it by appealing to the *same passages* which require obedience of the individual. This shows that they themselves ultimately recognize that the submission required is not based on the foundation of citizenship. Submission is required, not because we are citizens, but because: (a) the powers are ordained of God (Rom. 13:1); (b) for conscience sake (Rom. 13:5); (c) because of wrath (Rom. 13:5); (d) for the Lord's sake (1 Pet. 2:13). Not once did any inspired writer say that submission is required, by Christians to governments, because of our citizenship. If so, then most Christians in Paul's day owe no submission for multitudes of them were not citizens of the Roman Empire. They were subjects who had been conquered by Rome. So all passages requiring submission require submission whether we are citizens, subjects, slaves, or *visiting* in a foreign country. (3) This shows that the question of citizenship has nothing to do with the issue, in so far as our submission is required, although a government may make a distinction on that basis with reference to what it requires of those within its jurisdiction. Thus the citizenship issue may make a difference to the government itself, in what it requires, but not to the Christian for he submits in what is required. (4) The issue is not whether we should submit to a government's command. The affirmative and the negative are agreed that we should do so unless it requires something which would violate our submission to God. The issue is whether using the sword on enemies, at the government's command, conflicts with what God requires of the Christian. (5) The issue is not over the right

of the Christian, and the duty as well, to refuse to obey man rather than God when the commands of the two to the Christian conflict. Both the affirmative and the negative are agreed that we must obey God rather than man (Acts 5:29). The issue is: Does a government's command to Christians to use the sword on enemies place Christians in the position of disobeying God or man. (6) The issue is not whether governments carry the sword as ministers of wrath. They do (Rom. 13:1-4). This no more proves that the individual Christian is to be its agent in such a work than it proves that the church is. It is no more of an argument for Christians killing murderers, than it is for Christians killing heretics, or any of the following: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultry, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murderers, drunkenness, revelings, and such like;" (Gal. 5:19-21). These are as surely works of the flesh as is murder, and they are listed along with murder. They also all endanger civilization and the rights of others. They are the source of strife between man and man as well as between God and man. Why select just one or two works of the flesh to punish with the sword? The Catholics can work up just as good an argument for punishing heretics with the sword, on Romans 13, as any brother can work up to punish murderers with the sword. Notice: (a) The governments are to be a terror to evil works (Rom. 13:3). So "if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain." (Rom. 13:4.) (b) Heresies are listed along with murder as evil deeds, works of the flesh (Gal. 5:19-21). (c) Therefore, working as agents of the civil government Christians should put down heresies with the sword. The church thus calls on the state to act as a minister of wrath on these evil doers. (7) The issue is not whether the enemies are wicked. All enemies of the church are wicked but that does

not give the church the right to fight; or the right to call on the government to put down the church's enemies. (8) The issue is not whether one will suffer loss of life or property if he does not use the sword. That would come as close to proving one should not use the sword, for one who fights is exposed to such loss as much or more than one who does not fight. Furthermore, when the church was persecuted it faced such losses, and such dangers did not prove that the church was to fight against its persecutor who in many cases was the government itself. In such cases Stonestreet does not believe that Christians should fight, so the dangers of such losses do not change the real issue one way or another. (9) The issue is not whether the Christian and a particular government are on the side of the right. The Christian faith is right, but that does not authorize the church to fight or individual Christians to fight for the church as agents of the government. (10) The issue is not whether the enemies deserve, speaking from the standpoint of justice, punishment with the sword. This argument by itself would come as close to proving that the church should punish its persecutors. In strict justice, *all* sinners deserve punishment, and all have sinned. (11) The issue is whether God has required of Christians, in any capacity, the use of the sword on any enemies.

When one becomes a Christian he becomes a new creature in Christ. This change involves a change in all relationships in life in that allegiance to Christ not only qualifies all other allegiances, but it also demands that in *all* relationships in life the convert must act from *Christian* principles.

I. The Christian's Primary Function

Our primary function is to be Christian and to try to save men. Any command which would nullify the command to preach the gospel to *all* men must be disregarded

(Acts 5:29). All the world is embraced in the commission (Matt. 28:19). The command to kill certain enemies makes void, if obeyed, the command of Jesus to preach to all. How so? (a) War sends men with a gun to kill the *very men* to whom Christ has sent us with the gospel to save. *Who can deny it?* We must obey God rather than man. (b) The gospel is preached in words. Those who kill enemies cannot preach to them and they make it impossible for any one else to preach to those whom they have slain. It is likely that in many cases they also make it more difficult to preach the gospel to that dead person's father, mother, or children. These would hardly give as an attentive hearing, to the extent that they would otherwise possibly do it, to the church which sanctioned the killing, and engage in it through its members, of their loved ones. (b) The gospel is preached in deeds (1 Pet. 2:12; 3:1). The deeds which soldiers are supposed to manifest towards enemies are not deeds which are directed toward winning, or likely to win, those enemies for Christ. These deeds do not preach the Christ of mercy to the enemy. They frustrate the mission and they violate the ethics of the gospel. A failure to preach the gospel by our conduct is just as serious as a failure to preach it by word. Since one cannot obey both, the military command to kill the enemy abrogates the command to preach Christ by word and by deed, and thus it is equal to a command, in so far as its effect is concerned, to cease from preaching Christ to them. For additional places wherein war abrogates Christ's teaching see my third negative, section IX, point (15).

II. Nature of the Kingdom

The nature of the kingdom must also be our nature. We have been born into it and have thus become a part of it. In Christ we are new creatures and the spirit of the church must be our spirit. Its spirit keeps servants from

fighting for its king (John 18:36). The nature of the kingdoms of the world is such that those who place it supreme will fight for its rulers *in wars of aggression as well as those of defense*. But the nature of the kingdoms of the world is not our nature for its nature is not the nature of the kingdom into which we have been translated. Since its spirit does not include fighting, it abrogates the fighting spirit which the world has as surely as the higher allegiance nullifies the lower when the two conflict. In the world men learn the ways of war, in the kingdom of Christ they do not, according to Isaiah 2:2-4.

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

If this prophecy applies to the kingdom of heaven, and to those who flow into it and walk in His ways, the nature of that kingdom is one of peace. Since this is its nature it must be our nature. Its nature leads people to beat swords into plowshares, and to learn no more the ways of war. *Can this prophecy find fulfillment in you if you learn the ways of war?* Even though you learn them for the sake of your country and not for the church, you are still learning the ways of war. With so many Christians beating plowshares into swords it is no wonder that some pre-millennialists do not think that Christianity fulfils this prophecy. Certainly many of our brethren do not fulfil it.

III. CHRISTIANS AS OBJECTS OF MERCY

Christians have been objects of mercy and they must deal with others on the basis of mercy. Justice is not a distinctly Christian virtue. Even pagans, to an extent, follow this principle in dealing with one another (Matt. 5:46-47). If we live on the level of demanding and forcing strict justice from others we are not distinguished from the general level of humanity. The exercise of mercy, of returning good for evil, is distinctly Christian and it is the basis on which Christians must treat enemies. We are not allowed to follow the law of justice, which is an eye for an eye, but rather the law of love and mercy (Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12:14, 17-21). If we, who have received mercy, do not dispense mercy instead of justice we shall be like the servant of Matt. 18:23-24 who was an object of mercy and yet who dealt with his debtor on the basis of justice. He had the right, according to law, to have the man put in prison for his debt. He was only exacting justice. By operating on the level of exacting justice from another he placed *himself* under that law and his master then dealt with him on the plain on which he had chosen to deal with others. He was not forgiven. "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." God has forgiven us, as it were, the ten thousand talents. If we refuse to forgive those who need our forgiveness, we are refusing to forgive the hundred pence. Do you want justice or mercy? Justice will condemn you for you have sinned. Mercy can save you. Deal with others on the basis of law and God will not deal with you, in the judgment, on the basis of mercy for you have been content to live on another plain. War, at its best; would treat men on the basis of justice; although war is never at its best for too many innocent ones suffer and too many guilty ones go free. "For he shall have

judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgement." (Jas. 2:13).

This principle is also stated in Matt. 6:14-15. "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." How can we ask God to forgive us, and then go out and destroy enemies? War is not fought on the basis of love, forgiveness and mercy for the offender; therefore we must not war. How can we ask God to forgive us and yet not show mercy to enemies who have offended us.

IV. Christians Must Follow the Golden Rule (Matt. 7:12)

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." War does unto the enemy what he has done to you. It tries to outdo him at his own game. It lets the enemy decide as to the *weapons* with which the war is to be fought and the level on which it will be fought. To shoot the enemy; to destroy his home; and to bomb his babies is not doing unto him as you want him to do unto you. At the best it is following the law of dealing out justice to an enemy. "As he hath done, so shall it be done to him" (Lev. 24:19). "Then shall ye do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother." "And thine eye shall not pity: but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." (Deut. 19:19, 21.) This law of doing as one had been done by was an Old Testament law, which Christ does not permit His followers to follow (Matt. 5:38 quotes it to abrogate it for His kingdom, Matt. 5:39-). The golden rule takes its place for the Christian. It applies to our relationships with men. War says that one must not treat his enemy according to that rule, but that one must use the Old Testament rule which Christ abrogated for His disciples. We must

obey God rather than man. He has not given Christians authority to abandon the golden rule for the duration. If we abandon it, what rule are we to follow? And why should war and murder be the only cases in which we are to abandon it. And if they are not the only cases, where does the abandonment stop?

V. Christian Love

Christian love works ill to no man (Rom. 13:8, 10). This love embraces friend and foe (Matt. 5:43-48). It has no room for hate and destructive violence (1 Cor. 13). Christians are not authorized to conduct themselves toward enemies on any other basis than that of love which seeks to redeem. War does not deal with the enemy on the basis of love, therefore the Christian should not war. The acts and spirit of war are not those of Christian love.

VI. Christians Are Not To Return Evil for Evil

Christians are to return good for evil, and not evil for evil (Rom. 12:17). To do unto one as he has done unto you is to return evil for evil, if he has done evil unto you. The principle of doing good for evil is to be acted on with reference to all men; this includes evil men for they are the ones who treat us evilly and for whose evil we return good (Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15). War is not returning good for evil, therefore war is forbidden to the Christian in that he is commanded to return good for evil. Who will affirm that bombing their homes is returning good for evil.

VII. The Christian Attitude Toward Enemies

The Christian attitude toward enemies is clearly set forth in the Bible. In considering this attitude and spirit we realize that Jesus has said *everything that needed to be said* concerning war and the Christian. He sets forth a way

of life which is so incompatible with war that many brethren who contend that it is right for Christians to fight acknowledge that the ways of war and the spirit of Christianity are incompatible. Jesus forbade His disciples to live on the plain of forcing strict justice from others. An eye for an eye is forbidden. We are to turn the other cheek. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." To do unto others as they have done unto you is not acting on the Christian level. "For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?" (Matt. 5:38-48 embraces this and more.) "And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thanks have ye? For sinners also do even the same." (Lk. 6:33.) This spirit, of love, is demonstrated in Christ's prayer while on the cross. "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." (Lk. 23:34.) It is illustrated in Stephen's prayer for those who were stoning him to death. "And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." (Acts 7:60.) *This is the Christian attitude toward enemies.* This is not the attitude of war. Therefore, we must not war. But what if the enemy makes us a slave? Are we to hate the master, especially if he is cruel? Paul told slaves to serve their masters "with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men" (Eph. 6:7). "Servants (bond servants or slaves, J.D.B.), be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward." But what if they make us suffer unjustly? "For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." (1 Pet. 2:18-20.)

"Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." (Col. 3:24-25.) No man can maintain this spirit in attitude and actions and still find war acceptable to him.

If it be protested that the Lord is telling us to love our *personal* enemies, but that it has no reference to the way that *national enemies* are to be treated, our reply is threefold *First*, the Lord nowhere limits the passage as those limit it who insert *personal* before enemies. *Second*, one could argue that it means *national* enemies, and not personal enemies. Or one could argue that since it does not say to love *religious* enemies that one can ask the state to put such enemies to death. *Third*, the term for enemies in Luke 6:27-36 "besides being used for private and personal enemies, is also used in the Septuagint, the New Testament, and elsewhere, for *national* foes (Gen. 14:20; xlix. 8; Exod. 15:6; Lev. 26:7, 8, 17, 1 Sam. 4:3, etc., etc.; Lk. 1:71, 74; 19:43; also Origen *Cels* ii. 30; viii. 69.) (C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, p. 23, footnote.)

VIII. The Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of War

The spirit of Christ and the spirit of war cannot be reconciled. It is: Love vs. hate. Mercy vs. justice. Forgiveness vs. vengeance. Dying for enemies vs. killing enemies and dying for friends. Returning good for evil vs. returning blow for blow. Spiritual weapons (2 Cor. 10:3-4) vs. carnal weapons. Warring not after the flesh (Eph. 6:12) vs. war after the flesh. Swords to plowshares vs. plowshares to swords. Not to hurt and destroy (Isa. 11:9) vs. hurting and destroying. Avenge not vs. avenge. Instruments of redemptive love to redeemed man vs. instruments of vengeance to destroy man.

The following experiments should 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's description of the noblest Christian. (2) Pray in Jesus' name for the essential nature of war and the acts of war. (3) See if Christian teaching, such as the sermon on the mount, would be accepted by the army as good pre-fight instruction to cultivate within the soldier the spirit they need in war. We have elaborated on these experiments in *The Christian Conscientious Objector*. The fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22) are not hate and war, and the the fruits of war are not the fruits of the Spirit.

IX. The Example of Christ

Christ's example forbids the acts of war to Christians. What Jesus *did* was just as important as what he *said* for it illustrated what He meant. *What does love mean?* It means to give to save the souls of men (John 3:16). *Does it give just to save good men and friends?* No, for while we were sinners, and enemies, Christ died for us (Rom. 5:6, 8, 10). We cannot die for the world as He did but we can love and die for it in an effort to present the gospel to them in word and deed. We are to see in all men *men for whom Christ died*. No soldier who sees the enemy in his rifle sights can pull the trigger, and send him unprepared to eternity, if he views that enemy as a man for whom Christ died. If Christ died for him, we should try to let him know about it, before death, in order that he may at least have an opportunity to be saved. What if we suffer at his hand in so doing? "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threat-

ened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." (1 Pet. 2:21-23, 19-20.) *What did Jesus say?* Love your enemies? *What did Jesus do?* Died for his enemies. The cross is the supreme example of non-resistance, of self-giving sacrifice, of redemptive love. The cross is the reaction and the answer of Christ to evil. It must be our answer also. It is the way Christ broke the power of sin. It must be our weapon against evil.

X. Of What Spirit Are You?

To those who wanted some enemies destroyed, Christ 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. 9:55, 56.) Since the church is to carry His saving message to men, how can it scripturally destroy men's lives, which lives He came to save?

XI. Vengeance Is Left To God

"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." Leaving vengeance to God, what do we do? "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. 12:19-21.) To do this forbids the Christian to war for war says: If thine enemy hunger, tighten the blockade and starve him into submission; if he thirst strangle him or give him poison; heap fire bombs on his head and on the head of his wife and children. Be not overcome with his armies, but overcome him with larger and more violent armies.

Christians must leave vengeance to God. One of the ways that God executes this vengeance is through civil powers (Rom. 13.) Paul here tells saints how God takes vengeance through overruling the powers that be. He does

not here tell Christians how God uses Christians for vengeance, for he is not talking about Christians when talking about civil powers. The Christians could not carry out Paul's instructions, quoted above, which revealed how they were to treat enemies if they were to carry the sword of the government. The powers of Romans 13 were one party and the Christians were an entirely different party.

XII. The Weapons of Our Warfare

The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, *but they are mighty*. "For though we walk in the flesh, *we do not war after the flesh*: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds:)" "(2. Cor. 10:3-4.) If the present carnal war is *our war*, and the brother so contends, the weapons of our warfare are carnal. Is the present war a war after the flesh? If it is, then it is not our war for we do not war after the flesh. And if fighting a national war *is not warring* after the flesh, then it would be permissible for the church to wage a similar war.

XIII. Put Up Thy Sword

The Lord told Peter to put up his sword. Peter had drawn the sword to protect the life of the innocent one against an evil aggressor. Christ said, "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. 26:52.) The sword which He commanded him to put up was the one which had been bared in a righteous cause against a wicked enemy who endangered the freedom, the life and the civil rights of Jesus. The Lord was not telling Peter to put it up because his opponents only would perish with the sword, for that would not be a reason for *Peter* to put it up. To make sure that they perished with the sword was one of the things that Peter would have tried to do with his sword. So the

Lord spoke not merely of those who opposed them perishing, but also of Peter and his use of the sword.

XIV. Let Brother Love Continue

The Bible says, let brotherly love continue (Heb. 13:1). Let brethren discontinue love for the duration, and bomb brethren if they are near a military target or in an enemy city. The Lord's church or nation is composed of men of all races and countries who have obeyed the gospel. Some of them live under democratic governments and some under a dictatorship. Regardless of where they live they are members of the body of Christ, the one body. Brotherly love is one of the striking characteristics of this body (John 13:34-35; 15:12). "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (1 John 3:14.) "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour." (Rom. 13:10.) The body must manifest unity as well as love. When one member suffers, all suffer (John 17:20; 1 Cor. 12:26). Is the body mad that it would allow wars of worldly nations to divide it and to make it inflict wounds on itself?

XV. We Do Not Deny the Severity of God

We no more deny the severity of God than did Jesus when he refused to destroy the people in Luke 9:52. The reason that He refused is sufficient reason for His followers to refuse. It was because His mission was not one of wrath, but one of mercy, i.e., to seek and to save the lost, the very ones who in justice may deserve death. Christians are to carry on this work of mercy. Regardless of the means by which God may today visit wrath on men, He does not do it through Christians. We are His agents of mercy, not wrath. He has shown us mercy and we must show mercy to friend and foe.

XVI. Questions

(1) Would it be right today to fight for the establishment, maintenance, and enlargement of such a dictatorship as existed when Paul wrote?

(2) Would it be right for a Christian to be such a dictator as ruled when Paul wrote Romans 13?

(3) Should one war in order to escape slavery?

We commend this first affirmative to the close scrutiny of our opponent and we pray that both its weaknesses and its strength may be made evident by his reply.

James D. Bales Affirms P. W. Stonestreet Denies

FIRST NEGATIVE

Bales Stonestreet Discussion

Second Proposition Resolved that the Scriptures teach that the Christian's conduct toward enemies prohibits his taking the sword even at the command of the powers that be.

"The Christian's conduct toward" *personal* "enemies" is not under discussion, but only the Christian's attitude toward inspired commands to obey the powers that be in dealing with *national enemies*. Only in a secondary sense is the Christian's attitude toward enemies involved, for the Christian, as such, is *under* authority, not *in* authority in war. Even when a Christian is in the highest place of authority in government, that one is to be governed by God's law pertaining to *that* realm, not some other realm of God. Illustration: If a Christian wants to raise a crop of corn in order for a livelihood on earth, that one is governed by God's of *nature*. Just so, when it becomes necessary for the government to stop mad hords of national aggression in order to live on earth and commands Christians to assist in that grim but noble effort, the Christian is to be governed by the God-sanctioned military force of government, not some other power of God. Thus those

inspired commands to Christians are objective as well as subjective for the Christian.

Just as there is no incongruity between God's law of nature and God's law of persuasion through the gospel, neither is there any incongruity between God's law of force through government and God's law of persuasion through the gospel, as they are ordained for their respective ends. Whatever is done through the government by God's sanction is God's law in operation—not man's law. Even when God's law of force in the form of the just side of war, resisting intolerable evils against civilization, results in unintentional injury to the innocent, it no more proves that the side of war fighting for peace is arraved against the gospel than when God's law of nature in the form of a cyclone scatters to the four-winds a meeting house of the church and sometimes the church also, is arrayed against the gospel. So beyond what is revealed, man cannot know the extent of God's overruling hand in such matters. But fortunately, the Christian's attitude toward personal enemies and the Christian's attitude toward national enemies through government are, respectively, pointed out by Inspiration. May we observe both attitudes and leave results with God.

Individual Christians and the Church

Brother Bales suggests: "Always remember that whatever Romans 13 teaches the individual Christian to do, in principle, with reference to obedience to civil powers, *it also teaches the church.*"

But his statement fails to distinguish between "the individual Christian," as such, and "the church," as such. He overlooks the fact that the function of the church, as such, is circumscribed in the New Testament, while the function of the individual Christian is not thus circumscribed. Readers may choose between the textual designa-

tion "every soul" in Romans 13:1 and Brother Bales' designation "the church." Even if it were practical and desirable for every member of the church to bear the sword, that would not constitute the function of the church, as such; but it would be function of each and every member of the church in an individual capacity, just as they may engage in the occupations of life.

Since "taking the sword" in a just cause at the command of the government, does not belong to the religious but to the moral realm, the proposition obligates the affirmative to prove that it is morally wrong in itself. He is wasting space in the effort to prove a proposition relating to the church. Even if he proves that proposition, he will not thereby prove the proposition that he is affirming.

The obligation to take the sword at the command of the government in a just cause has a twofold basis. On the part of the government it is based on citizenship, etc., whether one is a Christian or not; on the part of the Christian, it is based on the inspired commands to submit, obey and to be ready unto every good work, except as conscience may strangely protest. Of course no one can scripturally obey even the gospel with a conscience rebelling against that obedience. "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men." (Col. 3:23.)

The Exact Point of Difference

Since the affirmative and the negative are agreed that in case of a clash between the commands of the civil government and God's law, the Christian is to obey God rather than men, *just at what point does that clash occur?* The only clash in commands that we find in the New Testament is when the civil authorities became so religiously minded that they actually commanded the apostles not to teach any more in the name of Christ. Think of it! Teaching the doctrine of Christ is the way Christianity is propagated.

Teaching is involved in the Savior's world-wide commission to the apostles just before He ascended to the Father on high. Nothing would have been more vitiating to Christianity than would have been for the apostles to have obeyed that command. While Christianity has always survived and will ever survive controversial opposition, it could not have survived complying with that command. As was so well said by the late M. C. Kurfees: "The truth has always flourished in the soil of controversy;" and as was so aptly said by the late A. G. Freed: "The more the truth is rubbed, the brighter it shines," it must have a fighting chance with the sword of the Spirit in order for it to *flourish* and *shine*. But by that command of the Roman authority, the truth was not to even have a fighting chance. So no wonder the reply was so emphatic: "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29.) That command was not only in violation of one realm of God, but it invaded another realm of God. *That is why it was purely the word of men.*

That is the exact point at which commands of civil authorities become the mere word of men—not when their commands are in harmony with the divinely-sanctioned mission of government, even when bearing the sword is involved in a just cause. That command not to teach in the name of Christ actually arrayed God's sanction against God's commands. It is futile to try to locate that clash at any other point in the light of the whole counsel of God. Also to claim that commands of the civil government become the mere word of men short of the government's divinely-sanctioned mission is to make an unwarranted division in the word of truth in violation of 2 Timothy 2:15. In such a case, such religious teaching itself becomes the mere word of men; in fact, the word of men supplants the word of God much more in the religious realm than in the civil realm today; and it is incumbent upon the negative under this proposition to point it out.

Furthermore, inasmuch as civil authorities are divinely designated as ministers of God and their mission of vengeance is divinely sanctioned under some circumstances, I ask Brother Bales what logical right he has to assume that such commands within such limits are the mere words of men? Also, I ask him whether or not all the commands of civil authorities are the words of men?

Different Forms of Evil Are Involved

Brother Bales says: "Notice: (a) The governments are to be a terror to evil works (Rom. 13:3). So 'if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain' (Rom. 13:4). (b) heresies are listed along with murder as evil deeds, works of the flesh (Gal. 5:19-21). (c) Therefore, working as agents of the civil government Christians should put down heresies with the sword."

Reply: (a) The New Testament does not mentally digest its teaching for the student; only the individual can do that. To that end, the Christian is taught to handle aright (rightly divide) the word of truth. When that is done one will observe a practical division between the different forms of evil and in the light of the whole counsel of God, one will also observe that the literal sword of the earthly government is to be used against forms of evil that menace life on earth, while the figurative sword of the Spirit is to be used against all forms of evil. Both persuasion and force have been used to stop the Axis powers in this global war, but against their form of evil force has been much more effective. (b) Certainly, heresies are listed with evils, but the student is to observe 2 Timothy 2:15 on the word of truth at that point and realize that, in this age, only the sword of the Spirit is divinely assigned to heresies, because heresies do not directly and immediately jeopardize life on earth; they especially have to do with life in the Spirit world, far beyond the mission of earthly pow-

ers. (c) Therefore, neither the government nor the Christian at the command of government is to use the literal sword against such evils. Earthly governments are to keep order on earth, while the mission of the spiritual government is to prepare one for the spirit's eternal home. Therefore, punishment for the sin or evil involved in disobedience to the gospel, whether heresies or other evils, *in this age*, is divinely reserved till the coming of the Lord; "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus." (2 Thess. 1:7, 8.)

A New Creature

Certainly, "when one becomes a Christian that one becomes a new creature in Christ." But that spiritual relationship does not imply a change in all relationships of life—relationships that have ever been right. Righteous relationships are already in accord with being a new creature in Christ, for we read from Inspiration: "Brethren, let each man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." (1 Cor. 7:24.)

What about one being called who is already a military soldier, Brother Bales? The word "Soldier" is another one of the many words that are spiritualized in the New Testament. I ask Brother Bales to cite just one attribute of the devil that is peculiar to the devil that has been spiritualized in the New Testament? His position assumes that military service for the Christian on all sides of all wars is of the devil, so he should be able to cite the information called for. Let it be resounded around the world that the Christian's conduct toward personal enemies does not prohibit the Christian from taking the sword at the command of the government in support of a righteous cause to which the sword has been divinely assigned.

God's Authority Is not Divided Against Itself

But if, as assumed by the affirmative under this proposition, God's commands to the Christian are to stop short of the God-sanctioned mission of government, there would be a clash between God's *commands* and God's *sanction*. But just as God's house is not divided against itself, neither is God's authority divided against itself. Both stand in God's revelation. The clash is only in the minds of some students who do not distinguish between God's realms according to the word of truth. This in brief and in principle covers all that the affirmative says in his first instalment under this proposition. Yet for the sake of all concerned, the negative is perfectly willing to go further into details of the subject matter.

True, there are certain *religious* commands and principles set forth in the New Testament that apply exclusively to Christians, but these are not of the *moral* code. The sterling moral qualities of Cornelius set forth in Acts 10 furnish an outstanding example of this. No doubt there are myriads of them today. Since these moral principles were practiced before the advent of Christianity, they are not therefore exclusively Christian principles just because Christianity inculcates them; yet they are often called Christian principles after the current dispensation. Hence, whatever is morally wrong for the Christian is morally wrong for the non-Christian and the government to do. Brother Bales' confusion is based on the traditional error that God has two standards of Morality—one for the Christian and the other for the non-Christian and the temporal government.

"An Eye for an Eye and a Tooth for a Tooth"

That impressive expression of the Savior refers to the well established law recorded in Ex. 21:23-25, etc. That aspect of the law was not to be enforced without due con-

sideration of another phase of the law—*mitigating circumstances*, which characterized all such laws. Since such exceptions and provisions of mercy were integral parts of the law itself, of which God was the author, the Savior does not condemn the entire law of justice, but He condemns only the perversions of that law. It was not to be perverted to justify individual retaliation. Evidently the Savior's audience was not emphasizing all of that law, for the text reads: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," etc. (Matt. 5:38), which was only a part of the provisions of that law. To show beyond all doubt that the Savior did not condemn the justice aspect of the law, we need only to read His scathing rebuke to the Pharisees: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice, and mercy, and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone." (Matt. 23:23.)

Thus, *justice* tempered with *mercy* is God's law for the Christian under governmental authority. Individually one may extend a greater degree of mercy than would be expedient to do collectively, so we should ever distinguish between individual action and collective action. Let it be emphasized that it is *by the mercy of God that the salvation of the soul is made possible under the terms of the gospel*. To that end, the Christian is to be merciful, but not to abuse mercy. But Brother Bales says: "War, at its best, would treat men on the basis of justice," etc. But war is not without mercy, too, for our commander-in-chief, President Truman, in his history-making speech last night, August 9, 1945, said with reference to the use of the recently discovered atomic bomb: "We have used it in order to shorten the agony of war, in order to save the lives of thousands of young Americans." Thus, the use of that bomb has a merciful motive and result. True, there is the

other side to military force of all kinds, but it is obvious that it is more merciful to use such force under such circumstances in an effort to bring the war to a speedy end than to allow the mad hordes to invade the United Nations with all its increased horrors. Also, our former commander-in-chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his bond-selling speech over the radio Sept. 8, 1943, very aptly stated the twofold purpose of the just side of war, as follows: "The money you lend and the money you give in taxes buys that death-dealing, life-saving power we need for victory."

That is exactly the purpose that such power serves in God's realm of force; and a more truthful and significant statement on the subject could not be made. To have approached such maniacs as the leaders of the Axis powers with another power of God (the gospel) at that time before their powers of conquest had been overcome, would have violated the inspired injunction: "neither cast your pearls before the swine, lest haply they trample them under their feet, and turn and rend you." But in harmony with the divinely-sanctioned mission of earthly governments, the thing to "cast" at them, under such circumstances existing then, was *death-dealing power* that its *life-saving power* may accrue to civilization; and all who bought *war* bonds and paid *war* taxes had their part in it. Under God's free-moral agency, no one had to thus take part in the war; instead, they could have suffered the consequences, even if it called for being shot at sunrise. All normally-minded people renounce the *causes* of war. But to unqualifiedly renounce the Christian's participation in war, as the theory championed by Brother Bales does, is to renounce both sides, including its life-saving aspect. Moral: All that is necessary to living in this world till God calls us out of the world, is implied in that God-given privilege, so far as national justice and mercy are concerned; and this is true for the Christian as well as the non-Christian.

Individual and Collective Mercy

It is magnanimous and the very essence of the doctrine of Christ for an individual to treat an offender (one who has simply injured that one personally) better than the offender deserves, and all should strive to do that. But as extended by humanity, mercy does not apply by proxy. Hence, in the collective aspect by justice and mercy, all the peoples involved have a voice. What right does a religious theory in the United States, for example, have to tell in theory the peoples of war-torn countries abroad to disregard justice and extend mercy? Why, that is not only unscriptural, but it is not even practical. Thus mercy on parade is most unmerciful. Since Christ's sermon on the mount is practical for the individual, it applies individually. To assume that it applies nationally, *so far as Christians are concerned*, is to thwart, *so far as Christians are concerned*, God's law of force through civil government for collective ends. I ask Brother Bales by what law of compensation is he governed in accepting the benefits of civil government and at the same time standing aloof from serving the government within the limits of its divinely-sanctioned mission? As between divinity and humanity, it is realized that man cannot compensate for divine blessing, but the point of inquiry is between man and humanity; that is, between the citizen and the human authorities of government.

"The Nature of the Kingdom"

"The nature of the kingdom must be our nature."
(Bales.) Yes, but the nature of Christians is not to be at variance with the three forms of commands of the King of the spiritual kingdom, for the part of God's family that remains on earth sustains this important relationship to the essential earthly realm. Only that part of God's family that has passed on is exempt from all essential earthly re-

lationships. So let's face the issue squarely in harmony with the facts as well as the Scriptures. The radically different natures of the earthly kingdoms to the spiritual kingdom preclude any rivalry between them within their respectively ordained realms, for only homogeneous natures among kingdoms can be rivals.

God's Vengeance

A part of God's vengeance is executed without human instrumentality, but in this discussion we are especially concerned with the part in which humanity is used. Brother Bales now says: "One of the ways that God executes this vengeance is through civil powers (Rom. 13)." Exactly! We are now making progress. But he adds: "Paul here tells Christians how God takes vengeance through overruling the powers that be. He does not here tell Christians how God uses Christians for vengeance, for he is not talking about Christians when talking about civil powers."

But God is commanding Christians in opening the chapter with: "Let every soul," etc. Also: "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." (Verse 7.)

"To honor, in scripture style, is taken not only for the inward or outward respect which people have and pay to persons who are superior to them; and to whom they owe particular marks of deference and distinction; but likewise for real services which are due to them." (A part of Cruden's definition.)

Assuredly every service is "due" the government within the limits of its divinely-sanctioned mission when it calls for such service, and "honor" thus commanded implies all that is due. So Paul is telling Christians more than Brother Bales supposes. Brother Bales, does your "honor" due the government carry the idea of services within the limits of

the government's divinely-sanctioned mission? What is said in Romans 13 is in perfect harmony with other texts telling the Christian to "obey" and "to be ready unto every good work." This phase of the subject is more extensively dealt with under the first proposition in the first affirmative, which see.

Brother Bales' Questions

While it is not according to the rules that usually govern such discussions for the affirmative to ask direct questions, yet, since we had no such agreement, the rules do not have to be waived to answer the following questions:

"(1) Would it be right today to fight for the establishment, maintenance, and enlargement of such a dictatorship as existed when Paul wrote?"

Reply: That depends on whether or not such a dictatorship was adhering to the divinely-sanctioned mission of government.

"(2) Would it be right for a Christian to be such a dictator as ruled when Paul wrote Romans 13?"

Reply: The question involves a contradiction between God's sanction and authentic history. It would be right for a Christian to be in that position, for one form of government to the exclusion of other forms is not sanctioned in the word of truth. It would not be right for any one, whether a Christian or not, to violate one realm of God in order to influence another realm of God as Nero did. In brief, whatever is morally right for the non-Christian would also be morally right for the Christian. If not, why not?

"(3) Should one war in order to escape slavery?"

Reply: Only at the command of the government—not at the Christian's personal initiative. I trust Brother Bales will effectively observe all that inheres in the meaning of the word "submit" in contradistinction to all that inheres in the word "obey."

“Put Up Thy Sword”

The unlawful use of the sword is condemned, but its lawful use at the command of the government is not: “for he (the government) beareth not the sword in vain.” Its use of record in Matt. 26:51 was unlawful for a threefold reason. (1) Its use had not been commanded; (2) it was being used for a cause where only the figurative sword of the Spirit is to be used; (3) it was being used under circumstances expressed as follows: “Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?” (Verses 53, 54.) So in that miraculous age, when so much power was available for but not desired by the Savior, why use the sword? But it is quite different now at the command of government, when miraculous power is not thus available, for in this age results are accomplished by law, whether we are dealing with one realm or another.

“Let Brotherly Love Continue”

Certainly, let brotherly love continue for both victims and offenders, but it is to continue, respectively, according to God's different realms. Sometimes in the purely religious realm brethren have to be dealt with severely, as follows: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them.” (Romans 16:17.)

Brother Bales, do you indiscriminately condemn both sides of religious division commanded in that text just as you do both sides of war? When he gets through explaining that, according to that text, only one side of that division is responsible for that evil in that realm, it will serve as a fitting illustration for war in the moral realm when only one side is responsible for it. I am opposed to

religious divisions, except under circumstances when God's law in the spiritual realm calls for it. Just so, I am opposed to war, except under condition when God's law in the moral realm calls for it. Moral: Let us be careful not to indiscriminately condemn religious divisions, for all religious people are parties to it; also not to indiscriminately condemn war, lest we fight against God's law.

Military Service

Many of the young men in military service are not there by choice, but by a high sense of duty. No wonder, then, the Christian is taught to pray the following significant prayer: "I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications, 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 Timothy 2:1, 2.) According to the A. V. the design of that prayer is: "that we may lead a tranquil and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty"; and Weymouth translates that design: "in order that we may live peaceful and tranquil lives with all godliness and gravity."

Thus, the "tranquil," "peaceable" or "peaceful" life, however desirable, is made contingent upon the action of kings and those in high station. But except as the law of the land may be violated, kings are not concerned with the Christians treatment of personal enemies, whether one turns the other cheek or not. This text shows plainly that the peaceful life referred to is beyond the control of the Christian if that one would be obedient to God, for kings have nothing to do with a citizen's personal peace. Thus, this distinction between personal and national enemies is an integral part of the word of truth itself, and no one can handle aright the word of truth and ignore it. But if, as alleged, passive submission to the government is all that is required one could live a peaceful life regardless of kings

and all in high station; but as it is, under this principle, the peaceful life is beyond the control of the Christian. So the affirmative under the first proposition and the negative under this, the second, proposition, is in perfect harmony with the inspired implication of this text.

BALES' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

When Stonestreet maintains that we are to treat national enemies in a different manner than the one in which we are to treat our personal enemies, he makes a distinction which Jesus did not make. Jesus did not say to love just your *personal* enemies. He said your *enemies* (Matt. 5:43, 44), and that would include any and all kinds of enemies. One might as well argue that we can fight *religious* enemies because when the Lord said love your enemies. He did not say that we had to love religious enemies. Stonestreet assumes that *we* are under *two* standards with reference to enemies; one which applies to personal enemies and another which applies to national enemies and which is *opposite* to that which applies to personal enemies. The term used when Jesus said to love your enemies (Matt. 5:43, 44; Lk. 6:27, 35), is also used with reference to the enemies of Israel who were generally the Gentile persecutors (Luke 1:71, 74); with reference to the Romans (Luke 19:43); and with reference to those who oppose Christ (Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:43; Heb. 1:13; 10:13). The very enemies, of Rom. 12:19-20, concerning whom Christians were to leave vengeance to God, were the *very ones* in Rom. 13:1-4 against whom God exercised the vengeance through civil powers. Rom. 13 does not tell how God uses Christians to exercise vengeance, but how God, to whom Christians leave it, carries it out. These very enemies against whom God exercised vengeance through civil powers were the very ones toward whom the Christians were to do deeds of kindness. "Dearly beloved, avenge not

yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" (Rom. 12:19-21). Stonestreet cannot carry on that manner of conduct toward the very enemies, here under consideration, and still carry the sword against them which the government carries. Furthermore, if he does do so, he is *not only* going contrary to the command given here as to conduct toward "thine enemy," *but he is also* exercising the very wrath which Paul told him not to exercise. Stonestreet does not reason as does Paul. Paul says that we leave vengeance to God, and *therefore we* do the good deeds of Rom. 12:20-21 toward the enemy; but Stonestreet says since vengeance is God's and we leave it to Him, that *we* carry it out for Him through civil powers. Paul said *not* to take vengeance on enemies *because* it is left to God; and Stonestreet says take vengeance on them because God takes vengeance. Stonestreet thinks that Paul is telling Christians how they are to cooperate with God in carrying out the vengeance symbolized by the sword, but Paul said nothing about Christians helping carry out that vengeance and instead he gave them instructions in Rom. 12:20-21 as to how they were to treat these enemies.

Furthermore, since the enemies against whom the civil government is using the sword in Rom. 13 are, according to Stonestreet, national enemies, they are the very ones in Rom. 12:19-21 that Paul called "*thine enemy*" and the ones whom they were to feed and to whom they were to do good. So even on Stonestreet's positions the Christian attitude toward his enemies includes, in *his enemies*, national enemies.

God has certain laws of nature, but even there Christians do not enforce punishment for the violations of those laws of nature.

As for the unintentional injury to the innocent, people know very well that when they carry out a fire raid, as for example on Tokyo where the estimates say around 100,000 died on one raid, one knows that thousands of innocents will be slaughtered. But all must bow to the supreme commander, "military necessity," which sanctions all that a nation at war considers to be essential to its successful prosecution of the war. So bomb the babies, it is unintentional injury and only done through military necessity. That is the way of war but *that is not the gospel way* and therefore it is not the way for Christians since Christians have been transformed by the gospel and must follow the gospel way. War says "suffer little children," but it does not finish the verse and forbid them not to come to Christ.

To carry through Stonestreet's illustration about the cyclone, why would it not be right for Christians to increase the power of the cyclone, against people and buildings, and help it kill the people and tear down the buildings. After all that is his position with reference to the power of wrath which God exercises, i.e., he says that we are to help carry out His wrath in Rom. 13:1-4.

With reference to the church, I have shown that Stonestreet's arguments on Rom. 13 could send the church *as such* to war. Surely we all agree that in some things the church submits to the demands of governments; for example, in regulations concerning buildings, etc. Where do we get authority for such submission. In those passages which also embrace the individual Christian's submission to governments. Unless we do find it there, there is no place which commands any submission by the church *as such*. And who will affirm that. Thus it is evident that these passages teach the same measure of submission of the church, *as such*, to the government as it does the individual Christian. And in both cases the measure of that submission is to the extent that the government does not require anything of either

that would involve them in disobedience to God's commands to the *Christian*.

As for the moral realm, I have shown that it is wrong for Christians to treat enemies as war treats them. My morality and worship are based on the same thing, i. e. the revelation of God in His word. Futhermore, how would Stonestreet prove that it is morally wrong for Christians to kill personal enemies and persecutors of the church? These persecutors of the church are the same type of evildoers who attack others, such as civil governments. Thus his argument which is based on a distinction between moral and religious realms is just as much against his principle (of not killing persecutors of the church or personal enemies) as it is against my principle of not killing any kind of enemies. He will have to give up this argument or the position concerning persecutors of the church.

In point 1 of my first affirmative I showed that a command from the government for Christians to go to war is equal to a command not to preach the gospel to some. War tells us to go with the *gun to kill* those to whom Christ has sent us with the *gospel to save*. War is a command for a Christian to treat enemies as God has forbidden him to treat them. Therefore, we must not war. Stonestreet himself thinks we should refuse to obey when we are commanded not to teach any more in the name of Christ. Why can't he see that war tells us not to teach, any more in the name of Christ, the national enemy? It tells us to cease teaching them and acting toward them as a Christian until it gives us authority to do otherwise. What war ordains for the Christian is exactly contrary to what God has ordained *for the Christian*. We must obey God rather than man. Since God has never ordained the sword for the Christian, when we point out what God has required of the Christian with reference to all enemies, we are not setting those scriptures against what He has ordained for the Christian

With reference to Stonestreet's questions the following is offered. The term in 1 Pet. 2:13 translated in the King James as "ordinance of man" is translated by Goodspeed as "human authority." *The Bible Commentary* says that it literally means "every human creation," "here taken in the sense of institution, or as in A. V. ordinance; i. e. every authority constituted or appointed by man. This meaning rests on the authority of the ablest Fathers,....and is adopted by late commentators." The civil government under which Paul lived, and those which have existed since that time, are creations of man. God has not personally appointed any civil government. Thus the commands of a civil power are the words of men, but to these words of men God has required that we submit up to the point where submission would involve us in disobedience to what He has ordained for the Christian. The reason we do not use the sword to carry out the wrath which they carry out is because God has not ordained that work for the Christian. As pointed out in the first paragraph of this article, what God does through them is expressly forbidden to the Christian. What they do to enemies is quite different, as shown by Rom. 12:19-21 and Rom. 13:1-4, from what Christians do to enemies. When Paul wrote concerning what God did through governments he was not telling us what God does through Christians. Stonestreet's major difficulty is on this point. He assumes that when God tells us what He does through civil powers that He is also telling us what He does through Christians as agents of civil powers. This is his assumption, but he can find no proof which shows that God ordained for Christians what he ordained for civil powers. No more than he can show that God ordained that civil governments pay Christians' taxes.

When Stonestreet tried to reply to my syllogism, which showed that his logic would involve the execution of heretics, he met it with assumptions and not scripture. Instead of saying something about a process of "divine elimination," as he did in the first part of this debate, he now asks us to ob-

serve "a practical division between the different forms of evil". What we wanted was a *scriptural* division which supports his classification of evil and his conclusion concerning the evils on which the sword was to be used. As I have shown all forms of evil sooner or later "menace life on earth." All help endanger civilization. Stonestreet says that we are to use the sword of the Spirit "against all forms of evil." Then why not the same with reference to the literal sword. We refer the reader to the first half of this debate for a fuller examination of Stonestreet's arguments concerning two types of evils.

When we become a new creature in Christ all relationships in life are changed in that in all relationships we conduct ourselves as new creatures and we cannot do anything in any relationship which would go contrary to the principles which animate the new creature. All must be done unto the Lord through Jesus Christ (Col. 3:17). Our standard of conduct in any relationship is not what men think is permissible in that relationship, but what the way of life for the new creature makes permissible. The ceiling, so to speak, of our conduct in any relationship is determined by the standards which govern the new creature. We are not just a human being, or a husband, or a wife, etc., in relationships but we are a Christian husband or wife, etc. in that relationship.

As for 1 Cor. 7:20 this does not prove that Christians are to abide in any and all callings and it does not imply that Christians conduct themselves in that calling as they did before conversion. Whenever a master demanded of a slave what was generally expected of slaves in that day, the Christian as a slave could do as long as it did not violate his principles of life which now animate him as a new creature. Paul told slaves to abide in that calling and not to rebel. He did not tell them to fight for life and liberty. He did not tell them to rebel, as Hitler's slaves were told to rebel, and as some of Stonestreet's principles would tell them to rebel and fight for freedom. If one is called who is already a military soldier he should see that he is not placed in a position where he will

execute wrath on anyone. He should do nothing that will violate Christian principles concerning conduct toward enemies. Cornelius, for example, was called. I do not know what became of Cornelius but I do know the following. *First*, the Roman army of which he was a part had carried on wars of aggression and Cornelius was now in a foreign country, a member of the Italian band, as a part of an army of occupation which held down territory which had been conquered in previous wars of aggression. If it was right for Cornelius to remain in that type of army *and carry out vengeance*, then it would be right today for men, when converted, in armies of aggression for dictatorships to remain in those armies and carry on wars of aggression or to be a part of armies of occupation which held in subjection the conquered people. *Second*, the Roman army was full of idolatry which was inextricably interwoven with army life. Should a Christian remain in such a situation where he will be involved in idolatry (For proof of this see *The Christian Conscientious Objector*). *Third*, The Bible does not tell us what Cornelius did, so in order to find out what he should have done we must go elsewhere in the new testament and find those principles which set forth Christian conduct. For instance to patiently suffer at the hand of the persecutor, as Peter taught (1 Pet. 2:21-23). We would like to ask Brother Stonestreet what a soldier, who is called while in an army of aggression or of occupation for a pagan dictatorship, should do when he is called by the gospel?

Yes, the word "soldier" is spiritualized, but that does not mean that the life of the soldier of Paul's day was approved. If it does then it approved the type of soldier with which Paul was familiar, i. e. the soldier who helped a pagan dictator to hold territory conquered in wars of aggression and to extend the dictator's conquests. The Lord's coming is likened unto that of a thief (Rev. 16:15), but that does not approve house breaking.

My position assumes and proves that it is wrong for Christians, in any country, to conduct themselves in a war

toward the enemies of that country as war demands that they conduct themselves. As for Stonestreet's question concerning something peculiar to the devil which has been spiritualized in the New Testament, we ask him what attribute of the soldier in the New Testament was peculiar to a soldier engaged in a defense war for a pagan dictatorship which was not also peculiar to the soldier engaged in a war of aggression or in any army of occupation which holds down territory conquered in wars of aggression. Furthermore, that these attributes may be spiritualized and applied to Christian no more proves that it is right for Christians to fight for a government than that it is right for them to fight for the church against its enemies. *This* particular argument would prove as much for fighting for the church as it would for fighting for a government.

The negative seems to be unable to understand that the New Testament does not teach that God has now required of Christians the wrath which they leave to Him and which He carries out, at least in part, through civil powers. God has not commanded or sanctioned for Christians what is ordained for civil powers. Furthermore, the work ordained for each was not ordained in the same way. God has only one church, but there are many types of civil powers; God exercised mercy and created the church, but civil powers were not created that way; God established the church through men selected and guided by Christ and the Spirit, but governments are creations of men; no government has had God's will revealed directly to it in this dispensation; no government was told that God used it for anything; those who are in Christ and do the work of the church shall be saved, not so with reference to the work of governments for no brother will affirm that one can be saved just by doing the word of governments. From this it is clear that the two were not ordained in the same way nor for the same purpose. Christians are objects of mercy and they must show mercy, and war would not allow them to do that.

Therefore, Christians must not war no matter what governments do.

To impression further on the reader's mind that God's children are not always permitted to do what God may do or may do through others, we cite the following examples. (1) God once "set all men every one against his neighbour" (Zech. 8:10). (2) "For, lo, *I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land, to possess the dwelling places that are not theirs. They are terrible and dreadful: their judgement and their dignity shall proceed of themselves. . . . They shall come all for violences their faces shall sup up as the east wind, and they shall gather the captivity as the sand. And they shall scoff at the kings, and the princes shall be a scorn unto them: they shall deride every stronghold; for they shall heap dust, and take it. Then shall his mind change, and he shall pass over, and offend, imputing this his power unto his God. Art thou not from everlasting. O Lord my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die, O Lord, thou hast ordained them for judgement: and, O mighty God, thou hast established them for correction.*" (Habakkuk 1:6-12). God raised them up, but would it be right for His children to do such? (3) God used nations in wars of aggression to punish other sinful people. He said: "I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." (Amos 7:9). He did this and carried Israel captive out of their own land, according to Amos' prophecy (Amos 7:11). God said He would slay them; that His hand would take them; that He would command the sword to slay them (Amos 9:1,2,3). He did this through a pagan people. (4) God said that "I will send a famine . . . of hearing the words of the Lord" (Amos 8:11). (5) God used Nebuchadnezzar's war of aggression to punish Israel (Dan. 1:1-2). "And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God: which he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his God; and he brought the

vessels into the treasure house of his God." These things show, as we have shown before, that even pagan wars of aggression may be used of the Lord to punish one people and then He in turn may punish them when He has accomplished His purposes through them. Futhermore, it shows that all that God ordains is not necessary sanctioned for His children. To find it sanctioned for His children we would have to find it *ordained for His children*. Zechariah 14:2-4 is another clear case which illustrates these two facts. "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and the half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when He fought in the day of battle." These things show that God may work through even wicked powers who do things which He has not approved for His children and for which He will punish them. These cases are simply illustrations of the power of God over all men which is stated in Rom. 13 with particular reference to civil governments.

Stonestreet is the one who is trying to place over *Christians* two standards of morality and conduct, i. e. one with reference to personal enemies and another with reference to national enemies. He binds two rules, the golden and the iron, on Christians. I am saying that God deals with Christians on one basis and civil powers on another. This is clear from several considerations. *First*, He deals with Christians through His revealed word, not so with government. *Second*, He deals with Christians on the basis of mercy and as redeemed people. But governments in Paul's day were not within the realm of redemption. *That is*, they were composed of people of the world and not of people who had passed from law to grace (Rom. 6:14). *Third*, of Christians He required that vengeance be left to Him, but He did not require that of governments (Rom. 12:19;13:4). *Fourth*, He commanded Christians to treat enemies (Rom. 12:20-21),

in the way which was different from that which civil powers did to those very enemies (Rom. 13:1-4). Call it two standards of morality, or anything that you want to call it, but it does not change the fact that in dealing with Christians and in dealing with civil powers He was dealing with two different conditions of peoples and two different ways of life. And He has not ordained for the Christian the way ordained for civil powers. Another thing that bears this out, in addition to the four points mentioned, is that what Christians do with reference to enemies contributes to their righteous deeds and crown of life; but what civil powers do has no saving value whatsoever. They could do all ordained for them in Rom. 13:1-4 but that would not help save them on judgement day. As we have shown elsewhere in this debate God has two types of servants, those who know Him and those who do not. One, for example, who did not know Him and yet was used of Him, was Assyria (Isa. 10:5-12). So since he has two types, why get upset because of two different standards, which just proves that much more that He does have two different types of servants. But He has not bound these two different standards on the same servant. One is for one type, the other for another. Stonestreet would bind *both* standards on *one* type, i. e. he would place Christians under a double standard of treating one kind of enemy, who would persecute you even unto death, one way and another type (the national enemy who would do the same) another way. He would have us to exercise mercy to one degree as an individual, but to another as a collective.

Matt. 5:38 did not refer to a perversion of the law when it referred to an eye for an eye. And this law did not refer to individual retaliation, but to the legal execution of justice. Furthermore the text does not even hint, as Stonestreet assumes, that "the Savior's audience was not emphasizing all of that law." And as for his reference to Matt. 23:23 this referred to their condition under the law of Moses (Matt.

23:2-3). In the sermon on the mount Jesus laid down some of the principles which were to prevail among His disciples under *His* law and not to people under Moses' law. Stonestreet said, "Let it be emphasized that it is *by the mercy of God that the salvation of the soul is made possible under the terms of the gospel*. To that end, the Christian is (to) be merciful, but not to abuse mercy." Jesus shows how far we are to go in this exercise of mercy to save sinners, even sinners who would put us to death. Christ died for His enemies to save His enemies (Rom. 5:6,8,10). As Brother W. L. Wilson said, "Had Christ not died for his enemies, we could never have been reconciled to God. The whole plan of salvation or scheme of redemption rests upon the death of Christ. *Yea it rests upon the death of Christ for his enemies.*" Stephen died without retaliation and while praying for his enemies. We must show mercy to others as God has shown it to us. We must forgive one another as He for Christ's sake has forgiven us (Eph. 4:32). When we kill someone to save someone else we are not showing mercy toward the one whom we kill. The Gentiles show that kind of mercy. But Brother Stonestreet would hardly think it was mercy if it was shown to him when someone else kill him. Those who show that kind of mercy should find it difficult to pray for God to forgive them *as* they forgive those who have trespassed against them

The passage about swines does not say that we have the right to say that whole nations are swine and therefore we ought to cast bombs at them. Neither did Jesus say that instead of casting pearls you could cast bombs. The most that can be shown from that passage is that we refuse to teach certain who reject the gospel, but not that we therefore have the right to kill them.

Stonestreet assumes that our paying taxes involves us in the war. Jesus said to pay taxes to Caesar and Caesar used tax money in wars of aggression; in wild parties; to support a pagan religion; but was Jesus implicated in all these

things? He was, if Stonestreet's idea about it is correct. In some places church property is taxed; would the church there be implicated if the government used some of the taxes for war? In Canada taxes paid by brethern help support some phases of Catholic educational work which includes religious instruction which glorifies the Pope. Rom. 13 commands brethern in Japan to pay taxes. In some states tax money paid by brethern helps pay for textbooks which teach evolution and to support public school systems in which dancing is taught and students are urged to dance. American soldiers who were prisoners of war, in some cases at least, worked in steel foundrys in Japan. Prisoners of war generally do some sort of work which helps support the nation, which has captured them, in some ways at least. Would Stonestreet say that they had a part in all these things and were thus guilty?

As to the moral which he draws concerning "all that is necessary to living in this world", we have dealt with it already (See fourth negative, third paragraph). What if the Japanese said that in order to live according to this "moral" they must have more land in which to expand.

All people have a voice as to whether they will extend mercy or not, but they do not have the right to determine whether or not Christians shall extend mercy. I am not trying to apply mercy by proxy, whatever that may mean, but I am convinced that Christian persons should apply mercy in dealing with those who are in sin. As individuals Stonestreet thinks we should bear all things and be merciful, but not as a national group. Of course, that is his idea and not New Testament teaching as to what Christians are to do toward all enemies. We cannot fight for ourselves, but we can for the state. What is so sacred about the state that it must be preserved at all cost, but not so with reference to the Christian or the church when it is persecuted.

"As far as Christians are concerned" God's law of force cannot be thwarted by their refusal to fight, for the simple

reason that God has not ordained that that law of force operate through Christians. The exercise of mercy from Divinity to humanity through Christ is the pattern which Christians are to follow in dealing with humanity. Christ died even for His enemies. This may not be practical, as the world sees it, but it is scriptural, and furthermore it is just as practical for a group as for an individual—and Stonestreet thinks individuals should follow it; or for the group known as the church.

One may get benefits as well as deficits under any government under which we live. I render to it subjection (Rom. 13:1); taxes (Rom. 13:6); prayers for it (1 Tim. 2:1-2); obey its laws (1 Pet. 2:13-14); and honor its rulers (1 Pet. 2:17). However, I do not carry the sword for it since God has not permitted Christians to treat enemies thus. Whatever righteousness I have, or help create in others; whatever light or salt I have; helps the country and the world as a whole. So I make a contribution, but that contribution is determined by what I can do as a Christian. To change the subject of his question, "I ask Brother Stonestreet by what law of compensation is the *church* governed in accepting the benefits of civil government and at the same time standing aloof from serving the government within the limits of its divinely-sanctioned mission?" The same law here which he applies to the church, applies to me. Regardless of whether we receive good or evil from the government we are supposed to submit.

I try to render what it is proper for Christians to render civil governments, but I cannot render that which conflicts with my allegiance to God through Christ. To treat any enemy as war wants them treated is unchristian and I must not do it. Paul did not tell Christians how they are to take vengeance, in Rom. 13, but tells them of one way God does it. God does in that way what Christians are told to leave to Him. My obedience is limited by *my mission as a Christian* and not by the standard of the mission of civil power. Their

mission is not mine, any more than my mission is theirs. They have as much right, which is no right, to take over the mission of the Christian as we have to take their mission.

It is still true that in Matt. 26:51 conditions are present which Stonestreet, in other places, thinks should lead us to draw the sword. *First*, for self-protection. *Second*, in a just cause. *Third*, when the conduct of the enemy endangers those principles which are necessary to civilization. However, Stonestreet agrees that even these arguments do not in themselves justify the Christian using the sword. Therefore, if Christians are to use the sword it must be because of some reasons other than the above. So these arguments within themselves prove nothing as to whether or not Christians are to use the sword.

Love is still to continue even after one has withdrawn from another. I do not condemn both sides of the religious division, commanded in Rom. 16:17, because one of the sides is Christian. In war between worldly kingdoms neither side is Christian although one may be morally better than the other in many instances. God commanded *Christians* in this verse to withdraw fellowship, but Stonestreet cannot show where God commands the Christian to draw the sword. I ask where a *Christian* is so commanded, and he goes to where a government, which was pagan, carried the sword. Surely that is confusion, to be unable to distinguish between what was commanded of the Christian and what God did through civil powers which were not Christian. Even if one side was 100% innocent, with no sins which merited the wrath of God (such as Col. 3:5-6), it would not prove that Christians are to fight. As we have shown in our clarification of the issue, even if a side is entirely right that does not prove that Christians are to fight. So that is off of the issue, and proves nothing in a debate as to what Christians are to do. Furthermore, all nations have sins which merit God's wrath and no nation is entirely without guilt for present world

conditions, even though some are much more responsible than others.

All who are in the military service are there by choice, in contradiction to what Stonestreet said. It may have been a high sense of duty; or fear of the consequences; or not knowing exactly what else to do; that led them to make that choice but they did make a choice. If they had no choice in the matter, neither did our brethern in Japan.

The majority of things offered under Stonestreet's examination of 1 Tim. 2:1,2 are answered in my third negative, point VIII, which see. Paul did not even hint that they were to fight for their peace. Brethern in Japan could thus pray, but that would not authorize them to fight. Furthermore, Stonestreet says that the peaceful life here referred to is "beyond the control of the Christian" so it certainly does not teach fighting for a peaceful life. For if it did, then to that extent it would be under the control of the Christian. And since one would have as much lack of peace when attacked by a personal enemy as by a national enemy, I do not see that this passage has anything to do with the issue. It is likely that Paul was here referring to peace which comes to Christians when they are not being persecuted by civil powers, or by others as when the church had rest in Acts 9:29-31.

SECOND NEGATIVE

On Second Proposition by P. W. Stonestreet Enemies Personal and National Distinguished Between

Brother Bales confuses personal enemies with national enemies. True, Jesus does not specify personal enemies in the sermon on the mount, but there are several ways of saying things without specifying them. The fact that the same term that is used in that text is also used with reference to the enemies of historic national Israel does not prove

Brother Bales claim; his claim only shows that he fails to observe that that term is used with different applications. The salient facts and the context plainly imply that reference is made to personal enemies, for the following reasons:

1. An individual in an individual capacity cannot authoritatively speak nor adequately act concerning national enemies, whether love is manifested one way or another. The problem is far beyond the individual's control, and Jesus does not require impossibilities. Nothing short of a nation or its qualified representatives can thus speak and act. Therefore Jesus, in that sermon, is not telling civil government how it should manifest its love for enemies. Neither is he forbidding Christians to obey the government in dealing with national enemies according to established national law.

2. Jesus' hypothetical recognition of fact in his statement: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight", etc., does not condemn dealing with national enemies according to established laws governing kingdoms of this world, especially according to the divinely-approved mission of kingdoms of this world set forth in Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14. Therefore, since there is an inspired distinction made between dealing with national enemies and personal enemies, and this distinction is made to Christians, it is the province of the Christian to observe it. Divine civil sanction and divine personal commands are not at variance, for they pertain, respectively, to widely different realms. To confuse them is to fail to effectively observe the whole counsel of God on the subject.

3. By its very nature, Christianity's appeal is individual in contradistinction to collective or national. Its blessings and continuity are not dependent upon collective or national acceptance and action, while civil government's benefits and continuity are dependent upon collective or national support and action. To array commands in one realm against commands in the other realm, as the affirmative under this pro-

position does, is to array Christianity against civil government and thereby perpetuate the traditional misconception of the early Christians concerning the nature of the spiritual kingdom and realm. But divine authority is not thus divided against itself. Only religious teachers, however sincere, are responsible for such a state of confusion.

It is realized that comparatively few conscientious objectors do not constitute the balance of power on which a nation may fall or survive, but I refer to the principle involved. If the entire nation had been thus minded when the United States was attacked in World War II, the Axis powers would have had us with a down-hill pull, without the intervention of miraculous power, which is not divinely promised for this age of accomplishing military ends by military law. This does not mean that divine interest in the destiny of nations is not the same now as it was in the days of Joshua and Gideon, but it does mean that to a much greater extent than in previous ages, God has commissioned humanity to cope with conditions of this world by lawful means rather than miraculous means. Thus, a government and its subjects can be destroyed by passive non-resistance; and as surely as effect follows cause, the ultimate end of Brother Bales' theory, when reduced to collective or national practice, would render civil government futile in case of attack by a foreign foe. Of course according to the teaching of the New Testament, a totally Christianized nation would not be the aggressor in war, but according to Brother Bales' theory a totally Christianized nation would thereby be doomed unless the community of nations of the world were also Christianized. Does Brother Bales' position provide for the existence of civil government just like it provides for the existence of the devil? Is that the teaching of the New Testament on the subject? The New Testament reveals the mission both of the devil and also civil government. Yet the Christian is commanded to *resist* the one and *obey* the other; and as surely as it is the Christian's duty to

resist the devil to the extent of his mission, so surely is it the Christian's duty to obey the government to the extent of its mission. The greatest love a nation can manifest toward humanity is to arrest the powers of evil of a foreign foe the shortest way possible, even if it becomes necessary to use "the death-dealing life-saving power" of military force divinely sanctioned in this age against a form of evil that refuses to obey the power of the gospel of Christ.

4. An individual in an individual capacity may refrain from resisting a personal enemy and be the sole victim of that enemy's designs, which is his province. But to assign that principle to a nation by which to be governed would nullify its mission and result in a corresponding increase in victims. Moreover, an individual in an individual capacity may refrain from resisting a personal enemy and thereby figuratively heap coals of fire on his head. But the Scriptures do not suggest that we figuratively heap coals of fire on a nation: that would involve a plurality of heads. Hence, the same reason that justifies a nation in resisting a national enemy, also justifies a Christian in obeying the national government to the same end. So the distinction between personal and national enemies is wide and plain without a specification of it, for it is thus implied.

God's Vengeance

Brother Bales says: "The very enemies, of Romans 12: 19-20, concerning whom Christians are to leave vengeance to God, were the very ones in Romans 13:1-4 against whom God exercised the vengeance through civil powers."

But the passage reads: "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." (Romans 12:19,20.)

The act forbidden in that passage turns on the significant meaning of *yourselves*. (The definition is for both the singular and plural pronoun), thus:

"You and not another or others; you in your own person or individuality." (Webster)

Brother Bales' theory assumes that its meaning is: *You and another or others*. But Webster says it means: "You and not another or others."

This is not the first time the destinies of mankind hung on the little word "not". A way back in the garden of Eden that little word "not" marked the difference between the command of God and the command of the devil, with which, I am sure, Brother Bales is familiar. The prohibition does not attach to the Christian when military service is rendered with the mission of the government's lawful procedure that is divinely sanctioned, for such service is not of the Christian's own "individuality."

Moreover, the passage does not read: *Avenge not, beloved, etc.*; but it reads: "Avenge not yourselves", etc. Military service is for the nation, not simply for one's "own person or individuality." When such service is rendered by God's sanction and at the command of both God and the government, it results in God's vengeance as surely as God's word accomplishes his designs. May my correspondent fully realize that there is a vast difference between *avenging yourselves in person and individuality, and in avenging the government by lawful means*. Of course, as I have previously pointed out, another principle is to govern the Christian in such service: The fight must be against an evil identified with that mentioned in Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14. I ask Brother Bales, why is the mission of civil government taught to the Christians in the two cited passages if it is not given them by which to be governed in their obedience to the government?

Negative Commands

That which is morally wrong in itself does not go unforbidden in the Scriptures. For example, we read: "Let him that stole, steal no more", etc. But nowhere do we read: *Let him that has served in the military army serve no more*. Yet that is the very statement needed by Brother Bales to sustain his position. Just as *positive* teaching is necessary to establish a scriptural principle of action, so is *negative* teaching necessary to terminate a well-established principle of action in the moral realm. While the subject is discussed and the word "soldier" is used in both its literal and spiritualized senses, not a vestige of condemnation is divinely registered against military service. Instead, to the Christian there is revealed the mission of civil government as that mission pertains to the punishment of evil-doers whose evil is outside the realm of man's free-moral agency.

"Ordinance of Man"

Brother Bales gives several definitions of the ordinance of man, which I endorse (but they are beside the issue), adding: "but to these words of men God has required that we submit up to the point submission would involve us in disobedience to what God has ordained for the Christian."

Such generalizing! But *at what point do the* "words of men" clash with God's commands? Sometimes words of men are also words of God. The Bible is replete with the principle. The exact issue is: at what point do the words of men cease to be also the words of God? God refers to such civil authorities as "ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing." Also God reveals *to Christians* the mission of such ordinances as that mission pertains to punishment of evil of certain forms - evil that is outside the realm of man's free-moral agency divinely bestowed. Brother Bales' theory assumes that the Christian is to ignore the divine limits set to man's free-moral agency.

Under God's teachings, even that wide realm has limits. God in his wisdom and mercy has ordained that civil government defend and preserve that wide, though limited, realm of freedom. The free-moral agency of man, divinely bestowed and humanly preserved, is the very principle under which Brother Bales has a right to be a Christian only, religiously, and to worship God according to his conception of the teaching of the New Testament. Yet his theory assumes that his duty to obey the government in defending that free-moral agency of man stops short of accomplishing that purpose; that the particular point at which he ceases to obey God and begins to obey "men" is short of the divinely-sanctioned mission of civil government. Think of it! Why, his theory, in principle, vitiates his own position and practice on the subject. Behold the errors, both historic and current, that are based on the misconception of the nature of the spiritual King and kingdom! That error dates back to the days of Herod when he "slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem, and the borders thereof, from two years old and under", seeking to slay the new-born King, Jesus. But as divinely ordained and sanctioned, there is no rivalry between the spiritual Kingdom and earthly government. Rivalry exists only when one or the other of these radically different nature of government departs from its ordained mission. Civil government divinely functions in that wide, though limited, realm of man's free-moral agency, while the spiritual government functions in that smaller realm after man has made his choice to serve God. But the Christian is vitally concerned with the free-moral agency realm as long as he is on earth.

Scriptural Divisions of Evil

Brother Bales wants not only a "practical" classification of evils, but a "scriptural" classification of evils. Well, I cited Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14 for the class of evil with

which humanity is divinely concerned. Also I cited 2 Thess. 1:7-10 for the class of evil with which humanity is not concerned so far as punishment for it is concerned, for that punishment is reserved till the coming of the Lord. Both of these passages being in the Scriptures, the classification is not only *scriptural*, but it is even *Scripture*. Also, since God sanctions human instrumentality (the civil government) for the punishment for the one form of evil, while punishment for the other form of evil is divinely reserved till the coming of the Lord, the classification is also very *practical*.

Brother Bales says that I assume that "when God tells us what He does through civil powers that He is also telling us what He does through Christians." No. Brother Bales has the word "assume" in the place of the word "observe". May he observe, too, that God also tells the Christian to "submit to", "to obey", and "to be ready unto every good work" of "rulers." The assumption is the other way around. Bales assumes that the Christian's obedience is to stop short of the government's mission, which God calls "good." Not only is it called good, but even good for the Christian. Also he assumes that when God tells us how to personally treat personal enemies that He is telling us how to nationally treat national enemies.

Brother Bales also says: "We would like to ask Brother Stonestreet what a soldier, who is called in an army of aggression or occupation for a pagan dictatorship, would do when he is called by the gospel?"

A soldier is not justified in knowingly being in an army of aggression in the first place, and of course he should quit on being called by the gospel, for God's civil sanction and God's religious commands do not clash. But in turn, I ask Brother Bales what a soldier, who is serving in an army of a government that is not a pagan dictatorship and whose mission is not that of aggression but to prevent aggression,

should do when he is called by the gospel? My question pertains to the issue; his does not.

Brother Bales should realize that the military service sanctioned by the New Testament is "for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well." The historic Roman government violated that mission. Yet, Brother Bales persists in holding it up as a criterion by which to judge all civil governments. But the press recently carried an announcement of a conscientious objector, Corporal Desmond T Ross, being presented a Congressional Medal of Honor for service in saving lives in the army. This is commendable on the part of both Corporal Ross and the government of the United States. No criticism against one living up to his convictions have been registered by me in this discussion. Within the limits of man's free-moral agency, the preservation of which God has committed to civil government in this age, one has a right to be a conscientious objector. But Brother Bales' theory, carried to its logical ends, would render the defense of that right futile, for his theory assumes that only the servants of the devil are to defend that right, even at the command of the government. It is one thing to have such convictions, but it is quite a different thing to try to make more conscientious objectors. On this point, I simply deny that he has a right, except under man's free-moral agency, to try to make more of them.

"By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for seven days." God had commanded that procedure. But since Bible faith comes by hearing God's word and God had given no such commandment concerning our recent national foes, the Axis powers could not have thus fallen by faith, for Bible faith ends where God's word ends. Thus the Axis powers could have fallen only by the execution of military laws divinely sanctioned for that end. The war was not won by God's religious law for this

age, but it was won by the operation of military law divinely-sanctioned for this age.

Matthew 5:38

Brother Bales says: "Matt. 5:38 did not refer to a perversion of the law when it referred to an eye for an eye."

Instead of repeating in substance my own comment on the point in question, I prefer to give what scholarship says, as follows:

"An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. The law quoted is found in Exod. 21:23-25 and Lev. 24:18-20. Moses intended it to protect persons and property by prescribing what punishment the law should inflict. He who took a life should lose his life; he who robbed another of an eye should be punished by the loss of an eye. The Jews prevented it to justify *private* retaliation." ("Explanatory Notes" by B. W. Johnson.)

*"An eye for an eye—*It was never the law of God that he whose tooth or eye was knocked out should proceed, without judge or jury, to knock out the tooth or eye of his assailant; but in every case of maiming under the Mosaic law the guilty party was regularly tried in the courts, and the penalty was inflicted by the officers of the law (See Deut. xix. 17-21; Ex. xxi. 22-25.) The injured party was not required to prosecute, but was at liberty, if he saw proper, to show mercy by declining to do so. (Comp. Lev. xix. 18.)" ("New Testament Commentary" by J. W. McGarvey.)

To show that Jesus in the sermon on the mount was correcting the perversions of the law and that his preface: "Ye have heard that it hath been said" referred to traditional perversions to some extent, I quote briefly from McGarvey on verse 43, as follows:

"Hate thine enemy.—'Love your neighbor as yourself' was an express precept of the law of Moses (Lev. xix. 18),

while the sentiment 'Hate thine enemy' is not found in the law as a precept."

Quotation from other authors might be given to the same effect, but these are sufficient for the readers to judge as to the truth of the question.

Brother Bales asks: "How would Stonestreet prove that it is morally wrong for Christians to kill personal enemies, and persecutors of the church?"

I would prove it by properly applying the teaching of Jesus referring to personal enemies which Bales misapplies to national enemies. (Of course the word "enemy" is a relative term. Not all enemies are trying to kill the object of their enmity.)

The early Christians did not constitute a civil government; they were citizens of civil government. Therefore, since their enemies were chiefly the civil authorities of the government of which they themselves were subjects, they could not sustain a national attitude toward their enemies in that case. So it was not only right, but even prudent for their temporal welfare for them to passively submit to their civil and religious persecutors. But with reference to a government like the United States that is not violating its mission thus, the other word of the Scriptures "obey" is a more fitting term, for the United States fights as much for Christians as it does for non-Christians. Why assume a persecution complex when the Scriptures furnish a more fitting term for existing conditions in this country? The New Testament anticipates all the various circumstances under which the Christian may be placed, whether favorable or unfavorable for the cause.

The Obligation of the Affirmative

The reader will observe that Brother Bales is in the affirmative in this, the last half of this discussion. I am in the negative. I am not obliged to affirm a negative; that is his

obligation. He is therefore obligated to adduce from the Scriptures proof that the well-established custom of a citizen of the civil government to bear arms for the government in a just national cause has terminated; he is obligated to prove that such military service terminates upon becoming a Christian. This he has utterly failed to do. True, he says much about love and enemies, but he fails to scripturally differentiate between national and personal enemies, and to effectively observe that love is an active principle, which may result in pleasing or displeasing, punishing or refraining from punishing the object of that love, depending on circumstances.

Motives

The Scriptures assign three high motives for the Christian's deference to the civil government, as follows:

1. "*Because of the wrath.*" This refers to the punishment that may be inflicted on one for personal violations of the civil laws, which in itself is a splendid reason for good behavior on the part of the Christian. If passive submission were all that is taught, this one motive might well be sufficient, but this is not all.

2. "*For conscience' sake.*" What a high motive! It is comparable to one of the designs of gospel baptism, which is: "the interrogation of a good conscience toward God." Also, Cruden's Concordance makes a suggestion on this point which I endorse: "that is, not only for fear of punishment from the magistrate, but more especially out of conscience to duty, both to God, who is the ordainer of him to that special ministry, under himself; and to the magistrate, whose due it is in respect of office." The *office* of such a magistrate is therefore to be honored, with all that the word implies. But to what extent? Manifestly to the extent of its divinely-sanctioned mission, else why would its mis-

sion be stated to the Christian? What other purpose could it serve?

I call Brother Bales' attention to two pronouns in Romans 13:4. One of them is in the second person "thee" referring to the Christian; the other is in the third person "him" referring to anybody else. I ask Brother Bales why is the Christian told the government's divinely-sanctioned mission as it relates to non-Christians if, as he assumes, that part of the mission is no concern of the Christian? May we observe that we are to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

3. "*For the Lord's sake.*" This shows the divinely-sanctioned mission of force in the realm of civil government and the Christian's relation to it: "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."

While it is true that God's power of the gospel is designed to curb all forms of evil by *persuasion*, it is equally true that God's power of *force* through civil government is designed to restrain mankind from transgressing that wide, though limited, realm of man's free-moral agency with forms of evil peculiar to that realm; and by the teaching of the whole counsel of God, the Christian sustains an important relation to both by inspired command.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

On Second Proposition by James D. Bales Personal Enemies

The type of enemy that we are to love is one who would mistreat us; curse us; hate us; despitefully use us; and persecute us (Matt. 5:39, 44). This is the very type of enemy that the country calls on men to fight. But it is the very type that we are not to resist, that we are to love; bless; do good to; and for which we are to pray. This enemy is the

type of enemy who is not only our personal enemy but also an enemy to society, for under the law of an eye for an eye, to which Christ referred and repealed for His disciples (Lev. 20:24; Deut. 19:21; Matt. 5:38), society was to put to death such an enemy. Christ is not talking to worldly governments, which are outside of the realm of discipleship, but to His disciples. *This is law for His disciples.* When governments require us to act otherwise toward enemies, we must obey God rather than man.

Stonestreet refers this to personal enemies, but it is my opinion (which he can deny if I misrepresent him) that he believes that it is right for Christians to call on the government and to be commissioned by it to resist even personal enemies.

Removal of Moral Responsibility

One of the arguments against war is that *it asks me to cease making moral decisions*—with reference to enemies, to lying propaganda, to the slaughter of the innocent—and to leave all such decisions to the government, whose decisions one is asked to carry out without questioning. He may be asked to kill conscripted soldiers who did not want to go to war; or to blot out an entire city, which may include brethren who are conscientious objectors; or to fight against natives in Java who may be fighting for the very type of freedom for which this war was fought with reference to the white man. One is asked to follow leaders who maintain, as did Lord Baldwin, that "The only defense is offense, which means that you have to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy if you want to save yourselves (house of Commons, 10-11-32). Or such statements as these, which were endorsed by General Eisenhower and General Marshall, in a booklet written by Frank B. Sargent on "Psychological Preparation for Combat." "Without a consuming personal hatred and desire to kill, our men are not

truly prepared for battle against the skillful and determined enemies they must face." "Hate must become first nature to a soldier and make him want to use every trick." This would be especially true of soldiers who expect to come into physical contact with the enemy. Of course, all do not surrender to this attitude which the military, who knows more about it than Bible teachers, says makes the best soldier. But, of course, if a Christian should be a fighting man why shouldn't he try to do and be everything that will make him the best possible fighting man? And thus he would be willing to do anything and everything his superiors required.

The reader may say: Brother Stonestreet does not believe in leaving moral decisions in the hands of others, but he believes Christians must make these decisions for themselves. Our answer is: He may not realize it but he endorses the principle of leaving these moral decisions in the hands of worldly governments. He wrote: "An individual in an individual capacity cannot authoritatively speak nor adequately act concerning national enemies, whether love is manifested one way or another. The problem is far beyond the individual's control, and Jesus does not require impossibilities." What would this require but that with reference to national enemies the individual give up all moral appraisal of his own actions and let his conduct be dictated by another individual or individuals in a governmental capacity. Individuals in office make decisions concerning national enemies which they bind on others. Christians must not leave to nations, which are not regulated by Christian principles in dealing with other nations, the moral decision as to the Christian's conduct toward the men of other nations. I cannot determine what others in the nation may do, but I can determine my own conduct; and in requiring that I determine my conduct Christ has not required the impossible. When a civil government tells us to war on enemies they are telling us to treat them in a man-

ner which is opposite to the way Christ said for us to treat them

In no place is there an inspired distinction between the way *Christians* are to treat national enemies and personal enemies. In fact, even against the enemies against whom the government carries the sword the Christian is not to take vengeance and he would be taking vengeance if he carried the sword, for the government, against these enemies. Paul said: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord," (Rom. 12:19). We are not to take vengeance because He does it. How are we to treat those enemies? "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." (Rom. 12:20). What is one of the ways in which God takes vengeance? The next verses tell us that he does it, through civil governments "for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." (Rom. 13:1-4). "Now, if God acting through the civil power is taking vengeance, why would not Christians acting through civil power also be taking vengeance?" (A. S. Croom, *Christians and War*, 19-20). It would be taking vengeance. Thus we are forbidden to do the very thing the civil government does. Thus all of Stonestreet's arguments, concerning civil governments and their work as sanction for Christians to do these things, are shown to be false.

John 18:36

To our former comments on this passage we need add only that the disciples were no more of the world than was His kingdom (John 17:16). Therefore, we no more fight for the world than His kingdom fights. The nature of the kingdom forbids us doing those very things that men in worldly kingdoms do who do not sustain the relationship

to the kingdom of heaven that we sustain. We must not use this passage to sanction the very thing for His disciples which Christ used it to prohibit.

· Arraying Commands Against Commands

This we have not done. We have shown that Stonestreet confuses realms by applying to Christians what God applied to governments. He fails to realize that when Paul said that the government carries the sword, he was no more talking about what Christians do, than that when he said that Christians pay taxes he was telling us what governments do. We no more carry the sword for them than they are commanded to pay taxes to us or to preach for us. Stonestreet is the one who arrays command against command for he maintains that Christians, who are under the golden rule, are also under the iron rule. He is maintaining that we who are commanded not to take vengeance, are to take it at the government's command. On the very section where Paul said not to kill (Rom. 13:9), Stonestreet maintains that he authorized us to kill. I no more array command against command, to Christians, when I maintain that they must not fight than he does when he maintains that the kingdom of heaven must not fight.

Christian Nation

Stonestreet knows that the whole nation will hardly become Christian. But what if it did. If all in this country were Christians then the nation would be co-extensive with the church and an attack on the country would be an attack on the church. And Stonestreet himself does not believe that the church should resist. If all in this country had been Christian before the war, we would have done so much good in evangelizing the world; in sharing what we have with the needy nations; in returning good for evil; that there would have been no cause for attack unless it was because

we were Christians. And then Stonestreet does not believe we should fight. One might as well argue, on Stonestreet's principle, that the kingdom of heaven would be doomed to destruction unless it fought or unless all the rest of the world was Christianized. Or that the individual Christian is doomed unless all other individuals are Christianized. And it would not be as great a tragedy for a worldly kingdom to be destroyed as for the kingdom of heaven to be destroyed. Stonestreet's argument is like that of the infidel Celsus who wrote against Christianity in the second century. Of the Christians he said: "For if all men were to do the same as thou, there would be nothing to prevent him (the king) from being left alone and deserted, and earthly affairs from falling into the hands of the most lawless and savage barbarians, and the glory both of thine own worship and of realm wisdom from being left on longer among men (C. J. Cadoux, *Christian Pacifism Re-examined*, 232. I would fear no more for a totally Christianized nation I do for the church. However, let the reader remember that the issue is not concerning the conduct of kingdoms of this world, but of the Christian whose supreme allegiance is to the kingdom of heaven.

The number of individuals who might be in danger if my position was followed does not decide the issue one way or another. We are not discussing the consequences of my doctrine, but whether or not my doctrine is scriptural. The argument from consequences could also be used against Stonestreet's position that we should not fight when the kingdom of heaven is attacked. If there were millions in the kingdom, millions would be exposed to danger, but that would not change the teaching.

Rom. 12:19

We have Stonestreet's word that although we may not avenge ourselves *we may avenge others* thus we could

avenge brethren. Wherein is there authority for acting from one standard when doing something on our own behalf but from an opposite one when doing something for another? In wars governments appeal to personal vengeance to try to get soldiers to fight harder. The soldier is supposed to be fighting for himself as well as for the government. The comments on this verse which were made just before the John 18:36 section also show that Stonestreet misuses this passage. Also where are we told to avenge governments?

“Negative Commands”

“Nowhere do we read: Let him that has served in the military army, serve no more.” (Stonestreet). This is no more significant than the fact that we do not read: Let him that served in an army of aggression serve no more. And, after all, the armies which operated for Rome in the first century were armies of aggression and of occupation of conquered countries. It was an established custom to fight for one's country regardless of the cause of the war. Using instrumental music and infant membership were established Jewish principles. However, we do not contend for them because we do not read: Thou shalt not do these things. With reference to war, general principles and specific commands makes it wrong for Christians to treat enemies as war treats them.

Question

“I ask Brother Bales, why is the mission of civil government taught to the Christian in the two cited passages if it is not given them by which to be governed in their obedience to the government?” *First*, these passages tell them to obey governments; but they do not tell them to carry the sword for the governments. And we have shown, in our affirmative arguments, that sword bearing would conflict with principles of the Christian life. *Second*, since the govern-

ment under which it was written was a pagan dictatorship which engaged in wars of aggression, if these passages told Christians to fight for the government they would have to fight for that type of government. Even Stonestreet does not believe that it would be right to fight for that type of government; so how can he believe that these passages teach sword bearing for Christians. *Third*, it is likely that they were told about governments not because they were to fight for them but to keep them from fighting against the type of the government under which they lived. Jamieson-Faussett-Brown in their commentary refer to the government of Nero as "an unchecked despotism."

"But since Christians were constantly charged with turning the world upside down, and since there certainly were elements enough in Christianity of moral and social revolution to give plausibility to the charge, and tempt noble spirits, crushed under misgovernment, to take redress into their own hands, it was of special importance that the pacific, submissive, loyal spirit of those Christians who resided at the great seat of political power, should furnish a visible refutation of this charge." (Comment on Rom. 13:5).

Thus it told them how to treat a government which was even an enemy to the church. So Rom. 13 and 1 Pet. 2:14 would keep them from following a theory, similar to Stonestreet's, that such governments were outlaw governments.

On Stonestreet's theory and on his own description of the civil government of that day, he might ask himself why these passages were written since they say that that government was of God, which Stonestreet's theory says was outlaw. Of that civil government he wrote: "The early Christians did not constitute a civil government; they were citizens of civil government. Therefore, since their enemies were chiefly the civil authorities of the government of which they themselves were subjects, they could not sustain a national attitude toward their enemies in that case. So it was not only right, but even prudent for their temporal welfare for them to passively

submit to their civil and religious persecutors. But with reference to a government like the United States that is not violating its mission thus, the other word of the Scriptures 'obey' is a more fitting term . . ." *First*, Stonestreet says Rome was violating its mission and engaged in civil and religious persecution. Thus, on his theory concerning Germany and Japan, such a government was outlaw and one should not fight for it. And yet, if these passages teach fighting for civil governments they taught it then and if they taught it then they taught it for the type of power he declares outlaw, but which Paul said was of God for there is no power but of God, the powers that be or exist are ordained of God. Furthermore, if it taught fighting for such a country then it teaches it for such a country now. But Stonestreet denied that Christians in Japan should have fought for such a government. Thus he must also deny that Rom. 13 taught fighting for Rome in Paul's day for he admits it was such a government. Thus these passages cannot teach fighting now. *Second*, Stonestreet's theories lead him to say "obey" is the more fitting term today in the U. S., but that it was not under Rome. Paul made no such distinctions. The same government he says to submit to was the same that he said to obey. *Third*, if Rome was, as he maintains, violating its mission, then on his theory it was an outlaw government. Thus no legal government existed then. Therefore, in fighting against it Christians would not have been fighting against a true government. If the early Christians had believed as does Stonestreet they would have set up their own civil government and fought against Rome. They may not have succeeded, but is the likelihood of success or failure to be the determining factor in doing what is right? If so, then all of Stonestreet's arguments for fighting against aggression are of no avail, on his own logic, unless one is sure that he will succeed. *Fourth*, the fact that God revealed to Christians the mission of governments, including wicked Rome, did not mean that the Christians were to fight for them. Even

Stonestreet does not believe that one should fight for such a government as was Rome.

Free-Moral Agency

Stonestreet's comments under "Ordinance of man" concerning free-moral agency sets forth the absurd position that it is right to fight for the right to be a Christian, but that it is not right to fight when one is attacked because he is a Christian. His reasoning on this point did not bring forth a scripture authorizing Christians to fight for a government. Why not fight against those who would keep people from hearing the gospel? The Catholics, for example.

"Scriptural Divisions of Evil"

Enough about this has already been said to show that the division is Stonestreet's rather than Scriptural. On his logic that certain evils are to be punished at Christ's coming, and thus not by civil governments now, we would have to conclude that the evils which are punished now are not to be punished at Christ's coming. Thus the murderer who is executed by the state will not be judged when Christ comes. But this is contrary to Scripture. Since both types, as he classifies them, of evil doers will be punished at Christ's coming, then on his logic, on 2 Thess. 1:7-10, neither type should be punished now. We have already shown that sins against God and sins against man are closely connected.

It will take more than *Young's Analytical Concordance* to find the Scripture which says: Christians "be ready unto every good work" of "rulers". Our first negative, point II. on Titus 3:1 deals with the passage which Stonestreet likely thinks contains such admonition.

Exchange of Questions

Stonestreet says a soldier in an army of aggression when converted should quit. He does not do, as he asks me to do,

for he does not give the scripture which says: Thou shalt not serve in an army of aggression. He does not even think that the statement applies here which says abide in the calling wherein the calling ye were called. As we have shown, since Rome's armies were armies of aggression and occupation Stonestreet here forbids that he should use the case of Cornelius, or scriptures written under and of Rome, to prove that Christians were authorized to fight. He is saying that Rom. 13 did not authorize Christians to fight for Rome, for if they fought her they would have to fight in the types of wars she conducted and also they would be fighting for a power which, Stonestreet teaches, was violating its mission. My question does pertain to the issue for it shows that Stonestreet's position is an inconsistent one; that his arguments contradict.

In answer to his question, I would tell the soldier not to engage in acts of violence against the enemy; but to love him; Pray for him; and do good unto him. In this I would be following Christ's example for He told patriotic Jews, who wanted to fight against the Roman aggressor, not to rebel against Caesar, the aggressor. He refused to teach His countrymen to fight to throw off aggression and I endeavor to follow His example.

I do not hold Rome up as the criterion by which to judge all civil governments. I am simply showing him that Rom. 13 embraces even such as Rome, of which he says that "the historic Roman government violated that mission". It was under and of Rome, that every passage in the New Testament which teaches about civil government was written. Whatever it says about civil government it says about Rome as embraced in its reference to civil government. Since Stonestreet does not believe that one should fight today for a government which is like the Roman government, how can he think that those passages in Paul's day taught fighting for governments. If they teach it now they teach it now because they taught it then. And if they teach it now, or taught it then,

they teach it for such governments as Stonestreet says one cannot fight for, as well as governments for which he says one may fight.

Right To Be an Objector

If the Scriptures do not sustain my position I do not have the scriptural right to be one. If they sustain it the right was given to me by God and cannot be taken away by man, although man might make me suffer the consequences.

Matthew 5:38

When scholarship clashes with Scripture we accept Scripture. Although there may have been some perversions of the law referred to, yet in Matt. 5:38 Jesus is referring to the law, and its use, as given to the Jews. He did not hint that this was simply correcting an abuse. Instead he gave an illustration (Matt. 5:38) which shows that even the procedure of civil law, under the Old Testament, was not the level on which His disciples should live.

Obligation of the Affirmative

I have shown that what war requires of the Christian contradicts what Christ's requires. We remind Stonestreet that it was as well-established a custom to fight for one's country in wars of aggression as in wars of defense; and that Jesus refused to send the Jews on a war of defense against the Roman aggressor. It was also a well established custom to kill heretics.

"Motives"

We are to obey governments because they are ordained of God; for wrath's sake; for conscience sake; and for the Lord's sake. But these things, in themselves, do not set the limits of our obedience. All agree that there are limits and

that the limits are where a government would lead us to disobey God. We believe such a limit is reached when the government asks us to war and we believe we have proved it. All of these reasons for obedience were written under and of Rome, a pagan aggressor, that Stonestreet said violated its mission. Furthermore, even slaves were to submit to their masters as unto the Lord (Eph. 6:5-7).

With reference to his question under (2) we have already replied in part in the quotation from Jamieson-Faussett-Brown. Christians could have stronger faith in the providence of God when they realized that even such a non-christian, and anti-christian, power as Rome was still used by God in some way. It would also enable them to be in submission to such a power and not to be rebellious. It enabled them to be conscientious objectors against fighting the very type of power Stonestreet labels "outlaw". It enabled them to understand that they must obey up to the point where a command of the government would interfere with *their mission as a Christian*. To tell Christians of God's use of a pagan dictatorship did not even suggest to them that such was the Christian's mission any more than it suggested that it was right for Christians to be such a dictator. And it would be right for them to be such as was Rome if it was right for them to fulfill Rome's mission. If they could *do* her work they could *be* what she was.

THIRD NEGATIVE

On second Proposition by P. W. Stonestreet Personal and National Enemies

There is no issue over "the type of" personal enemies that the Christian is to love; the issue is over the type of national enemies against whom God sanctions national "vengeance", and whether or not the Christian is a part of that national endeavor when commanded by the government.

Brother Bales' theory assumes that the Christian is to stand aloof from that God-sanctioned endeavor. But the truth is that Christians are the very people to whom that mission of vengeance is revealed and the command to obey is directed. So by *command* the Scriptures teach obedience to that endeavor and by *implication* teach that only the God-sanctioned mission of the civil power marks the limits of that obedience, which is all I am obligated to prove.

The active principle of love is sufficiently flexible to conform to all commands of the New Testament, for: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." (John 14:15.) By one of its negative definitions, we learn that *love* "doth not behave itself unseemly." The "not" and the prefix "un" make a double negative which is equal to the affirmation that, *love behaves itself seemly*. The word "seemly" is defined: "Becoming; fit; suited to the object, occasion, purpose, or character; suitable." (Webster) So the New Testament manifestation of love, according to the sense in which it applies on this point, depends solely on what the Scriptures teach relative to the issue under discussion, not some other issue. Hence, since there is a divinely-sanctioned "occasion" and "purpose" for the use of military force, we may be sure that such sanction and commands comport with scriptural love.

Personal enmity may or may not transgress human rights. If it should, it would be "right" for a Christian to report it to governmental authorities; and if the Christian victim of that enemy were in turn commanded to assist in restraining that one from transgressing human rights, it would also be "right" for the Christian to obey, for that is the God-sanctioned purpose of the civil power. But enmity may be limited to violating God's religious law without violating the wider realm of human rights. This does not mean that the mere observance of the principle of human rights is equal to a passport to heaven; it means only that one who thus obeys that principle has a right to live on earth unmolested. This

paragraph answers Brother Bales' expressed "opinion" as to what I might do under certain circumstances, as if that had anything to do with the issue.

Brother Bales does not properly differentiate between *strategy* and *tactics*. Tactically it is often wise for the defense to assume the offensive, which accounts for the statements he quotes from governmental authorities on that point. When it is plain that a foreign foe means to nullify human rights, then the shortest way possible to defeat that purpose is the right way. When Christians are persecuted by the local government of which they themselves are citizens, then both prudence and the Scriptures teach "submission", which was the very condition that obtained with the early Christians under some circumstances. But the custom of applying that condescending term under circumstances when the government is defending instead of persecuting Christians, is absurd in the extreme. All such kindred terms apply to Christians, *but not under the same circumstances*. The New Testament is applicable to all circumstances of this age, but not all of it applicable to all circumstances. "Handling aright" the word of truth is ever applicable. Basing his statement on a misconception of the facts in general and my position in particular, Brother Bales inquires: "What would this require but that with reference to national enemies the individual give up moral appraisal of his own actions and let his conduct be directed by another individual or individuals in a governmental capacity."

Much in every way. The Christian is divinely taught to "discern good and evil" for practical purposes. If one could not do that it would not be anticipated. Man's free-moral agency serves a practical purpose on earth. It is only by that choice that there is virtue in choosing the right course. If the civil power commands the Christian to fight against human rights, then the Christian is to obey God rather than men, for such a command would be wholly of men. In such a case, the Christian is to passively "submit"

(a fitting word here) to the consequences, whether it means martyrdom or something else. But if the cause is for defense of human rights, one obeys God as well as men. So the Christian's "moral appraisal of his own actions" may be exercised accordingly. Brother Bales' position is the one that voids the Christian's "moral appraisal of his own actions", for it assumes a religious strait-jacket for the Christian concerning a matter that is not even religious.

Brother Bales quotes from "A. S. Croom, Christians and War" as follows: "Now, if God acting through the civil power is taking vengeance, why would not Christians acting through the civil power also be taking vengeance?"

Even so, since, admittedly, it is God's vengeance "through the civil power", why is it not also God's vengeance through Christians in mutual obedience to God and the civil power?

Such opposition to mutual obedience to God and the civil power in the God-sanctioned endeavor to restrict man to that wide though limited realm of freedom, is nothing short of resisting the ordinance of God. The greatest difficulty that Bales and Croom have on the subject is that Romans and 1 Peter are directed to Christians.

John 18:36

On the text cited above, Brother Bales says: "To our former comments on this passage we need only add that the disciples were no more of the world than was His kingdom (John 17:16)."

That statement is a plausible pretext, however unwittingly on the part of my correspondent. While it is true that the *discipleship* of Christ's disciples is "no more of the world than" is His kingdom, yet Christ's *disciples* sustain the same relation to the world *in the righteous sense* that they did before becoming disciples. By *righteous sense* is meant every sense of the several meanings of the word "world" and its derivatives, *except the sinful sense*, which is every sense di-

vinely sanctioned. Moreover, the basis of discipleship in Christ's spiritual kingdom is exclusively that of revelation of the Spirit of God, while the basis of Christ's disciples themselves is both God and man. Hence, they are obligated to service in both realms of God within the limits of God's righteousness. In this life, the habitat of disciples is on earth; and as they are recipients of the benefits accruing therefrom, they are even on the score of God's law of compensation, obligated to service in that realm to the extent of its divine sanction.

True, the term "disciple of Christ" does not include the *nation*, yet the term "nation" or its equivalent, does include Christ's disciples and everybody else in it. Consequently, while the individual, as such, can refrain from punishing evil-doers of the class referred to in Romans 13:4; 1 Pet. 2:14 without violating that one's mission, yet the nation, as such, cannot refrain from punishing that class of evil-doers without violating its mission. It therefore devolves upon my correspondent to cite the Scriptures which show that the individual ceases to be a part of the citizenry of the nation on becoming a Christian. This he has utterly failed to do.

The Nation and the Church

Contrary to Brother Bales' hypothetical reasoning, if every person of the nation were a Christian it would not follow that the nation and the church would be co-extensive in every sense. It would still be true that the church and the nation have their respective missions; it would still be true that it is the civil government's mission to defend human rights on earth; it would still be true that preaching the gospel has been committed to faithful men of the church. To deny that faithful men can scripturally serve as a part of the citizenry of the civil power is to deny their citizenship, affirmed by Paul, and reflect on the righteousness of God in

the sanction of its mission, *even advising Christians of that sanction.*

Hence, let it be resounded around the globe "for kings and all that are in high place" that while Christianity teaches Christians to pray for all such authorities that international peace may prevail, *yet it is plainly implied that such peace is contingent upon the action of such men in high station.* Therefore, if such men in high station violate the principle of human rights, divinely bestowed and humanly defended, and should extend that violation beyond their national borders, there is not only nothing in Christianity to restrict the Christian element of other nations from resisting it through the civil power with all the military might that human ingenuity has provided, but Christians are even under an inspired command to obey the civil power and the only logical and scriptural limits to such obedience is the divinely sanctioned mission of that power. Assuredly, in the light of God's revelation, Christians, at the command of the civil power, are just as much in obedience to God in the use of force against that particular form of evil as they are in preaching the gospel against all forms of evil. It is only necessary for **them** to identify that form of evil with the evil referred to in Romans 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14.

Referring to himself and to me, Brother Bales says: "I no more array command against command, to Christians, when I maintain that they must not fight than he does when he maintains that the kingdom of heaven must not fight."

His fallacy on that point is that, while the kingdom of heaven and the kingdoms of this world are of wholly different natures, yet the Christian sustains a relation to both by inspired command. Of course the Scriptures do not place the Christian in any particular rank of military service, but they place one in the service and the government places one in the rank. If, perchance, one is persecuted by the government of which one is a citizen, then it is both scriptural and prudent to "submit", with all that word implies; but if a foreign foe

attempts that persecution in violation of human rights, and the Christian is commanded by his own government to assist in defeating such evil, then he is scripturally obligated to "obey". In both cases the Christian complies with the Scriptures; passively under "submit"; positively under "obey". True, the human element of all government is fallible, yet authority for government is placed in three institutions; viz., the spiritual kingdom, the home, and the civil government; and, as divinely ordained, there is no conflict between them.

Assumed Authority Versus Governmental Authority

Under "ordinance of man" it appears that Brother Bales misunderstood my statement, so I try it over. Except by governmental command or approval, the individual has no right to resist evil by force. Only through civil government are human rights to be preserved by force. To act in that matter without authority is lawlessness; to act with authority is lawful, which is the difference between sin and righteousness. The government is composed of men *in authority* and men *under authority*. Both inhere in "the powers that be." The Christian is, therefore, just as much a part of the citizenry of government as the non-Christian and Christianity does not exempt him from sharing its responsibilities, including the defense of human rights when necessary, except as conscience may strangely protest.

Romans 12:19

On my comment under the next cited above, Brother Bates inquires: "Wherein is there authority for acting from one standard when doing something on our behalf but from an opposite one when doing something for another?"

His question involves only the point of authority which I have been emphasizing and which he has seemingly ignored. Of course when Christians are commanded by God's "min-

ister" (the government) to avenge the government when human rights are involved, then in that broad sense, since Christians are a part of that body-politic, benefits accrue to them in the same way as if they were not Christians. For a fuller comment under this text, see my second negative under this proposition.

Fighting in an Army of Aggression

Referring to my statement that a soldier should not fight in an army of aggression in disregard of human rights, Brother Bales comments: "He does not give the Scripture which says: Thou shalt not serve in an army of aggression."

I am glad to accommodate him, for the Scriptures say by implication that very thing. Punishing evil-doers for violating human rights is the only punishment by civil government that is divinely sanctioned for this age; and hence, it is the only punishment that citizens of the government can scripturally engage in at the command of the government. (See Romans 13:1-7; 1 Peter 2:13,14.) Punishment for all other forms of evil is deferred, as far as humanity is concerned, till the coming of the Lord (See 2 Thess. 1:7,8.) We may know beyond all doubt that these passages refer to different forms of evil because one is and the other is not to be punished by the government. Thus, the Scriptures are cited which plainly imply the very point of his criticism. Since human rights are involved in the evils of international aggression and God sanctions punishment for that form of evil, I ask my correspondent to explain how God could sanction the services of a soldier in committing the very form of evil that He sanctions fighting against? This is to be explained from the standpoint of God's ordination of the powers that be during this Christian age, not some previous age. Brother Bales' theory assumes that God deals with "the powers that be" in this age as they were dealt with during the age of the one chosen nation (Israel). There is not a vestige

of evidence for the assumption in the New Testament. This amply provides for the "moral appraisal" of one's own action in obedience.

In the first negative under this second proposition, I said: "many of the young men in military service are not there by choice, but by a high sense of duty", not meaning that they were not in service by choice under man's free-moral agency, but that they were not in military service by choice of circumstances calling for their service. Evidently Brother Bales missed the point, for he denies the truth of the statement.

I Timothy 2: 1, 2

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—"that we may lead a quiet peaceable life in all godliness and honesty" (A. V.); "in order that we may live peaceful and tranquil lives with all godliness and gravity." (Modern Speech by Weymouth).

Thus, according to the design of that prayer, if there were nothing else in the New Testament on the subject, in the light of the well-established custom of fighting for human rights, it would establish by implication the proof for the negative under this, the second proposition. Manifestly, the design of that prayer is conditioned upon the action of "kings and all that are in high place" rather than the Christian's peaceful life in a personal capacity. This shows conclusively that the peaceful life mentioned in this text is *national* instead of *personal*, for all the men in high station of the world have nothing to do with personal peace as taught in the sermon on the mount.

Moreover, while national peace is desirable, it is nevertheless made contingent upon "kings and all that are in high place." Notice the plural form. This shows that not only

leaders of the government of which the Christian is a citizen are embraced, but foreign leaders as well; any one who may attempt to thwart the free-moral agency of mankind and thereby break the Christian's national peace. But according to Brother Bales' theory, all the men in high station of the world could not thwart the Christian's peaceful life, for he is not to fight at all for a national cause, however righteous. So while many are not in military service by choice of circumstances that conspire to call for their service, they are thereby choosing to obey the government in its noble effort to preserve human rights, thus rendering mutual obedience to God and His ordained "minister" in the civil realm.

Let us therefore distinguish between obedience in a personal capacity and obedience in a national capacity, thereby observing the whole counsel of God. In a personal capacity the individual Christian may practice the teaching of the sermon on the mount, whether anybody else practices those principles or not, without violating his personal mission. But not so with a nation. A nation cannot practice those principles, regardless of what other nations do, without violating its mission, for its mission is to defend human rights, whether they are assailed by a domestic or a foreign foe. By a proper division of the word of truth, we may know this is the scriptural idea, for the evils of mankind that are not corrected by the persuasive pleas of the gospel and are not deferred till the coming of the Lord in accordance with 2 Thess. 1:7,8, are to be dealt with by the civil government with the use of force when necessary. Hence, so surely as the Christian is a part of the citizenry elements of the government, and the Christian is just that, so surely is that one a part of that force at the command of the government for that righteous cause. Thus by the teaching of the Scriptures, the Christian is "furnished completely unto every good work." Not only is performing its divinely-sanctioned mission a good work of the civil power, but it is even good for the Christian. (See Romans 13:4.)

BALES' FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

My first affirmative clarified the issue and emphasized that *the issue* was concerning the conduct of *Christians* and not of worldly kingdoms. The Bible distinguishes between the Christian on the one hand and the worldly kingdom under which they live on the other hand. The two were also distinguished in fact in that when Paul wrote pagans, not Christians, constituted and controlled governments. A fundamental error which runs through Stonestreet's writing is that the Christian is commanded to do what God does through civil powers. Their mission is no more our mission than our mission is their mission. We have no more of a command for Christians to carry the sword than governments have to preach the gospel. In my arguments I am showing what the Bible says that Christians are to do, while Stonestreet is talking about what the Bible says about the world and worldly governments. I apply to Christians what the Bible applies and he tries to apply to Christians what the Bible applies to the world. But what the Bible affirms of kingdoms of the world it does not affirm of Christians. Stonestreet does not rightly divide and apply the Word and thus he places a sword in Christian hands.

Stonestreet may not see that the question of killing involves a question that is religious, but that does not change facts. This matter is connected with religion for it is a question of *Christian* conduct and our religion either regulates our conduct or it is void. On his assumption this matter would seemingly be placed entirely outside of Christianity; well, to say the least, such conduct as war demands is not Christian, and thus it is outside the realm of Christian conduct. And Christians should not engage in conduct that is not Christian.

In denying that Christians are to carry the sword, the affirmative has not denied one single thing that the Bible teaches concerning civil government. We accept all that it

says about that matter, but we refuse to apply to Christians anything in that teaching which God has applied only to worldly governments.

How Stonestreet Argues

First, he maintains that the Christian love of enemies, as set forth in Matt. 5:38-48; Rom. 12:14-21; 13:8-10; does not apply to anyone to whom a worldly government does not apply it. This sounds harsh, but it is implied in his arguments. Those whom the worldly governments declare to be enemies of society, and evildoers who should be put to death, are to be approached by Christians not with love but with the sword. At times it seems that he would apply Christian love to personal enemies and persecutors of the church, but in fact he would not do that for with the permission of the government he would use the sword on them also. Christian love is all right, it is practical, until things get rough enough to endanger your property or life!! Thus did not Stephen (Acts 7:60). Nor did the apostles teach it (1 Pet. 2:20-23). Since the New Testament makes no such limitation of Christian love we must not so define or practice it. From 1 Cor. 13 we know what Christian love does and anything which would call on us to act otherwise cannot change the meaning of or harmonize with that love. The Scriptures teach us to love and to do good to the very type of men Stonestreet thinks that we can slay.

Second, Stonestreet sets up a number of double standards. Here are some of them: (a) It is right to fight dictators in governments, but not to kill any that might arise in the government under which you live. You must submit to them, but oppose those in other countries with the sword. (b) One's personal conduct toward personal enemies is different from one's personal conduct toward national enemies. In our personal, Christian capacity we are to follow the sermon on the mount, but in our personal capacity and national

Christian
love

Double
standards

conduct we must not follow it *for it would be sinful to do so*. In other words, we must violate our mission as a Christian in order not to violate our (?) mission in civil government. (c) As Christians we must follow the Golden Rule, but as citizens we may follow the Iron Rule. (d) One standard for war, another for peace. In war one may cast aside every humane, benevolent principle with reference to the enemy. "The shortest way possible" to defeat the enemy "is the right way". Atomize an entire nation if necessary. No holds barred if it will help defeat the enemy. There, in its utter disregard of all moral principles with reference to the enemy, is the position Stonestreet holds. To clearly state his position should be a refutation of it to the informed Christian.

Third, Stonestreet contradicts himself. (a) He asks for a command that "Thou shalt not fight in a defensive war;" but thinks it wrong to ask for a command that "Thou shalt not engage in a war of aggression"—even if that war of aggression is against an evildoer within another country who is persecuting only his own people. (b) He said that soldiers in the New Testament were not told to leave the army. Then he states that it is wrong to engage in a war of aggression. Then he admits that Rome was violating her mission and that she engaged in wars of conquest. Then he tries to prove that the Scriptures Paul wrote, and when he wrote them, prove that it is right for Christians to fight. So on his own position these soldiers in New Testament times should have been told to leave such armies. However, when we recall his argument that they were not told to leave the army in New Testament days, we could show by his logic that it was right to be in armies of aggression and of occupation, which held down conquered territory, for such armies were Rome's. Stonestreet did not, he cannot, adequately deal with my proof that his position would force Christians in Paul's day to fight in such wars as Stonestreet himself does not believe one should fight in. But if he is right it does jus-

tify such; but since he denies that it is right to fight in such wars he should realize that the New Testament does not teach that we should fight today. For if it teaches fighting now, it teaches it now because it taught it then, and if it taught it then it taught it for just such wars as he repudites. (c) Stonestreet does not believe that the church should go to war as a kingdom fighting for itself or others. But he believes that Romans 13 teaches Christians to carry the sword for themselves and for the government at its command. Since whatever Romans 13 teaches the individual Christian it teaches the kingdom of heaven, if it teaches the Christian to do the above it teaches the church that it is necessary, at the government's command, to carry the sword on its own behalf and on that of the government against evildoers. (d) He admits that it would not be right for Christians to be a dictator like Nero, but he argues from Rom. 13 that it would be right to fight for a dictatorship like Nero's. Rom. 13 was written under his dictatorship and whatever it affirms of any government it affirms of Nero's. (f) Stonestreet believes that evildoers who threaten life, property, and liberty should have the sword used on them. But when I point out that false religious teachers threaten these things he denies that they should be put to death. He thinks that such forms of evil as are mentioned in 2 Thess. 1:7, 8 should not be punished now, but at the judgement. However, I have shown him that the sins which he says should be punished now will be punished at the judgement. Therefore, on his theory, they should not be punished now. Furthermore, the evildoers in 2 Thess. 1:7,8 were the very type that his position says should be punished. These evildoers were persecuting, causing tribulations, troubling or afflicting, Christians (2 Thess. 1:4, 5-7). This is endangering, life, property, and liberty. Yet Stonestreet contradicts himself and says that we should not use the sword on them. (g) In Rom. 12 and 13 Stonestreet says that we should take God's vengeance on evildoers, but that God's vengeance in 2 Thess. 1:8 we should not take. If

we took vengeance in these matters it would be as much God's vengeance as in Rom. 13; and in Rom. 13 he says we are to take God's vengeance.

Fourth, Stonestreet contradicts the Bible. (a) He contradicts its teaching on love of enemies, by saying that we must use the sword on personal, religious, and national enemies, when they endanger our lives and we are authorized by the government to do it. (b) He contradicts Rom. 12 and 13. The very passage in which he tries to find authority for Christians to kill is sandwiched in between two passages which plainly tell Christians not to kill. "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves. . . . Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him:Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: . . .Thou shalt not kill. . .Love worketh no ill to his neighbour" (Rom. 12:19-13:10). (c) Peter said to suffer for well doing, take it patiently, follow Christ's example in suffering (1 Peter. 2:20-23). Stonestreet says fight against those who would make you suffer for well doing, when authorized by the government. The limit of your Christian forbearance is to be determined by a worldly government. (d) Paul said that God expressly forbids Christians to take vengeance, and that he works through worldly governments in such matters (Rom. 12:19). Stonestreet expressly says that God works through Christians and governments and that Christians are to take God's vengeance. (e) Stonestreet's teaching about going to war violates the teaching of the Commission about going to all the world with the gospel, not with a sword. (f) Stonestreet said that Rome violated her mission, and thus he would maintain that she was an outlaw power. Paul said that Rome was ordained of God. Stonestreet said that certain world powers in this age were not of God; Paul said that there is no power but of God, that the powers that *exist* are ordained of God.

Fifth, Stonestreet's formulation of "God's law of compensation" sends us to war because a person benefits if he

*Contradicts
Bible*

lives under a benevolent government. Why, then, would not that same law teach Christians to rebel against, and fight, a government under which they lived if they received evil from it. This Stonestreet will not allow. We can fight against evil in Hitler's government, if we are not citizens under his government, but not if we are citizens. Others could fight for you and free you, but you could not "compensate" them, while they were fighting for you, by being a collaborator and fighting against your government from within. So he rules out his "law of compensation". His position even teaches that Christians in this country should not have fought in the Revolutionary war against England. Would he apply this "law of compensation" to the church? He must to be consistent. So since the church receives benefits from a benevolent government; and since Christians in another country, who were persecuted by their government would benefit by the benevolent government fighting against their government; then why would not the law of compensation compel the kingdom of heaven all over the world to fight for that benevolent government? Then, too, millions of Germans received better things from Hitler than from the United Nations. Does the law of compensation mean that they owed war service to Hitler? We do not justify Hitler. He was wrong. But we are exposing Stonestreet's use of the law of compensation. Christians give ample compensation for any benefits received. They make a contribution to society which far passes that which can be made with the sword. We are salt and light. Our righteousness helps exalt the country and as salt we help preserve it from total corruption and from God's wrath. The world is far more indebted to us than we are to it. We shall serve it, but through Christian means.

Sixth, as for Christians being authorized to fight because, in some sense civil powers have a divine mission, we have adequately dealt with that in such places as my second negative, point II; third negative, point II; and in the second

affirmative. Shall we cause the Jew's to suffer tribulation because God sends them such for their sins, as Moses prophesied would happen (Deut. 28). Stonestreet's logic says, Yes.

Seventh, Stonestreet argues from the standards of citizenship which are set up by the world that Christians should fight. Instead of judging Christian conduct from what the world expects, he should judge the demands of the world from the standard of what God commands *the Christian*. God has not required the use of the sword by the Christian, he has forbidden it, and therefore men cannot require it of Christians. Our mission as Christians sets the limits of our obedience. We have already proved that the Bible does not command obedience to governments, by Christians, on the basis of citizenship. Whether slaves, subjects or citizens we are to submit. We must submit as strangers and sojourners to a country through which they are passing (1 Pet.2:11).

Eighth, with reference to his question, asked near the close of his last paper, we ask him one: How could Paul say Rome was ordained of God when she was a pagan dictatorship engaged in wars of aggression and suppression? How could Isaiah say Assyria was his servant when Assyria had in her heart only to destroy and plunder (Isa. 10:5-12)? How could Christ's crucifixion by lawless men (Acts 2:23), be said to be God fulfilling prophecy? (Acts 3:18)? With reference to the soldier about whom Stonestreet asks, I can only conclude that God may use evil men, as He did Assyria, to punish other evildoers, and to chastise His children. How was Hitler of God? I don't know, but as long as that government *existed* it was (Rom. 13:1).

Ninth, I have already dealt with 1 Tim. 2 (Consult the index for the references). This passage has no hint of international peace, but the context and the period of time when it was written would indicate that it was peace within the country from persecution by the government. Through persecuting us a government may thwart our personal peace.

Tenth, Stonestreet's use of the term "submit" has been dealt with (Second negative, point III; third negative; point III).

Eleventh, Stonestreet is a conscientious objector against fighting against one's own government if it becomes tyrannic and persecutes its citizens who are Christians or otherwise in disfavor. *If* his arguments about protecting life, liberty, property, families, etc., overthrow my conscientious objection they also overthrow his. They certainly do not overthrow my position.

Twelfth, Stonestreet's position would have forced Christians who were Jews to fight for Rome against their own countrymen in the "Jewish wars". They would have had to fight to help keep their own countrymen in subjection and to sustain the government which persecuted their own brethren in Christ.

We have not run out of scriptural objections to Stonestreet's unscriptural position, but space demands that we now summarize our affirmative arguments. Suffice it to say, with reference to his position, that the Bible evidently teaches some kind of non-resistance, and yet in actual practice Stonestreet's position leaves little or no such doctrine in the New Testament.

Summary of the Affirmative Arguments

Argument I: War is contrary to the Great Commission. Christians are commanded to preach the gospel—by word and deed—to every creature in all nations. War commands Christians to destroy men of certain nations. Therefore, war is contrary to Christ's command to the Christian. We must obey Christ rather than man.

Argument II: The nature of the kingdom of heaven is contrary to the nature of carnal war (Isa. 2:2-4; John 18:36). When we are born again we partake of the nature of the

kingdom of heaven. Therefore, since its nature is our nature war is contrary to our nature.

Argument III: Christians are objects of mercy. Even while we were ungodly, enemies, Christ died for us. We live under mercy and we must give mercy (Matt. 5:38-48; 6:14-15; 18:23-34; Rom. 12:14,17-21; Jas. 2:13). War is not fought on the basis of extending mercy to the enemy. Therefore, Christians must not war.

Argument IV: Christians must follow the golden rule (Matt. 7:12). War is not fought on that basis but it does unto the enemy what the enemy has done, or intends to do, to you. It tries to outdo him. Therefore, Christians must not war.

Argument V: Christian love works ill to no man and it embraces friend and foe (Rom. 13:8, 10; Matt. 5:43-48). It has no room for the violence and hate of war (1 Cor. 13).

Argument VI: Christians are not to return evil for evil (Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15). War endeavors to visit on the enemy what he has tried to visit on you.

Argument VII: The christian attitude toward enemies demands that we love, bless, do good unto, and pray for them (Matt. 5:38-48; Lk. 6:33). It is supremely illustrated in Christ's prayer for the enemies for whom he died and at whose hands He died (Lk. 23:34; Rom. 5:8, 10; Compare Acts 7:60). This is not the attitude of war.

Argument VIII: The spirit of christ and the spirit of war cannot be reconciled. War is not characterized, with reference to the enemy while the war is on, by mercy, forgiveness, dying for enemies, returning good for evil, spiritual weapons, redemptive love, and a lack of the spirit of vengeance. The characterization of the most noble Christian and of the most efficient and deadly fighting man, as described by military officials, are not compatible. Draw up a list of each and test this for yourselves.

Argument IX: The example of Christ, in his treatment of enemies while on earth, is an example for us that He did

not kill his personal enemies or that national enemies who held his homeland in subjection (Rom. 5:6,8,10; 1 Pet. 2:19-23).

Argument X: War seeks to destroy the enemy. Of this spirit Jesus 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. 9:55,56).

Argument XI: Vengeance is left by Christians to God (Rom. 12:19). Instead of vengeance the Christian does good to the enemy (Rom. 12:19-21). The sword seeks vengeance against the evildoer. Therefore for Christians to carry the sword would be to take vengeance and this we are told to leave to God. When Paul said that God takes vengeance and that we leave it to Him and whatever agencies He selects, Paul was not describing to Christians the manner in which Christians are to take vengeance. Instead, he forbade it. Stonestreet endeavors to show how Christians are to take vengeance. He thus endeavors to prove that it is right for us to do what Paul said for us not to do.

Argument XII: The weapons of our warfare are not carnal (2 Cor. 10:3-4). Those of the worldly wars are carnal. Therefore their war is not ours and their weapons are not ours. Therefore we cannot fight with their weapons.

Argument XIII: Christ commanded a sword, which was drawn in a righteous cause against an evil aggressor, to be put up and He said that those who take the sword shall perish by it. Can we draw that which Christ said to put up and do what He said perishes?

Argument XIV: Brotherly love must continue (Heb. 13:1), and this includes brethren in the enemy countries. The body of Christ should not destroy itself. War calls on Christians to destroy, if the country commands it and "military necessity" calls for it, their own brethren whom Christ has redeemed.

Argument XV: Christians must make personal decisions concerning moral actions. War asks one to become an auto-

maton and leave moral decisions, with reference to destroying both the innocent and the guilty: and with reference to deceiving others; to other men who often do not profess to be Christians and who, at any rate, are not members of the church of Christ. Christians must not thus turn over the direction of their conduct to men of the world, men who are not guided by the full teaching of the New Testament, although they may be good men in many respects.

We have borne no malice toward anyone in this discussion. We have not denied the sincerity, devotion, and sacrifice of soldiers for what they believe is right. Our supplication to God is for them for we bear them witness that they have zeal but it is not according to knowledge. Christians must think seriously and scripturally on this, as on all questions. The conclusion deeply affects our conduct. The issue, stated in terms of conduct is: bayonet, bomb, starve, burn, cripple, kill men, women, children, infants, aged, innocent and guilty, as long as and in as many places as the government, which is at war, commands you to do so. This is true even in a defensive war. Stonestreet contends for this conduct in defensive wars. The scriptural contention, with reference to conduct is that, regardless of the suffering which Christians have to endure they must not inflict the above on others. They must love, pray for, bless, do good to, and even minister to the needs, for food and drink, as we have opportunity of the very kind of enemy the civil powers bear the sword against (Rom. 12:17-21; etc). Brethren, THE WEAPONS OF OUR WARFARE ARE NOT CARNAL BUT THEY ARE MIGHTY THROUGH GOD.

FOURTH NEGATIVE

By P. W. Stonestreet

In his final affirmative on our second proposition, Brother Bales continues to assume that the Scriptures sanction

two standards of the moral law—one for the Christian and the other for the non-Christian. The only thing wrong with it is that it is false.

From the beginning, transcending all dispensational lines, there has existed a unilateral covenant between God and man touching moral principles. In such a one-sided covenant, without a formal agreement on the part of man to comply with its conditions, man has nevertheless been divinely warned of the consequences of failing to comply with that law.

That unilateral covenant is distinguished from dispensational covenants that are mutual between God and man only in the sense that man, in effect, agrees to abide by the conditions of the religious or dispensational covenant. But this religious or mutual covenant not only does not nullify the conditions of the unilateral-moral covenant, but it actually inculcates it. Hence, everything that was fundamentally essential to morality (human rights) before the advent of Christianity, is fundamentally essential to morality now and will ever be until all peoples of earth who are not Christians abide by God's unilateral—moral covenant to them and those who are Christians abide the mutual or Christian covenant between God and Christians. Manifestly that happy day has not yet dawned. Whether such a time will ever come, is not under discussion.

Thus, not a single principle that is exclusively moral, whether fundamental or statutory, is nullified by Christianity. But upon Brother Bales' assumption that a Christian cannot obey the civil government in performing its divinely-sanctioned mission in the use of the sword in defense of moral principles (human rights), then all that is fundamental to the defense of human rights by civil government is lost, as far as Christian cooperation is concerned, which also involves a clash between these two God-ordained, realms. Verily, God's realms are not thus antagonistic—are not divided against themselves. So Brother Bales' theory is of human origin.

Brother Bales' assumption is analogous to sectarianism. Denominationalism, in its teaching and practice, assumes that God has a plurality of religious laws. That assumption is an egregious error. But it is no less erroneous than is Brother Bales' assumption that God has two standards of morality, one for the Christian and the other for the non-Christian. Brother Bales is just as much in error on the moral-law assumption as denominationalism is on the religious-law assumption. The truth is God's moral law is precisely the same in Japan and Germany as it is in the United States—precisely the same for the Christian that it is for the non-Christian.

Misconstructions by Bales

First, Brother Bales alleges that I maintain "that the Christian love of enemies, as set forth in Matt. 5: 38-48; Rom. 12: 14-21: 13-8-10; does not apply to any one to whom worldly government does not apply it." On the contrary, in accord with the distinction that the Scriptures make between *individual* and *collective* action, I specifically said; "The active principle of love is sufficiently flexible to conform to all commands of the New Testament, for: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." (John 14:15.) Some of these commandments relate to the Christian's attitude toward individuals in an individual capacity; others relate to the Christian's attitude toward the civil government in a national capacity. God has not sanctioned the literal sword for the Christian to use in an individual capacity, but God sanctions such force by the civil government and commands Christians to obey it. Thus love for humanity is manifested in two ways; viz., in its national sense in mutual obedience to God and the civil government, and in its individual capacity in obedience to God only. The different manifestations of love are due to different circumstances and also to the difference in the respective missions of one in

an individual capacity and the same one in a national capacity. Under some circumstances, love makes it advisable to amputate one or more members of the body of a sick patient in order to save the life of that one. The circumstances are unfortunate, but the operation is justified under the circumstances. Precisely the same principle is true concerning the body-politic of earth. In order to save its life, the God-sanctioned law of force provides for amputating some of its members, that the body-politic may survive. The circumstances are unfortunate, but the operation is justified under the circumstances. Both manifestations of love are based on inspired commands to Christians; both apply to Christians who have not renounced citizenship in earthly government, thereby severing themselves from the citizenry element of the government.

We welcome the ideal state when every nation on the globe will practically adopt the principles of the sermon on the mount; but till that utopian state exists internationally, no nation can dispense with force, when it is necessary to use it, without violating its divinely-sanctioned mission. Not so with the individual *in an individual capacity*, for one's individual mission does not call for force, but only in a national capacity in mutual obedience to God and the civil government. So Brother Bales may be assured that Christian *love* is absolutely safe under all the commands of God for this age, for God is *love*, whether his commands relate to one realm or the other.

Second. Under this heading Brother Bales is leading the witness in attempting to state what I said about dictators at home or abroad. Otherwise he could have just quoted verbatim what I said. Referring to the principles taught by Christ for individual practice, I said among other things: "A nation cannot practice those principles, regardless of what other nations do, without violating its mission, for its mission is to defend human rights, whether they are assailed by a domestic or a foreign foe." I now add: In case two opposing

governments arise in a country where there had formerly been but one, we may make choice in the light of the facts and righteousness, especially since Inspiration does not stipulate one to the exclusion of the other.

In his claim that I advocate two standards of morality, he simply fails to differentiate between the *practice* of human rights on the one hand, and the *defense* of human rights on the other; he fails to distinguish between "Whoso sheddeth man's blood" (the violation of human rights), with "by man shall his blood be shed" (the defense of human rights.)

What Brother Bales says in his *third* and *fourth* paragraphs of his misconstructions, I skip, because they have been very definitely covered previously.

Fifth. Brother Bales claims that my "formulation of 'God's law of compensation' sends us to war because a person benefits if he lives under a benevolent government. Why, then, would not that same law teach Christians to rebel against, and fight, a government under which they live if they received evil from it?"

From a purely human point of view, aside from God's command's which is obviously Brother Bales' view, his implied answer to his question is plausible. But it so happens that God *commands* obedience to, but *forbids* rebellion against, the government. If his theory did not ignore the difference between obedience and rebellion, my explanation would be plain to him; for he has an alert mind, except as blinded by human tradition.

Sixth. "Shall we cause the Jews to suffer tribulation because God sends them such for their sins, as Moses prophesied would happen (Deut. 28)?" (Bales)

No. Only as they may transgress human rights are the Jews to be restrained or punished, just as Gentiles are dealt with; and even then the official element, and not the citizenry element, of the civil government is to take the initiative. Humanity fulfills its mission, while God fulfills prophecy.

Seventh. Brother Bales alleges that I argue "from the standards of citizenship which are set up by the world that Christians should fight." He is much mistaken. I argue that point from the standards of truth and fact. But even the world is right in everything that pertains to the world, except the sinful and erroneous senses. If Brother Bales had another chapter in this discussion, I would ask him how he can conceive of a government without the citizenry element? Also, how he became obsessed with the idea that a Christian, who has not renounced citizenship in a worldly government, is not a component part of that government, especially its citizenry element? We are familiar with the fact that the words "citizen" and "citizenship" have been spiritualized, but that fact does not preclude their continued literal meanings and applications. Innumerable other words, too, have been spiritualized but their literal meanings continue to apply to Christians. Prominent among them is the word "family," surely my correspondent would not deny that that word in its fleshly sense applies to the Christian with all of its ancient sentiments. We should therefore reason the same way on all the terms that have been spiritualized and have a bearing on our discussion.

Eighth. "How could Paul say Rome was ordained of God when she was a pagan dictatorship engaged in wars of aggression and suppression?" (Bales) In the same sense that Paul could say that "rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil." The text and context show plainly that such "powers that be" are ordained of God "for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well." (1 Peter 2:14.) *Paul does not say that the personnel of government will always do what the government is ordained to do.* Neither does Paul say that the human personnel of the spiritual government (the church) will always do what the church is ordained to do; but on the contrary, warns that "the mystery of lawlessness doth already work."

So since the church is also ordained of God for its mission, and its human personnel could depart so far from its mission, we should not think strange that the personnel of civil government, which is also ordained of God, should depart so far from its mission, especially since the personnel of civil government is in only unilateral-covenant relationship with God, while the human personnel of the church is in mutual-covenant relationship with God, by which is meant that the human personnel of the church has made a pledge, either expressed or implied. So "kings and all that are in high place," however irreligious some may be, are in unilateral-covenant relationship with God, and may they heed its solemn warning! Of course the unilateral-covenant relationship pertains only to moral principles; and in their official capacity pertains only to that aspect of morality that pertains to human rights, which marks the limits of the governments mission as far as the moral law is concerned. Skeptics and some historians refer to the departures from christianity as Christianity itself, while the theory of Brother Bales, however unwittingly on his part, assumes that the departures of the personnel of civil government are in harmony with its New Testament-sanctioned mission. In both cases the divine mission is confused with human departures.

Ninth. Brother Bales says he has "already dealt with I Tim. 2.-(Consult the index for reference)." Yes, he "dealt with it"; and the reader may decide whether a prayer "for kings and all that are in high place" that we may lead peaceful lives refers to both national and international peace-whether such peaceful lives are made contingent upon the action kings, etc.

Tenth. He refers to my use of the word "submit" as also previously "dealt" with. But its inherent meaning remains the same, that it has a circumstantial meaning in expressing the Christian's attitude toward civil government.

Eleventh. He claims I am also a "conscience objector against fighting against one's own government if it becomes

tyrannic and persecutes its citizens who are Christians or otherwise in disfavor." Granted, with one reservation, that Christians can still fight with the sword of the Spirit. That was exactly the circumstances existing when the word "submit" was emphasized by Inspiration to the early Christians. But the idea that the word also applies when the government is trying to protect Christians is absurd in the extreme; as much so as praying for the kingdom to come after it has come. Thus the New testament was written for all circumstances, *but not all of it applies under the same circumstances.* How slow some have been in observing that important truth, especially concerning the word "submit."

But he adds: "*If his argument about protecting life, liberty, property, families, etc., overthrows my conscientious objection, they also overthrow his.*" Here he is in error. He fails to observe that he objects to mutual obedience to God and the government concerning fighting, while I object only to acting without being thus commanded.

Twelfth. He alleges that my "position would have forced Christians who were Jews to fight for Rome against their own countrymen in the 'Jewish wars'. Only if Rome's fight was in harmony with the government's divinely-sanctioned mission.

Summary of Affirmative Arguments Reviewed

Argument I: "War is contrary to the Great commission." Behold how indiscriminately he uses the word "war." It takes two sides to make war. I am defending only one side, the side that is in accord with the government's divinely-sanctioned mission. The right side is not contrary to the great commission, for it defends human rights under which it is preached. By the illogical and indiscriminate use of a word, one could say that religious division, too, is contrary to the Great commission. Yet religious people who emphasize the great commission are parties to religious division. But

the scriptural side to religious division is right, just as the scriptural side to war is right. If Brother Bales can determine the scriptural side of religious division, why can he not in the same way determine the divinely-sanctioned side to military force?

Argument II: "The nature of the kingdom of heaven is contrary to the nature of carnal war." In the same sense the nature of the kingdom of heaven is contrary to religious divisions. "Let there be no divisions among you", etc. Yet under some circumstances, division is commanded. (Romans 16:17.)

Argument III: "Christians are objects of mercy." But we have already pointed out that in God's civil-government realm, mercy must not defeat justice, but only temper it.

Argument IV: "Christians must follow the golden rule." Yes, in an individual capacity, but they must not nullify the civil rule under which they are protected on earth, for they belong to the citizenry element of that rule. Be assured this rule is safe under the commands of the New Testament, for that rule and the commands concerning the civil government are by the same author.

Argument V: "Christian love works ill to no man." No not in an *individual capacity*, as it is divinely applied. Neither does the God-sanctioned civil mission work ill to civilization, as it is divinely applied.

Argument VI: "Christians are not to return evil for evil but good for evil." Certainly, in an individual capacity, Christians are not vested with authority to act otherwise. Yet in a national capacity, at the command of the government they are to defend human rights, under which they are permitted to teach and practice such exclusively-Christian principles.

Argument VII: "The Christian attitude toward enemies demand that we love, do good unto, and pray for them." Yes, in an individual capacity. But when the enmity of enemies partakes of an evil that vitally concerns the public,

Christianity does not require that the Christian unwisely attempt to make one's individual attitude the public attitude toward that evil, nor can the Christian escape the responsibility of being a part of the public. Thus Brother Bales confuses God's two realms, one of which provides a degree of safety on earth and the other provides for the salvation of the soul in the world to come.

Argument VIII: "The spirit of Christ and the spirit of war cannot be reconciled." Again he uses the word "war" indiscriminately. Please see my reply to argument 1.

IX: "The example of Christ, in his treatment of enemies while on earth, is an example for us that He did not kill his personal enemies who held his homeland in subjection (Romans 5:6, 8,10; 1 Peter 2:19-23.)" Neither does that example set by Christ justify Brother Bales to attack his national enemies in a mere personal capacity, but only in a national capacity at the command of God's civil "minister." I have been trying to get him to see that point of authority for weeks.

Argument X. "War seeks to destroy the enemy. Of this spirit Jesus 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.'"

True. But Christ did not come to save men's lives unconditionally, either spiritually or physically. So Brother Bales' theory of saving physical lives unconditionally is exactly parallel to the religious error of saving souls unconditionally.

Argument XI: "Vengeance is left by Christians to God." Yes, but vengeance is left to God in the same sense that being saved by God's mercy is left to God, not unconditionally in either case. (See my fuller comment on this point in my third negative chapter.)

Argument XII: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal." Granted. The weapons of spiritual warfare are not carnal. Neither are the weapons of carnal warfare spiritual

or figurative, but literal. But spiritualizing the terms "warfare" and "weapons" does not cancel their material sense, nor condemn their carnal use to accomplish their God-sanction earthly purpose. Only the Christian's warfare in an individual capacity for mere personal ends in the moral realm is spiritualized. Since earthly conditions, where Christians live, are not spiritualized, it is preposterous to assume that Christ's teaching for the spiritual realm is all that he sanctions for coping collectively with the unspiritual conditions of earth. Christian ideals are not to blind us from recognizing moral and civil realities.

Argument XIII: "Christ commanded a sword, which was drawn in a righteous cause against an evil aggressor, to be put up", etc. Yes, but not a sword that was drawn at the command of God's civil "minister" and for its God-sanctioned purpose. It takes more than "a righteous cause" to justify the use of the material sword; it must be lawfully drawn—lawfully commanded and also for a righteous cause. While all, saint and sinner, belong to either the citizenry element or the official element of the civil realm, Brother Bales fails to practically realize that truism.

Argument XIV: "Brotherly love must continue." Yes; and, "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." Some of these commands relate to mutual obedience to God and His civil "minister"; and it is just as plainly implied that one is to obey the civil realm to the extent of its New Testament-sanctioned mission as it is implied in another command that we are to resist the devil to the extent of his mission.

Argument XV: "Christians must make personal decisions concerning moral actions." Granted. They are to decide whether the evil against which they are commanded to fight is identified with the evil referred to in Rom. 13:4; 1 Peter 2:14. This is in accord with the anticipation of the Scriptures to "discern good evil" and to be governed accordingly.

I have only the kindest personal feelings toward Brother Bales and others who may dissent from the position I have set forth in this discussion. I renounce the conditions that make war necessary, just as I oppose the conditions that make religious divisions necessary. But I defend either or both under conditions calling for either or both. The current indiscriminate condemnation of either or both implies that the Scriptures are responsible for the conditions calling for either or both, which is not true, and contributes to skepticism on the part of many sincere people. May this discussion be overruled to the edification of all concerned and to the glory of God.

