

[\(Click here for Table of Contents\)](#)

The New Testament Teaching

ON

WAR

BY

H. LEO BOLES

NASHVILLE, TENN.
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

The New Testament
Teaching

ON

WAR

BY

H. LEO BOLES

NASHVILLE, TENN.
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

CONTENTS.

[\(Click on chapter title for article\)](#)

CHAPTER I.

War—Reasons for a Study of This Question 5

CHAPTER II.

War Is Antichristian 9

CHAPTER III.

War Is Opposed to the Prophetic Peaceful Nature of Christianity 13

CHAPTER IV.

War Is Opposed to the Principles of Christianity as Announced in the Sermon
on the Mount 17

CHAPTER V.

War and Christ 21

CHAPTER VI.

The Christian's Attitude Toward War 25

CHAPTER VII.

Arguments in Favor of War Examine 29

CHAPTER VIII.

Arguments for War Considered 34

CHAPTER IX.

War and Obedience to Government 39

CHAPTER X.

War and Christian Ethics 45

CHAPTER XI.

The Testimony of Many Brethren on War 50

CHAPTER XII.

War as Seen by Scholars and Warriors 55

PREFACE.

The contents of this book were first published in the Gospel Advocate. There were so many urgent requests from many sections of the country for the articles to be put in book form that it was thought wise to yield to the suggestion; in fact, it was deemed unwise not to listen to the persistent demands of so many good and thoughtful brethren. The Christian's attitude toward carnal war as taught in the New Testament should be emphasized until *every Christian* clearly understands "the mind of Christ" and "the will of God" on this subject. There should be no confusion in the church of our Lord on this important question. Every member of the body of Christ should be taught what course to follow that will be absolutely safe, that will be pleasing to God, should our country be involved in another war. The church suffered greatly during the late "World War" because its members were not familiar with the New Testament teaching on carnal warfare.

The issue should be kept clear. It is not what Jehovah commanded the patriarchs to do or what he commanded or encouraged under the law of Moses, neither the justification of Israel's wars; but, what does the example of Christ and the principles of Christianity as revealed in the New Testament teach the humble follower of Christ to do in regard to engaging in bloody and deadly warfare? In discussing this question, the Christian's attitude is a negative position. Those who affirm that the New Testament teaches that the Christian *should* or *may* engage in carnal warfare are under obligations to give book, chapter, and verse.

It is not claimed that this book is an exhaustive study of this subject. It is a modest and humble contribution to a field of thought that should be cultivated more thoroughly than it has been done in the past. THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON WAR.

CHAPTER I.

War—Reasons for a Study of This Question.

Surely this is a good time to study this question. In time of peace we may study our attitude toward war. During the World War we were told that it was not expedient or opportune to teach and write upon this question. Perhaps that was true at that time, but that objection cannot be urged now. This is a better time to study this question than when there are rumors of war and the excitement of war inflaming the minds of the people. No one can study the question to the best advantage when excited and when the heat of prejudice controls the powers of mind. We need calm, quiet times, with full possession of mental powers unbiased by the exciting tumult of the people, to study our relation to war.

Again, this is an opportune time to study this question before we are plunged into another war. Church people and Christians should be taught God's will on the subject of war, so that when the time comes they may know how to act. It was said that the World War came upon the United States and found this nation unprepared. Whether this is true or not, we are not disposed to discuss this now; but one thing we do know, and that is, *that the church of Christ was unprepared*. Hundreds and thousands of good people, both men and women, were wholly at the mercy of the popular spirit. They had never been taught what attitude a Christian should take toward war. They had not studied the question for themselves, and were drafted and driven into war before they

had time to consider what was the mind of Christ on the subject. Even the leaders of the church and preachers in general were unprepared to give instruction to those who in prayer sought earnestly for guidance. Preachers and elders were ignorant, it seemed, of the Bible teaching on this subject, and in making a hasty decision were guided more by the "God of War" than by the Prince of Peace. The shepherds of the flocks were confused and could give no aid to the helpless young men who turned to them for instruction. Many of them, instead of going to the Book Divine for guidance, went to the authority of State. Not many, if any, maintained strict integrity and loyalty to the principles of New Testament teaching.

Another reason for studying this question at this time is that war is now unpopular. Our country and all the countries of the world are tired of war. Truly, war is unpopular now. Many of the daily papers and magazines are crying out against war. Even those which were so outspoken for war are now crying against it. Many agencies and individuals who denounced as unpatriotic those who were conscientiously opposed to war are now on the side of the conscientious objector and are loudly decrying war. I wonder, if we should be plunged into another war soon, whether they would stand firm against war or go war-mad again and please the rabble. We never know to what end blundering politics and financial greed and national hatred will lead us. Hence, it is best to be prepared as the people of God, so that when "the evil days come" we may know what to do. It is best for the church of God to know what the Bible teaches on this, as on every other question that pertains to life and godliness. It would be sad, indeed, for another war to come and find the members of the church so ignorant on this question.

Another reason is suggested for the present study of this question. We are not so far removed from the dire effects and bloody consequence? of war that we cannot see its horrors. Before we forget the awfulness of war, we should study war and its consequences. We may be able to glance

back at the blood shed during the World War and be warned; we can still remember the mighty upheaval in national affairs; we are still groaning under the heavy burden of taxation brought on by war. The lesson that we learned, or ought to have learned, should be indelibly impressed upon the present generation.

Should another war come, what would the churches of Christ do? What would the teachers and preachers encourage young Christian men to do? Would the leaders of the church of Christ to-day be divided on this question? Should we not try to find out what the Lord would have us do? Those who postponed discussing this question on the ground of expediency during the war should not be so tardy in instructing the members of the church on this question now. I hope that interest may be provoked and that many of our able teachers and preachers will address themselves to this question. It is to be hoped that we may stand united upon the clear and definite scriptural teaching on this question. Let us strive to be of the same mind and the same judgment on this important question. The church of our Lord should be able to present a united front and a solid phalanx on this question. It would be sad for only a little band of conscientious objectors to stand for the simple New Testament teaching upon this question, and the rest of the church follow in the parade for war and help to beat the popular drum. Would it not be better to say to the authorities of state that the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, every member of it, stands humbly and faithfully upon the principles taught in the New Testament, which governs our attitude toward war? We ought to be able to say that we are followers of the Prince of Peace, and that we cannot follow him and at the same time obey the demand of the "God of War."

We were so divided on this question during the war that we could have no influence with governmental authorities. Our division became sharp and acrimonious. Brethren were alienated from brethren. Some suffered persecution and imprisonment; while others, it seemed, rejoiced that

they were suffering. Many acted in a very unchristian way toward their brethren who for conscience' sake denied the right of the government to compel Christians to engage in war and to kill their fellow men. Division among brethren still exists, and alienation between brethren which grew out of the state of affairs during the war may still be found

The World War ceased a few years ago, but the warfare between brethren still continues. The "Treaty of Peace" has been signed by the different nations, but reconciliation between brethren cannot be had. If the other reasons assigned for the study of this question are not sufficient to impress its importance, surely the fact that brethren are divided over it ought to challenge a prayerful study upon this question on the part of all.

It must be admitted by all who claim to be children of God that the foundation of our duty is to be found in the will of God; it must also be admitted that God's will to his people to-day must be ascertained from the New Testament. We must all go, then, to the New Testament for a settlement of this great question. As Christians, we cannot acknowledge any other authority upon this important question other than the principles announced in the New Testament Scriptures. Of course, concerning those who do not acknowledge the New Testament as supreme authority on this question, we must admit that we have no contention with them at this time; we address not our argument to them, but leave them to their own standard for regulation of their conduct. We must inquire: *What is the win of God on this question?* In a few brief articles I wish to offer some of the teachings of the New Testament, which I trust may help us to come to a clearer understanding of the Christian's attitude toward war.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON WAR.

CHAPTER II.

War Is Antichristian.

Be it remembered that we are studying the Christian's attitude toward war. We are not discussing whether any other person or nation may engage in war. We have nothing to say at this time about one who is not a Christian engaging in war. The present study is, Does the New Testament teach that a child of God should engage in carnal warfare? The investigation is not that some wars may be more justifiable than others. War, any war, an *wars* are antichristian, and therefore a Christian should not engage in war. The nature of war is contrary to the nature of Christianity; the spirit of war is opposed to the spirit of Christianity; the "God of War" is antagonistic to Christ. This places the Christian in a negative attitude toward war; and this study of the question will be from the side of negation.

It is hardly necessary to examine into the nature of war to find that it is wholly opposed to Christianity. War is destructive; it is a calamity to the victors and a disaster to the conquered. It is impossible to recount the intense sufferings and irreparable deprivations which war entails upon private life. A father or husband or brother or son destroyed by war can never be replaced to the family. The slaughter of war causes many to weep in unpitied and silent secrecy of the home life; others are thrown into hopeless poverty and silent suffering. The loss of a loved one cannot be repaid by the world's clamorous empty glory; a gold star bedecked on the mother's breast does not restore her son to her arms. The addition of territory or provinces may add titles to rulers, but the brilliancy of these titles can throw no light upon the domestic gloom. The destruction of war brings horror and a dreadful picture of human violence.

The curses of war affect political affairs and disturb well-founded principles; the consequences of war are direful on the social life of a country; the atrocities of war are debasing to the morals of society. No war improves the social and moral condition of a country; no war encourages the spiritual uplift of any people. War makes murderers and demons of men. Truly, "war is hell."

The nature of war is mentioned only to contrast it with the nature of Christianity. There is nothing in the waging of war or the consequences of war that encourages Christianity. Christianity is constructive, while war is destructive; Christianity is elevating, war is debasing; Christianity is purifying, war is corrupting; Christianity blesses, war curses; Christianity calls for the best and the noblest that is in man, war degrades and depraves man; Christianity makes man moral, war makes him immoral; Christianity cultivates kindness and gentleness in men, war makes them hard and ferocious; Christianity makes men a blessing unto each other, war makes them a curse; Christianity calls upon man to regard human life as sacred, war causes man to destroy life with impunity; Christianity makes men happy, war destroys all happiness; Christianity saves, war damns; Christianity gives life, war destroys life; Christianity leads men to God and heaven, war leads them to destruction.

He who studies the spirit and genius of Christianity must know that it is contrary to the nature of war. If there were no other evidence against war, the very spirit and nature of Christianity are witnesses enough to condemn it. There is sufficient proof in the very nature of Christianity to condemn and forbid the devout Christian's participating in war. The whole character and nature of Christianity are eminently and peculiarly peaceful. The nature and spirit of Christianity are opposed in every principle to the murder, carnage, and devastation of war. Surely no Christian can encourage and participate in that which is in every essential part of its nature opposed to Christianity. A few scriptural quotations are submitted

here to show the peaceful spirit and nature of Christianity.

"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John 13: 35.) "With all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. 4: 2, 3.) "Finally, be ye all like-minded, compassionate, loving as brethren, tender-hearted, humble-minded: not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling; but contrariwise blessing." (1 Pet. 3: 8, 9.) "And to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work's sake. Be at peace among yourselves." (1 These. 5: 13.) "See that none render unto any one evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all." (Verse 15.) "But God hath called us in peace." (1 Cor. 7: 15.) "Live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you." (2 Cor. 13: 11.) "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." (1 Tim. 6: 11.) "To speak evil of no man, not to be contentious, to be gentle, showing all meekness toward all men." (Tit. 3: 2.) "But now do ye also put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth." (Col. 3: 8.) "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and Danger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you." (Eph. 4: 31, 32.) "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. But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to 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.) "My little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth." (1 John 3: 18.) "So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another."

(Rom. 14: 19.) "For the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Verse 17.)

Many other scriptures could be quoted to show us the spirit and nature of Christianity, and surely it may be clearly seen that Christianity is opposed to war. No approval or participation in carnal warfare can be given without obvious and gross inconsistency to the scriptures quoted above. Since war is obviously inconsistent with the general character and nature of Christianity, it follows that if no specific scripture were given forbidding war, that the evidence and witness of the general character and spirit of Christianity alone are as clear, absolute, and conclusive, as if some formal prohibition of war had been given.

But, in addition to the general nature of Christianity, there are some solemn public declarations of Christ which bear directly upon the question of war. In the "Sermon on the Mount" there are some references to fundamental principles and moral duties which show the Christian's attitude toward war. In this sermon Jesus puts his teaching in direct contrast and opposition to the popular interpretation and application of the law of Moses. He repeatedly refers to the less peaceful system of morality which the law of Moses inculcated, and sets over against that system the peaceful principles of his own kingdom.

CHAPTER III.

War Opposed to the Prophetic Peaceful Nature of Christianity.

All Bible students are familiar with the prophecies concerning Christ and his influence in the world. Christ was to come as the Prince of Peace. He is to reign over a kingdom of peace, and his subjects are to be peacemakers. His gospel is a gospel of peace, and his church is to pursue a peaceful mission.

The prophecies concerning the peaceful nature of Christianity are as numerous as the prophecies concerning Christ. Each prophet looked forward to an era of peace. It seemed that war-disturbed Israel sighed for a time of peace, and the clear vision of the prophets gave promise of such an era. Isaiah, the Messianic prophet, looking through the telescope of prophecy with the lens of inspiration, saw the Prince of Peace reigning in his glory, and describes it thus: "And he will judge between the nations, and will decide concerning many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isa. 2:4.) Again, in describing the peaceful nature of prophetic Christianity, Isaiah says: "And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. 11:

6-9.) The vision of Isaiah relates to the future of God's people and declares that the time shall come when war shall be no more with Jehovah's people. Implements of warfare shall be transformed into implements of peace and prosperity; the ferocious spirit shall be subdued by the gentle nature of the principles of the kingdom to come. The vision of the golden future is clear. No clouds of war or fraternal strife shall harass those who follow the Prince of Peace. Jesus was the Prince of Peace because he brought a new life quickened by the power of love. This new life was a peaceful life; its spirit and nature were conducive to peaceful relation; it enjoined upon each the peace of a brotherhood. "And the government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even forever." (Isa. 9: 6, 7.)

The prophecies of the Old Testament point unerringly to the arrival of a period of universal peace. "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the birds of the heavens, and with the creeping things of the ground: and I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the land, and will make them to lie down safely." (Hos. 2: 18.) All Christians now look forward to a time when vice shall be destroyed from the earth, when the violent passions of man shall have been subdued and when the blessings of Christianity shall have been universally diffused. But when will that time come? Many are confidently hoping that it may be soon. "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, desolation nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise." (Isa. 60: 18.)

Again, we have another prophet declaring the peaceful nature of Christianity with this language: "And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem; and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak

peace unto the nations: and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth." (Zech. 9: 10.)

It should be noted from an observation of these scriptures and others that could be quoted that *it is the will of God that war should eventually be abolished*, so far as God's people are concerned. If war is not in harmony with God's will as set forth in these prophecies, then he who espouses Christianity cannot engage in war without being out of harmony with God's will as expressed by the prophets. Clearly and definitely the time is pointed to in these prophecies when God's people shall work for peace, when they shall learn war no more. When are these prophecies to be fulfilled? I think that all students agree that they are fulfilled in the advent of Christ and his reign in his kingdom on earth to-day.

Christianity is the fulfillment of these prophecies; therefore, Christianity introduces the era of peace. If one should say that the principles of Christianity encourage, sanction, or allow war, then one should answer: By what system of religion will the prophecies of Isaiah and other prophets be fulfilled? By what principles will peace be brought to earth and good will be brought to men? Are we to expect some new set of principles or system of religion from Jehovah that will fulfill these prophecies concerning a peaceful era? Are we to believe that God sent Christ into the world to announce a religion and give principles for that religion that sometime must be set aside or altered in order to fulfill the prophecy of Isaiah? Jehovah says: "Neither shall they learn war any more." // *Christianity permits, or encourages war, what is it that will extirpate war?* If the principles of Christianity encourage violence, wasting, and destruction, what principles will promulgate gentleness, forgiveness, and forbearance? Surely we are not to expect any other religion or set of principles for righteous living. No other gospel, save the gospel of peace, is to be preached. "Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:8.)

Whatever the principles of Christianity as announced through the prophets require of the children of men at some future time, *they require now*. Christianity with its present principles and obligations is to produce universal peace, according to the prophecies which have been quoted. No system of religion, no set of principles has been given that so severely condemns war as the principles of Christianity announced through the prophets. The principles of Christianity, and they only, have been given to extirpate and abolish war. If Christianity as announced by the prophets should allow war, then the principles of Christianity are contradictory. It is absurd to claim that the prophets prophesied of a King and a kingdom that would encourage war. If there could be given no other proof of the unlawfulness of war, so far as the Christian is related to it, there is enough evidence in the Old Testament prophets to condemn it. Surely prejudice cannot deny this proof, neither can sophistry break the force of it.

Christ came as a fulfillment of these prophecies; taught the principles of Christianity, which were in harmony with the life he lived; inaugurated a kingdom of peace and set to work the leaven of Christianity which was to leaven the whole world for peace. Christ created peace by breathing into men the spirit of brotherhood. The hope of peace as given in the vision of the prophet begins to be conspicuous in the preaching of Jesus and becomes more conspicuous in his life. Those who did not appreciate his mission and the far-reaching influence of the principles that he taught did not catch the vision that the prophets gave. Christ, the Prince of Peace, sowed the living seed of a new order. He began to form a new brotherhood. Every one who enters into this brotherhood must be "born again;" he must become "a new creature" in Christ; he must drink of the peaceful spirit, put off the old man and put on the new; he must begin following the principles which make for peace on earth and good will among men, and these exclude the practice of killing in war.

CHAPTER IV.

War Is Opposed to the Principles of Christianity as Announced in the Sermon on the Mount.

The fundamental principles of Christianity are announced in the Sermon on the Mount. A great portion of the teachings of Jesus is an amplification of the principles in this sermon. To be sure, nothing that the Savior or the apostles ever said contradict the principles laid down in this sermon, but all other teachings of the New Testament Scriptures verify and amplify these truths and harmonize with these principles. Let us now look at the principles which bear upon the nature of war and the Christian's attitude toward it

Jesus said: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for' them that persecute you. . . . For if ye love them that 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 Gentiles the same?" (Matt. 5: 38-47.) It is to be noticed that the Savior emphasizes these prohibitions and injunctions. They impress! the obligations of Christianity as being peculiar to itself. No other system of religion had imposed such injunctions. All previous systems tolerated retaliation, and retaliation is here introduced by the Savior for the express purpose of prohibiting it. The Savior places beside the prohibition of retaliation the peculiarly pacific nature of Christianity. By this means he distinguishes more clearly and more forcibly the wide difference between the spirit of retaliation and the spirit of Christianity.

The precepts and principles of Christianity are set forth as being more excellent in nature and superior in purity to the previous system of religion. The law of Moses was directed to the external regulation of conduct, while the teachings of Christ apply to the heart and were intended to restrain and purify the motives and affections of the heart. The Savior gives this precept: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Verses 27, 28.) This principle not only forbids one with an unlawful passion using it to produce immorality, but it forbids the *passion* itself. The teachings of this sermon attach guilt not only to the *conduct*, but also to the *thought* of the conduct.

Another precept of our Savior which is announced in this sermon is found in this language: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire." (Verses 21, 22.) The law said: "Thou shalt not kill." Jesus says: "Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment." Jesus condemns the violent feelings of anger, such as resentment, hatred, and revenge, which lead to war and murder. When such unholy motives and intentions as hatred and revenge are prohibited, the spirit and nature of war are prohibited. War cannot be carried on without the motives, intentions, and passion of hatred and revenge, and the teachings and spirit of Christianity prohibit the very things which are necessary for the promotion and promulgation of war. *War cannot be encouraged or allowed, if that which is necessary to war is prohibited*, and Christianity as is taught in this sermon prohibits all things which promote war.

The law of Moses required that men maintain love toward their neighbors, but toward their enemies they were permitted to indulge the passions of resentment and revenge. Christ puts in direct contrast to this his teachings when he says: "For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye?" "*Love your enemies*" Men do not love their enemies when they are trying to kill them. When one makes preparation to destroy one's enemy, one is violating a fundamental principle of Christianity. It enjoins upon every one who espouses it to love his enemy. *This is contrary to war.* The distinguishing duties of the Christian are sacrificed when that one goes into carnal warfare. The publican, the Gentile, the sinner, and the world love those who love them and hate those who hate them; they attempt to destroy those who would destroy them. Now, if the Christian loves only those who love the Christian, he is no better than the publican, the sinner, or the world. But Christianity makes a distinction between the conduct of the Christian and the sinner, and that distinction is declared by the peculiar principle, *love your enemy.* War nullifies this principle, and, therefore, is opposed to Christianity. Yea, more, it is destructive to Christianity, for it would destroy the only peculiar and distinguishing feature of Christianity, "*Love your enemies*" To every Christian who enlists in war *willingly* is presented this question: Shall I abandon the duties of a Christian? The duties of a Christian, who knows and is loyal to the principles of Christianity, must be abandoned if one practices soldiery. The principles of war and Christianity cannot be obeyed at the same time by the same parties. "*Ye cannot serve two masters.*"

The statement, "Resist not him that is evil," and similar statements are said to be figurative, and, therefore, do not forbid one's engaging in bloody warfare. They say that when smitten on one cheek, to turn the other, is also figurative, and they usually ask some questions which are intended to give another interpretation to these scriptures. They ask: "Would it be wrong to defend one's self or one's

family against a robber or murderer?" These questions are intended to excite prejudice and arouse feelings instead of convincing the judgment. The objector should be called upon to tell what these scriptures mean. May I ask, What *is* the meaning of "resist not him that is evil?" Does it mean to bombard a city of innocent women and children and destroy them and their homes? Does it mean to devastate a country and bring misery and want to the inhabitants of it? Does it mean to murder or take the life of fathers, husbands, or brothers? Does this mean to ruin the commerce, sink the ships, torpedo the fleets, plunder their cities, drop bombs from airplanes and destroy property and life? If it does not mean what the above questions call for, then it does not mean to allow war; and if it does not allow war, those who are in favor of war get no consolation from quoting it. Whatever it may mean, *it does not mean to authorize Christians to go to war*; for, if it does, it contradicts every other principle taught by the Savior. Whatever liberty or license the advocate of war may take in the interpretation of this scripture, he cannot, either honestly or dishonestly, interpret it to mean that the Christian *must* or even *may* engage in carnal warfare; for we have observed from the above scriptures that they forbid not only the act of war, *but the very spirit of war*. This method of prohibiting his disciples' engaging in war was employed by our Savior, and is convincing and conclusive to all who love him. Truly, "he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes;" and the Savior throws the whole weight of this sermon against injustice, against political intrigue and deception, against cruelty, and against all that encourages and promotes war.

CHAPTER V.

War and Christ.

The life of Christ is an interpretation of his teaching. If one did not understand some of the principles which Jesus taught, one could see and understand the interpretation of it in his life. We are told that Jesus *did* and then *taught*. Luke, the supposed writer of the Acts, says: "The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach." (Acts 1: 1.) Jesus' attitude toward war and the spirit of war may be taken as an argument against war. We are to follow in his steps, to have his spirit, and to live the humble life which he lived. Surely the things and principles which he opposed in his life and teachings we must oppose. No one can follow in his footsteps and be guided by his example and at the same time do and practice the things which he opposed.

Be it remembered that Jesus not only condemned, both by example and precept, the passions, lusts, malice, and hatred that are necessary to war, but he also inculcated and emphasized by example and precept the affections which are opposed to war. The remarkable Sermon on the Mount pronounces solemn benedictions on those who should dwell in his church. The Beatitudes are like a string of pearls bedecking the life of his people. To enumerate these beatitudes, we have: *poverty of spirit, mourning, meekness, desire of righteousness, mercy, purity of heart, peacemaking, and sufferance of persecution*. These eight qualities adorn the Christian life. No one can enumerate eight other qualities which are to be practiced in mind and life that are more incongruous with war and more antagonistic to the spirit of war. In this cluster of beatitudes a benediction is pronounced upon the peacemaker. "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God." No one

can receive higher praise or a nobler title than to be a peacemaker, a child of God. These benedictions and qualities of character make it clear that Christ did not approve of war, with all of its devastation, destruction, and bloodshed. With all these traits of character, together with all others that Jesus commends to the Christian, one cannot possess them and at the same time encourage and engage in war; nay, the Beatitudes cannot possibly exist in conjunction with war. No one can believe that the Christ who made this selection of beatitudes and who distinguished the peacemakers with the peculiar title that they "shall be called sons of God" could for a moment encourage or sanction war. Does any one believe that the poor in spirit, meek, and merciful, subjects of Christ's kingdom, could ever slaughter their fellow men in war? When one engages in war, one must abandon the practice of all of the characteristics mentioned in the Beatitudes. No teacher of war or officer, in training soldiers, ever teaches the Beatitudes as a part of the knowledge or qualifications required of the soldier of carnal warfare.

When those who had betrayed the Savior approached him while in the garden of Gethsemane, seeking to arrest him, some of his disciples asked: "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" It seems that they did not wait for his answer, but the impetuous Peter "drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear." Jesus at once rebuked! him and said: "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. 26: 52.) Much importance is to be attached to this incident; a great lesson is to be learned. *It prohibits the destruction of human life in a cause in which there were the best of possible reasons for destroying it.* The apostles asked: "Shall we smite with the sword?" They meant to ask: "Shall we defend the Son of God from his enemies and murderers *by force of arms?*" They were ready to fight for him; they were ready to die for him. If any reason for fight-

ing could be a good one, the apostles surely had it at this time. But if the Master would not allow the sword to be used in his own defense from the hands of bloodthirsty betrayers, then for what reason do we think he would allow the sword to be used? Those who favor Christians' going to war and killing their fellow men are under obligation to show a better reason for destroying human life than is contained in this instance in which it was forbidden. Jesus' attitude in this case interprets the meaning of his teaching.

Some have contended that the reason Jesus did not suffer his disciples to defend him with arms was that it would have defeated the purpose for which he came into the world; that he came into the world to give up his life. It is true that he came into the world to die, to become a sacrifice for sin, but Jesus does not assign that as the reason for his apostles' not defending him. He says: "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,." He did not want them or any of his disciples to perish with the sword. A reference to the sacrifice of his life might have formed a reason why his disciples should not defend with the sword *then*, but the reason which Jesus gives is that *they should not fight at all; "for all they that take the sword shaft perish with the sword"* It means that not only his eleven apostles, if they should attempt to defend with the sword, would perish, but all, *at any time, in any place, and for any cause*, shall perish, if they depend upon the sword for protection or if they use the sword as a habit of life. What a significant lesson we learn from this!

There is another statement made by Jesus which is clearly interpreted by the life which he lived. After Jesus had been arrested and had been brought before Pilate to be tried, he makes a reference to the capability of his disciples in defending him. He says: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate

therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." (John 18: 36, 37.) Here Jesus has reference specifically to an armed conflict, to a war, to a conflict between numbers. He had before forbidden his disciples to fight in his own defense, telling them that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," and now before Pilate he assigns another reason for his disciples' not fighting. He says: "My kingdom is not of this world." War is incompatible with the life of Christ, the nature of his kingdom, and the spirit of Christianity. Here Christ draws a wide contrast between *his kingdom* and all other kingdoms. It belongs to other kingdoms and their subjects to fight and wage war, but to *Christ's kingdom* and its subjects such a spirit does not belong. He expresses that if it were consistent with the nature of his kingdom, his servants would be willing to fight. His servants are peculiar in this respect to the subjects of any other kingdom; there is as wide a difference between his servants and the servants of other kingdoms as there is between his kingdom and other kingdoms. In fact, the difference between his kingdom and all other kingdoms lies in the principles of his kingdom and the principles of all others; the difference lies in the lives and characters of his servants, governed by the principles of his kingdom, and the servants of other kingdoms, guided by the principles of human governments. Be it remembered that in this instance Christ did not refer to the act of a single individual who might draw his sword, but to an armed engagement between hostile kingdoms. Surely Christians cannot take up arms in behalf of the kingdom of Christ. Who, then, would affirm that they may or should take up arms in behalf of any other kingdom?

CHAPTER VI.

The Christian's Attitude Toward War.

The teachings of the New Testament breathe the spirit of peace. The incessant references to peace and mildness and placability emphasize the teachings of the New Testament on brotherly love. Christians are to be "peacemakers," follow after things which make for peace; provoke one another to love and good works, and love one another as Christ loved them. The whole tenor and spirit of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament is opposed to war. War is a discordant element that mars the beauty and peaceful relation between Christians who are members of the same body and members one of another. The whole pacific nature of the New Testament teachings is diametrically opposed to the spirit of war. Every principle of Christianity is outraged by the spirit and practice of war.

Emphatically, Christians cannot go to war with each other. Their relationship to Christ and their relationship to each other forbid their engaging in carnal combat with each other. The children of *God would be out of harmony with the divine relationship which they sustain to each other if they should engage in fighting or warring. A dozen or more Christians on one side cannot consistently, with the very spirit and nature of their relationship, enter into bloody and deadly combat with a few dozen Christians on the other side. A multitude or army of Christians cannot, without violating the nature and spirit of Christianity, engage in bloody battle with a regiment of Christians on the other side. A nation of Christians cannot go to war with another nation of Christians without going contrary to the example of Christ and his teaching. It is utterly absurd for any member or group of members of the body of Christ to be at war with some other group of Christians. We, as Christians, are com-

manded to "love the brotherhood." (1 Pet. 2: 17.) Again, we are commanded to "let love of the brethren continue." (Heb. 13: 1.) Again: "For ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another." (1 These. 4: 9.) Again, we are instructed to "let love be without hypocrisy. ... In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another; in honor preferring one another." (Rom. 12: 10.) Again, we are taught that love is a test of our conversion. "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (1 John 3: 16.) Again, we are taught "that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." (1 Cor. 12: 25-27.) "The Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle toward all." (2 Tim. 2: 24.) These scriptures, with many others that could be given, teach that Christians should stay in such relationship to each other and to Christ that it would be preposterous for them to be at war with each other. War would destroy the fundamental relationship of Christians and make nugatory the fundamental principles of Christianity. *Christians cannot go to war with one another.*

It is equally true that Christians cannot go to war with their neighbors. The principles of Christianity enjoin upon Christians to love their neighbors. "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Gal. 5: 14.) The nature of Christianity, the spirit of the Christ, and the peaceful traits of character of the Christian all forbid the Christian's going to war with his neighbor. If the neighbor is a Christian, the reasoning given above shows that he cannot go to war with his neighbor; and if the neighbor is not a Christian, the divine injunction is to "love thy neighbor." This attitude forbids the Christian's warring

with his neighbor. It matters not if his neighbors be two, threescore, or a multitude, the Christian cannot go to war with his neighbor. The number of neighbors that one may have does not change the principle that should guide the Christian in his conduct toward his neighbor. *He must love his neighbor.* This law of love excludes the spirit of war.

Christians cannot go to war with their *enemies*. "Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." (Matt. 5: 11.) Again: "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." (Verse 39.) We have seen that our Lord and Master lived in harmony with these principles and taught them to his disciples. Christ did not attempt to defend himself with carnal weapons; neither did he teach his disciples to defend themselves with instruments of war; neither did the disciples, guided by the Spirit of God, teach *any* of God's people to defend themselves with carnal weapons. "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men. 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. But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. 12: 18-21.) These scriptures teach the Christian his attitude toward his enemy. He is to "resist not," to "pray for" him, to "feed him" and "give him to drink." The Christian is to "overcome evil with good." All of these words describe vividly a course that is contrary to the habits of war. A Christian is not to destroy life or property nor take vengeance. It matters not if the enemies are few in number or a multitude or nation, the Christian is forbidden by express command, by the example of Christ, and by the very nature and spirit of Christianity to make war on his enemies. He is commanded to "love

your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you." (Matt. 5: 43.) As sure as the love that Christians must have for each other excludes and forbids their going to war with each other, and as sure as the love that Christians have for their neighbors precludes war with their neighbors, so sure does the love that Christians are to have for their enemies debar them from making war on their enemies. The same love, or law of love, applies to all classes, and, therefore, prevents Christians' going to war. *Christians cannot go to war with their enemies.*

It has been observed that Christians cannot go to war in behalf of the kingdom of God. Christ forbade his disciples' using carnal weapons in his defense and then made the" general application that his servants could not fight for his kingdom. The kingdom of God is maintained in all its righteous activity with peaceful aims and purposes. Any Christian would be violating the very nature of the kingdom of God to attempt to maintain its claims by force of arms. Such a course would defeat the kingdom of God. It is clear that either side or both sides of a war are wrong for Christians from the very nature of the Christian's relationship to the kingdom of God. Since Christians cannot go to war with each other, since they cannot go to war with their neighbors, since they cannot go to war with their enemies, pray tell me with whom they can wage war. Since Christians cannot fight for Christ, since they cannot fight for themselves, since they cannot fight for the church or the kingdom of God, pray tell me for whom they can fight. Surely they cannot violate all the principles of Christianity and fight for the kingdoms of this world.

CHAPTER VII.

Arguments in Favor of War Examined.

Be it remembered again that this series of studies on war has nothing to do with the one who is in the world, the one who is not a Christian, an alien and a stranger to the kingdom of Christ. We are not studying the alien sinner's attitude toward war. The New Testament regulates the lives of *Christians* and directs *them* in the paths of peace, in the service of God. Neither are we studying wars as described in the Old Testament Scriptures. These studies have nothing to do with Abraham's, Isaac's, or Jacob's attitude toward war, neither Moses' nor Joshua's nor David's participation in war. We are not studying whether or not God approved of wars under the patriarchal or Jewish dispensations, nor whether he commanded his servants of old to engage in war. These studies have been confined to the Christian's attitude toward war as set forth by the prophetic peaceful nature of Christianity as announced by the prophet and interpreted by the life of Christ. It has been our purpose to determine the Christian's attitude toward war when guided by the Spirit of Christ and governed by his teaching as set forth in the New Testament Scriptures.

It is strangely significant that the Bible has been quoted both for and against every great social, political, and religious movement for many centuries. The reverence for the authority of the Bible is to be appreciated and commended, but the judgment of those who quote it on every side of a question is to be lamented and deplored. The consistency of the New Testament Scriptures, as well as its principles and truths, forbids the New Testament being used on both sides of the war question. Is the New Testament to be quoted as being in favor of the advocates of peace or the subjects of the God of Mars? The subject of war touches the fundamental

nature and spirit of Christianity in such a way that the New Testament cannot be consistent and at the same time be opposed to war and also in favor of war. It is absurd to claim that the New Testament both favors murder and is opposed to murder; it is preposterous to claim that the New Testament is both in favor of sin and opposed to sin; so it is inconsistent to try to quote the New Testament on both sides of the question of war. It should be obvious to every thoughtful mind that, if the New Testament is quoted as favoring both sides of the question of war, one of two things will be the result— either the New Testament must be and will be discredited as authority or those who attempt to quote it on both sides will utterly fail and render themselves ridiculous. The New Testament cannot be the manual for the friends of peace and at the same time be the guidebook for the red-handed warrior. On which side of the question of war may the New Testament be quoted as consistent with Christianity? Which side may claim the New Testament as authority for its attitude toward war?

One argument drawn from the New Testament Scriptures by those who are in favor of Christians' engaging in carnal warfare is based upon the centurion who came to Jesus to get him to heal his servant. (Matt. 8: 5-13.) Jesus said unto this centurion: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." (Verse 10.) It is claimed that Christ found no fault with the centurion's confession. It is claimed further that, if Jesus had been opposed to the military character of the centurion, he would have taken this opportunity to condemn it; but, instead of condemning this military officer, he very highly commended him, and especially his great faith.

Now, the fallacy and weakness of this argument is obvious. It is based, not upon Christ's approval of the centurion's military character, but upon his *silence* in regard to the officer's rank and profession. Christ does approve of and commend the centurion, but this approbation is not directed to his skillful use of arms nor even

his profession, *but to his faith*. The centurion did not come to Christ as a military officer, but simply as a man seeking help for his servant. It is a gross fallacy to assume that Christ approves of everything about which he is *silent*. Christ does not indorse everything that he does not condemn. He very seldom interfered with the civil and political institutions of his age. There were many acts of wickedness around him while he was here upon earth which he did not indorse, neither do we find him openly condemning them. His mode of condemnation and extirpation of political vices was to teach general principles which in their eventful and universal application would correct and reform them all. But those who insist that he approved of the centurion's military profession because he did not condemn it are asked to notice the centurion's religion. He must have been an idolater; yet Christ did not condemn idolatry at this time. No one would claim that Christ approved of idolatry. We have as good reasons for maintaining that Christ approved of idolatry because he did not condemn it as we have that he approved of war because he did not condemn it. If we should reason from analogy, we would conclude that Christ would more likely have noticed and condemned idolatry rather than war. However, the centurion's faith in Christ excluded idolatry, so the Christian's following Christ forbids going to war.

A similar argument is made on the narrative of Cornelius. It is claimed that Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian army, was taught Christianity by the divinely guided apostle, Peter. It is claimed that there is no record given that Cornelius quit his profession or that Peter even instructed him to quit the army. It is claimed that he is not told that the new life that he was to live was inconsistent with his profession. This argument, like the other one, is built upon the *silence* of the Scriptures, and therefore it is simply negative. "We do not find that

he quit the service," says one. *Neither do we find that he continued in it.* The New Testament record says nothing about whether he quit or continued the profession of soldiery. Let it be remembered again that the primary object of Christianity was not to reform political institutions, but the primary object of the principles of the New Testament was to reform the heart and life of the individual. The heart is to be purified, and then the conduct will be changed. No one can consistently and logically claim that Peter encourages Christians' going to war in so far as Cornelius' case is concerned. The universal tendency and influence of Christianity are emphatic in teaching all who become Christians that they "may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity." (1 Tim. 2: 2.) Cornelius received this instruction, and therefore his future life, if faithful to God, was guided by these principles.

Another argument has been founded upon the fact that Christ paid taxes to the Roman government at a time that it was engaged in war. It is claimed that he knew that the money which he paid would be used in the prosecution of war and that his example proves that it is lawful and right for Christians to engage in war. Now, if this proves that Christians can engage in war, it proves too much; not only may or can Christians engage in war, but it proves that they *must* engage in war. Be it remembered that the taxes were all put in the treasury and that a part of the money was used for the most iniquitous and diabolical purposes. Sometimes the money in the king's treasury was used to gratify the king's personal vices and fleshly appetites and even his baser passions. Again, some of the money put into the king's treasury by taxation was used to support the false religions and corrupt idolatry of that day. Now, if paying taxes into the king's treasury meant that Christ, in paying the taxes, indorsed and encouraged war, because some of the money was used

to that end, it also proves that Christ indorsed and encouraged the vices, sins, and idolatry of that day. Hence, the argument made by those who favor war proves too much, and, therefore, proves nothing. The argument goes too far even in its application to war, for it would make Christ approve of all the Roman wars without any distinction of their justice or injustice, and we must not conclude that Christ gave indorsement or approbation to the atrocious iniquity of the Roman wars.

CHAPTER VIII.

Arguments for War Considered.

Be it remembered that the New Testament cannot be both for war and against it. War from its very nature is opposed to the nature and spirit of Christianity. It has been our study to determine on which side of this question the New Testament Scriptures give encouragement and speak with authority. Who is so bold and reckless as to insist that the New Testament teaches that the Christian must engage in war? A few have insisted that Christians *may* take up arms. It is strange that the New Testament Scriptures have been quoted as authority in every war; but what is stranger still is that both sides of every war have claimed the New Testament for authority for taking up arms. The war poets on both sides of a war, who write and sing to encourage the soldiers, have claimed authority from the New Testament for encouraging their respective armies to take up arms. Both armies have been incited by a false conception of justice to wage the war to the bitter end. The Christ, who "died to make men holy," is brought into the camp of both armies and his guidance sought by opposing armies. The promoters of war on both sides and those who managed the war on both sides have prayed to the same God to give them victory. It is clear to any student of the Bible that such a course is inconsistent.

Those who have urged that Christians *may*, *can*, or *must* take up arms and engage in war have presented arguments from different scriptures. Some use one scripture, while others reject that and use some other scripture; they are not agreed among themselves. Some have based an argument on this statement of the Savior: "He said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none, let him sell his cloak, and buy a sword." (Luke 22: 36.)

They ask: "For what purpose were they to buy a sword, if swords might not be used?" No sound or valid argument for war can be deduced from this scripture. The immediate context shows that the Savior was not encouraging carnal warfare. Verse 38 of the same chapter says: "And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough." Jesus responded immediately, when they told him that they had two swords: "*It is enough.*" There were at least eleven men and Jesus in the company. How could two swords be enough for eleven men, if they were to wage a carnal fight or stage a battle on a small scale? It is hard to believe that Jesus wanted these swords for military weapons. It matters not now what use Jesus wanted to make of the swords, it is sufficiently clear that he did not wish or even permit them to be used as military weapons. Jesus declared that his kingdom was not of this world and that his servants would not fight for it. It is a recorded fact that Jesus healed the only wound which the apostle ever inflicted with the sword and rebuked the apostle that made it.

It is inconsistent to claim that the apostles, guided by the Spirit of Christ, were to go out preaching the gospel armed with military weapons, ready to take vengeance on and destroy every one who molested them. No one can conceive of an apostle preaching peace and reconciliation, crying out with earnestness, "Forgive your enemies," "Love your enemies," "Pray for them that despitefully use you," "Render to no one evil for evil," and at the conclusion of his discourse, when those who disbelieved began to insult and do violence unto the apostle, as they often did, and then the apostle promptly drawing his sword and stabbing and murdering the offenders. Such a procedure would be so inconsistent with the spirit and nature of the New Testament that we cannot believe such a course would be pursued. Upon one occasion while Jesus was here upon earth, he, with his apostles, "entered into a village of the Samaritans. . . . And they did

not receive him." This angered James and John, and "they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? But he turned, and rebuked them." (Luke 9: 53-55.) This is the spirit of Christianity; it is not to destroy with the sword those who antagonize or put to death Christians.

Another argument in favor of war has been drawn from a statement from John the Baptist: "And soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do? And he said unto them, Extort from no man by violence, neither accuse any one wrongfully; and be content with your wages." (Luke 3: 41.) It is claimed that if it had been wrong to engage in war, John the Baptist would have told the soldiers so. It is claimed that John told Herod and many others plainly of their sins, and that if it had been a sin to be a soldier, John would have so declared it. Be it remembered that John lived and died under the law, under a system which required "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." It is to be remembered that John the Baptist was not in the kingdom or church of Christ. Jesus says "the least in the kingdom is greater than he." If it be true (but it is not true) that John encouraged people to go to war, we see that Jesus, the latchet of whose shoe John was unworthy to loose, has forbidden it, the Holy Spirit and the apostles have forbidden it, and the Spirit and the nature of the kingdom of God forbid it.

Sometimes Old Testament heroes have been cited as authority for Christians' engaging in war. We are told that God commanded them to engage in war and that the Christian may go to war now. But we live under a new covenant, in a new kingdom, whose King is the Prince of Peace and whose subjects are peacemakers. Where has God commanded his people under the new covenant to engage in war? The principles of this kingdom emphatically forbid the lusts and passions which precipitate war. Wars belong to the works of the flesh, and are, therefore, condemned. "Whence come wars and whence come fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your

pleasures that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war; ye have not, because ye ask not." (James 4: 1, 2.) This puts wars in the category of lusts and covetousness; it puts wars in the class of all sins; and war, therefore, must be condemned. It must be remembered that the New Testament was written *at a time of war*, during the most ferocious and pugnacious period of Rome's history, when old Nero, bloody and corrupt, reigned; yet the New Testament, written at such a time as this, breathes the spirit of peace and calmly teaches all followers of Christ to "lead a tranquil and quiet life." How great is the contrast between the Christian and the soldier of carnal warfare! The profession of soldiery to a Christian in the early days of Christianity is like the profession of a gambler or a keeper of a bawdy house now; they are inconsistent with the nature of Christianity.

The first paragraph of the thirteenth chapter of Romans has been quoted frequently on the side of war. If, indeed, this scripture does teach that a Christian can engage in war, then it must be out of harmony with the whole tenor and spirit of the Christian religion. But the scriptures all harmonize. Indeed, it is a sound, safe law of interpretation of scriptures to follow that "every interpretation of the Scripture must be made to harmonize with every other statement of the Scripture upon that subject." So let us approach this scripture with this thought: whatever it means, it must harmonize with all other scriptures as interpreted by the life of Christ and the teachings of the Holy Spirit. This scripture says: "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." (Rom. 13: 1.) Here it is claimed that the Christian is to be obedient to civil authorities, and that if the civil authorities command the Christian to engage in war, then the Christian must obey. Peter and John said that it is better to obey God rather than man. This shows that if the civil authorities should demand of the

Christian that which God forbids, then the Christian is to obey God. There are limitations to man's obeying any human authority. The child is to obey his parents. (Eph. 6: 1.) Wives are to obey their husbands. (Eph. 5: 22.) Citizens are to be in subjection to, or obey, civil authorities. However, there are limitations to all of these acts of obedience. If the parent should command the child to do that which God forbids him to do, then the child is to obey God rather than man. If the husband should (and many do) command the wife that which God forbids, then the wife is to obey God rather than the husband. If the civil authorities should (and sometimes they do) demand the citizen to do that which God forbids, then the Christian citizen is to obey God rather than civil authorities. So, if civil authorities should command a Christian to take up arms and fight or follow a course that is wholly antagonistic to the spirit and nature of Christianity, then the Christian must quietly and humbly, yet sternly, refuse to do that which is so contrary to the Christ life.

CHAPTER IX.

War and Obedience to Government.

We have seen that the nature of war is such that it unfits one for the humble and faithful life of a Christian, The very nature of war requires the spirit of destruction of property and life. When a Christian decides to go to war, he makes up his mind to kill, to take human life. Without the help of the devil, we could not make warriors of men to-day. The spirit of revenge and destruction of human life is needed to make a good soldier. The spirit and nature of Christianity wholly unfit one for the best service in Caesar's army.

But suppose one's country is involved in war and the Christian is called upon to take up arms in behalf of his country—yea, suppose he is commanded and even drafted into service—what must the Christian do? Shall he refuse, or shall he yield to the demands of governmental authority and take up arms? We are sometimes confronted with these questions: What if a nation attacks the United States government? What if a savage and barbarous nation should overrun this country? What if the Crescent should again make war upon the Cross? What if some ruffian should attack your home and family? What if an invading army should land upon the shores of this country and proceed to put the people and country to fire and sword, and the civil authorities should call upon Christians to help in driving these invaders from the land? What should Christians do under such circumstances? Should they refuse to obey their country's call, or should they respond and take up the sword in defense of their country, their homes, and their families? These questions present the matter, as many know, in a way that it often confuses and bewilders the Christian in answering them satisfactorily to governmental authorities

or even satisfactorily to one's self. To make the matter still more cloudy and confusing, the oft-quoted thirteenth chapter of Romans is referred to: "Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. . . . Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience' sake." (Verses 2-5.) This, we are told, is divine authority for the Christian to go to war. We should remember that no interpretation should be given this scripture that violates other passages of scripture. If war is wrong for the Christian, then no Christian should engage in it, it matters not what nation or human authority bids the Christian to take up arms. We have numerous examples of the apostles and early Christians refusing to obey the commands of the government under which they were placed. These examples teach and encourage the Christian of to-day fidelity to God and loyalty and right under the same circumstances.

Peter and John and Paul, with many others, suffered because they would not and could not with consistency obey the command of human authority without disobeying God. The answer was: "We ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts 6: 28.) This was the course that they pursued. If Caesar had ordered one of the apostles to be enrolled in one of his legions, does any one believe that he would have served? Does any one believe that Paul, who was a Roman citizen, would have entered the army, even though commanded to do so, under any circumstances whatsoever? It is preposterous for one to think that John or any of the faithful followers of Christ would have entered Caesar's army to kill and destroy men and property even though the Roman governments should have been invaded. What would the early disciples have done if they had been drafted into service to wage war? Would not they have refused and suffered the consequences? We find in their conduct an answer to the questions and arguments of those who urge the Christian

to take the sword in defense of property and life. They would not have drawn their swords to put to death their fellow men.

However, we are told that if the government commands one to go to war, the government takes the responsibility of the killing and the destruction, and, therefore, the soldier is not responsible for the evil done. We are told that responsibility in the war is transferred from the soldier to the government or army. I do not believe that such is the case. I find no authority for the Christian's resigning the responsibility of his conduct and committing his conscience to the will of another. No Christian can shift the responsibility of his conduct on another and act wickedly or even do good. The Christian never loses his identity and individuality whether alone or in the multitude; he is always responsible for the evil that he does, as he is to be rewarded for the good which he does. If civil authorities should direct the Christian to fire -his neighbor's property or to throw him over a precipice, should he obey? If the Christian should not obey this command from the government, then he has violated the popular interpretation of "Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Do governments ever make mistakes in their fiats, decrees, and commands? Do they ever command that which is wrong to be done? Must the Christian obey human authority, when that authority is diametrically opposed to God and his laws? It will not do to say that *all* of the commands of human governments are in harmony with God's law, for they are not. Might not the command to the Christian to go to war fall in the class of human blunders? Should the Christian do wrong because human authority commands him to commit the wrong? Who is so bold as to affirm that God, in the New Testament, requires his people to do everything that fallible human governments command? Does the command to obey "the powers that be" have any limitation whatsoever? Such an interpretation of Rom. 13 would make human authority above and superior to

divine authority; it would make man's will *supreme* instead of God's authority being supreme and final; it would make God's children servants of man instead of servants of God. If one command of the government can be disobeyed by the Christian when that command is contrary to God's will, why cannot another be, if it directs him to do something that is contrary to God's will? To refuse to obey when the command violates both conscience and the will of God is the final duty of Christians, *the imperative duty of all of God's people to-day*.

As no Christian can make resignation of his moral agency, he must ever be responsible for his conduct. As long as his conduct is directed by his own will, or as long as he submits his will to another to be used by another, so long will his personal responsibility continue. I cannot conceive of the Christian's responsibility ceasing when he becomes a soldier. The Christian is responsible for becoming a soldier. Surely that which is wrong or wicked for one man to do cannot be right for the Christian to do when he becomes a soldier. If it is wrong for one man to kill another when they are alone, how can it be right for them to get in a multitude and kill each other? The Christian religion nowhere grants a privilege to a Christian to do wrong even though the government demands him to do it. There is no immunity from the guilt because he is merely directed by another to do it. We are sometimes told that Christians do not bring about the circumstances which necessitates war, and are not, therefore, responsible for the war. All this may be true, but the Christian is responsible for voluntarily helping to wage the war; he is also responsible if he willingly lends himself to others to wage the war. His responsibility does not cease when he permits himself or yields himself to war.

Since war is contrary to the nature and spirit of Christianity, as has been abundantly shown in this study, it is wrong for the Christian to participate in war. Now, the civil authorities have no right to interfere with one's

religious acts. It is claimed that this government was founded upon the fundamental principle of freedom of conscience and religious liberty. Surely it must follow that the government has no right to command a Christian to do that which is wrong, or to do that which the spirit and nature of Christianity forbid the Christian to do. Hence, the Christian has no right, by divine authority, to obey a civil law which commands the Christian to do wrong. In such a case, it is the duty of the Christian— a duty imposed upon him by the Holy Spirit—to refuse to obey the civil authority under such circumstances. The Christian has no choice in this matter; he must obey God. To refuse to obey God is cowardice. The greatest courage that mortals can possess is displayed under such circumstances in one's obeying God. The coward is the one who yields and submits to human authority instead of standing courageously for right and for God and suffering unflinchingly and without murmuring whatever punishment may be inflicted upon him. God will bless him who with courage and with faith stands for the right, and I am persuaded that even the world will some day do honor to him who stands nobly and unwaveringly for the spirit and teachings of the New Testament Scriptures on this subject. The Christian should have only one fear: *he should fear to disobey God*. Such are the true heroes of earth. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. 10: 28.)

The Christian is a peacemaker. He must pray for peace, work for peace, and love peace. When he teaches and practices love, he will destroy all war and make war impossible, so far as God's people are concerned. Of course, there will always be confusion and corruption in political affairs, so far as human government is concerned. With human government there may always be war and rumors of war, but the child of God must walk in the footsteps of Christ and follow the guidance of the

Holy Spirit in paths of peace. The triumph of the gospel over the life of any one is the end of all disposition to wage war for any one or the waging of war with any one. The blood which flowed from Calvary to redeem man from sin and teach him the law of love must not be nullified by the saints in Christ to justify murder, whether it be an individual or a multitude. The blood of Christ sanctifies the path of peace for God's people as peacemakers.

CHAPTER X.

War and Christian Ethics.

Again let it be remembered that the purpose of these studies has been to obtain the will of God or mind of Christ in regard to his children under the Christian dispensation engaging in war. We have had nothing to say about any other class of people taking up arms and engaging in war; neither have we discussed the wars of the Old Testament; neither are we studying whether one nation can go to war with another nation. We are only concerned now about what God teaches Christians to do in regard to war.

Those who favor Christians' going to war and rely upon the New Testament for instruction should make themselves clear on this question. Do the New Testament Scriptures teach that Christians *may* go to war? Or do the New Testament Scriptures teach that the Christian *ought* to go to war? Is war in the class of the *permissibles* or in the class of *duties*? When nations engage in war, does Christ teach that his followers *must* go to war? What is the *Christian's* attitude toward war? Are Christians commanded to engage in war, or are they left to exercise their own judgment in regard to going to war? Shall Christians be the heralds of peace or the myrmidons of war? These questions ought to be made clear by the one who espouses the cause of war. The New Testament scripture ought to be found where the Holy Spirit commands the Christian to engage in war, if one claims divine authority for such a course. This is such an important question, fraught with such tremendous consequences with regard to the one who engages in war as well as the spirit and nature of Christianity, that no mere inference should be sufficient to determine this question with the Christian. No scriptural command has been

found, and I am persuaded that no just and logical inference can be drawn, that will justify the Christian's going to war. *The burden of proof falls upon the one who affirms that Christians may or should engage in war.*

Arguments are sometimes made on the ethics of war. The code of ethics for nations and armies has been compiled by statesmen of the world, who care but little about the ethics of Christianity. The national codes of the ethics of war change frequently. No classification of wars can place them in the duties of Christians. It matters not whether they be offensive or defensive wars, the practice" of soldiery cannot be a duty of the Christian. To the Christian, a war between armies or nations is only a great big fight between two opposing forces. Two men disagree and come to blows, and it is called only a "fight;" but when nations come to blows, it is called a "war." Of course, there are more complexities in the details and arrangements of the war, but this is due to the many individuals engaged in it. The principle seems to be the same whether between two persons or a hundred persons or between nations. To the Christian, war for passion's sake is only animal ferocity; war for ambition's sake is the sum of all crimes; war for national glory is wholesale murder; war for self-defense is to render evil for evil. Whether war be offensive or defensive, it is out of the class of Christian duties; it is contrary to the Christian's profession, though it may come within the scope of national rights.

Another argument has been based on the "theory of resistance." It is claimed that the Christian has a right to resist with carnal weapons an intruder on the rights of life, honor, or property. They claim that a Christian should resist the murderer of himself or family with physical arms; that he has the right—yea, it is his duty—to resist with deadly weapons the one who assails the honor of mother, wife, or daughter; that he may use deadly weapons in defending his right to property. Now, they say, if one can use weapons in resisting or defending

himself and family, then he can take up arms for his country and fight her battles. The whole argument rests upon an assumption. It is merely *assumed* that the Christian may or should use weapons in defense of life, honor, and property. Neither Christ nor any Spirit-guided disciple set an example for using carnal weapons even for self-defense; neither did they give any instruction to the Christian to do so. Again, if it be allowed that Christians should use weapons as described above, still it does not follow that they can go to war. In the argument here mentioned there is a false assumption, and then fallacious reasoning based on false assumption. This makes a very invalid argument, groundless and void. Jesus said: "Resist not him that is evil;" "Overcome evil with good;" "Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also;" "Render not evil for evil;" "Love your enemies." If it be granted that Christians could defend themselves with carnal weapons (though it is not granted), still wars do not come in the class of individuals defending personal rights. Some wars are aggressive; many are for "the maintaining the balance of power; some are based on assertion of technical rights; and a few are to repel invasions. The great majority of wars could in no sense be put in the class of personal rights. No law of ethics framed by man, no supposed law of nature, can contradict the law of God as expressed above. The Scriptures nowhere state that Christians may fight in wars that are defensive, neither is there any principle of Christianity that gives any encouragement to such a course. The New Testament Scriptures are clear in declaring the course of conduct for the Christian, and the child of God should rely upon Jehovah for defense in a persistent and determined course that is guided by the spirit of Christianity. It is absolutely safe for the Christian to pursue a course of non-resistance, so far as the use of deadly weapons is concerned. It is my deep, firm, and abiding conviction that war of every kind is incompatible with Christianity, and

that if God's people would live in harmony with this conviction all will be well with their souls. God will take care of all who trust him with the loyalty of their hearts and commit their souls in well-doing to a faithful Creator.

We are taught that we should be firm in all of our duties as Christians. If called upon to suffer for righteousness' sake, we must not yield to the evil one, but endure and suffer, taking the consequences as did Christ, as also did all the apostles and early Christians. They have left us an encouraging example in enduring suffering. The writer of the Hebrew letter seems to have rebuked some when he said: "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." (Heb. 12:4.) It is our duty to suffer even unto death, rather than do that which is wrong or displeasing to God. Many of the early Christians stood firm and suffered even unto death. Peter and John refused to obey civil authorities and said that it was better to obey God. Stephen died the martyr's death; he "resisted unto blood." There are times when it is the duty of the Christian to refuse to obey civil authorities; and when such is the case, we should do so respectfully, mildly, yet firmly, with a faith that never falters and a hope that cannot be dimmed.

It is sometimes urged that the Christian loses his identity—and, therefore, shifts his responsibility—in carrying out the command of the government. This cannot be true. No Christian can ever lose his identity before God; and his responsibilities cannot be shifted to another, especially when he volunteers to be used by another. The Christian can never resign his conduct and conscience to the will of another* and act wickedly. No Christian can do evil that good may come. No Christian can lose himself in a multitude of armed men and do evil and still not be responsible for it. No Christian can get into a crowd and do a thing which will be without merit for the good done or not be responsible for the crimes committed. It is better to suffer in jail with a

conscience void of offense than to lend one's self to the instrumentality of war.

These brief articles have been written in the fear of God and in the hope that all may see more clearly the mind of Christ in regard to this fearful question of war, and to encourage all of the Lord's servants to be faithful to him. It is not claimed that an exhaustive study has been made. May the Lord bless us in walking in the light, as he is in the light.

CHAPTER XI.

The Testimony of Many Brethren on War.

The study as set forth in the preceding chapters has been to determine what the New Testament teaches the Christian to do in regard to war. It was to determine the mind of Christ or will of God on the subject of the Christian's relationship to war as revealed in the New Testament. It has been ascertained that the spirit and principle of Christianity do not allow the Christian to engage in carnal warfare. This has been clearly, definitely, and emphatically presented in the former chapters of this study, and the subject might rest here, but for further emphasis it is thought wise to submit statements and interpretations of many wise and spiritual-minded brethren. They are quoted here to show that the conclusions reached in this study have been entertained by others who have carefully and profoundly studied this subject. We are in good company, and are thereby emboldened and encouraged.

Those who are familiar with church history know that the early Christians did not engage in war. Among these historians may be mentioned Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. It was a question with the early Christians whether one engaged in military affairs should even be admitted into the church.

"But how will a Christian war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received a formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, the centurion had believed; still the Lord afterwards, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier." (Tertullian, Volume I., page 171.)

"A sentence of death was executed on Maximilianus, an African youth, who was produced by his father as a

sufficient and legal recruit, but who obstinately persisted in declaring that his conscience would not permit him to embrace the profession of a soldier." (Gibbon's History, Volume II., page 60.) This was a young Christian who lived A.D. 284 to 300. Gibbon further says, when some Christians were aspiring to hold office: "The hope of the future candidates (Christians) was extinguished by the declared partiality of a prince (Julian), who maliciously reminded them that it was unlawful for a Christian to use the sword either of justice or war."

Alexander Campbell, in his address on war, has the following to say: "War is not now, nor was it ever, a process of justice. It never was a test of truth, a criterion of right. The precepts of Christianity positively inhibit war, by showing that * wars and fightings come from men's lusts' and evil passions, and by commanding Christians to 'follow peace with all men.'" "Popular Lectures and Addresses," pages 357, 363.)

Benjamin Franklin wrote: "We cannot always tell what we will or will not do. There is one thing, however things may turn or whatever may come, that we will not do, and that is, we will not take up arms against, fight and kill the brethren we have labored for twenty years to bring into the kingdom of God. Property may be destroyed, and safety may be endangered, or life lost; but we are under Christ, and we will not kill, or encourage others to kill or fight the brethren." ("Life of Elder Benjamin Franklin," page 287.)

J. W. McGarvey wrote, April 16, 1861: "In the meantime, if the demon of war is let loose in the land, I shall proclaim to my brethren the peaceable commandments of my Savior, and strain every nerve to prevent them from joining any sort of military company, or making any warlike preparations at all. I know that this course will be unpopular with men of the world, and especially with political and military leaders; and there are some who might style it treason." (" Life and Times of Elder Benjamin Franklin," page 287.)

Moses E. Lard wrote the following on the subject: "Now, since the act of going to war is shown by the preceding scriptures to be wholly inconsistent with the teachings of the New Testament, it is therefore shown to be, at least in the case of the Christian, a wrong act. Hence, since it is not an indifferent act, nor an act right simply in itself, but, on the contrary, is a wrong act, at least for the Christian, it thence follows that the State has no right to command the Christian to engage in it; and where the State does so command, every such command is a nullity in the sight of Christ, and is to be absolutely and unconditionally disobeyed by the Christian. Such is the conclusion which results legitimately from the premises now before us. Hence, on this conclusion we hold that every Christian man is bound to act, and that he has no discretion in the case. Consequently, if the State command him to go to war, let him mildly and gently, but firmly and unalterably, decline. If the State arrest him and punish him be it so; if the State even shoot him, be it so; *never let him go to war*" ("Lard's Quarterly," April, 1866.)

T. Fanning wrote the following: "Our Savior came to earth to subjugate bloody and deceitful men. When it was in his power to call to his aid more than twelve legions of angels, he quietly submitted to death rather than violate the rule of action that governed his life. The early Christians, it cannot be denied, followed the example of their Master. . . . Christ was not of the world, neither were his disciples, and Christians in the nineteenth century should not be instruments in the hands of the devil to carry out his purposes." ("Civil Government," by D. Lipscomb, page 155.)

"A hatred of war is an essential feature of practical Christianity. War makes villains, and peace brings them to the gallows, says the Proverb. War is pagan in its body, soul, and spirit, and not Christian. I stand in awe at the mighty and approaching conflict of the nations of Europe, and recoil with horror at the ferociousness of

man." (Jacob Creath, in *Gospel Advocate*, 1866, page 522.)

Jesse L. Sewell was waited upon by a committee to get him to make speeches throughout the country to enlist volunteers for the bloody War between the States. His reply was in these words: "Gentlemen, when I get to believe that Jesus Christ is an impostor, the New Testament a fable, and the Christian religion a fraud, then, perhaps, I might entertain your proposition; but as long as I believe that Jesus Christ is divine, the New Testament the word of God, and the Christian religion of divine origin, I cannot, for a moment, entertain it." ("Life and Sermons of Jesse L. Sewell," page 117.)

"Brother Kidwill was not only in favor of preserving the Union, but he was conscientiously opposed to Christians' engaging in carnal warfare. . . . But at the beginning of the war it took more courage to stand by one's honest and conscientious convictions that Christians should not fight and to stay out than it did to fight. But how Christian people can believe it is consistent with the religion of Christ to fight is a strange thing. Every principle of Christianity is opposed to Christians' engaging in war." ("Life of J. M. Kidwill," by E. A. Elam, page 50.)

"And that while Christ has taught us that we must necessarily be subjects of Caesar even unto death, we have never learned from Christ that we are to be soldiers for Caesar, even in the remotest degree, in war or in peace—to fight for him in bloody combat." (U. Wright, in *Gospel Advocate*, 1868, page 641.)

"The only ground on which we ever heard Christians justify themselves in going to war and slaying their fellow man is, the government was responsible, not the individual. If this be true, there is no limit to the necessity of obedience; at least, we are utterly unable to see

it." (D. Lipscomb, in *Gospel Advocate*, 1868, page 731.)

These quotations could be multiplied at great length, but these are sufficient to show that earnest, profound Bible students have arrived at the conclusion that the will of God for the Christian is to refrain from shedding the blood and taking the life of his fellow creatures in warfare.

CHAPTER XII.

War as Seen by Scholars and Warriors.

The Christian's attitude toward war has, we think, been clearly set forth from the New Testament Scriptures in a clear and definite way, and we are willing to let the question rest with the conclusion of the New Testament on war. However, it is thought wise to submit quotations and statements from scholars and statesmen who have studied the subject of war from another viewpoint. These quotations are submitted, not because the New Testament teaching is inadequate, but that all who are interested in this question may get the judgment of those who have studied it from a moral, economic, and legal standpoint. Some of these quotations are from men who have participated in war.

"War is the trade of barbarians." (Napoleon.)

"War is the father of other wars." (Colonel Gadke.)

"War suspends every idea of justice and humanity." (Nechar.)

"War is an awful misfortune even for the victor." (Adolph Richter.)

"The profession of a soldier is a damnable profession." (Sir John Sinclair.)

"War is unprofitable to the victor and to the vanquished." (Jean Bloch.)

"War is one of the principal causes of the degradation of the human race."
(J. Novicow.)

"War is nothing less than a temporary repeal of the principles of virtue."
(Robert Hall.)

"God is forgotten in war; every principle of Christianity is trampled upon."
(Sidney Smith.)

"War is not the triumph of righteousness. It is the triumph of brute force."
(Bishop Fraiser.)

"I cannot bear to go into the presence of God so angry as I always become in battle." (A soldier.)

"Its destructive effect upon the moral character of the nation that wages it is war's final condemnation." (Walter Walsh.)

"Reason is for us, for war is an outrage upon reason. Justice is for us, for war tramples justice under foot." (Henry Richards.)

"War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war, you would pray God you might not see another." (Wellington.)

"War, the expression of unreasoning anger. Coordinated and legalized violence to accomplish political ends." (David Starr Jordan.)

"War is antagonistic to Christianity for many reasons, but chiefly on account of the ugly passion it excites and the untold misery that it inflicts." (J. B. Remensnyder.)

"The influence of war on the community at large, on its prosperity, its morals, and its political institutions, though less striking than on the soldiery, is yet baleful." (W. E. Channing.)

"General Grant, offered a military review by the Duke of Cambridge, declined, saying he never wished to look upon a regiment of soldiers again." (In Andrew Carnegie's "League of Peace.")

"I have given four years of my life to leading the youths of Virginia to battle and to death. I want to give the remaining years of my life to teaching the youths of Virginia how to live." (Robert E. Lee.)

"War is the concentration of all human crimes. Under its standard gather violence, malignity, rage, fraud, perfidy, rapacity, and lust. If it only slew men, it would do little. It turns man into a beast of prey." (Dr. Channing.)

"Cicero says that war is a contest or contention carried on by forces; but usage applies the term not only to the action, but to the state or condition, and thus we may say, war is the state of persons contending by force." (International Law Digest.)

" I am tired and sick of the war. Its glory is all moon-

shine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry loud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell." (General Sherman.)

"Can we not learn that there is no more dignity, no more glory, about a national dispute, about a national conflict, than there is in a duel between two neighbors over the proper placing of a line fence? . . . War has no dignity. It offers a tragedy and a farce." (J. H. Ralston.)

"Yes, war is hell, as General Sherman long ago told us; but he did not go on to tell us why. There is only one possible reason. Hell is not a geographical term; it is merely the expression of the spirit or condition of its inhabitants. War is hell because it transforms men into devils." (E. H. Crosby.)

"On looking at all the wars that have been carried on during the last century and examining into the causes of them, I do not see one of these wars in which, if there had been proper temper between the parties, the questions in dispute might not have been settled without recourse to arms." (Lord Russell.)

"What distinguishes war is not death or disease or destruction or the other visibly woes that are drawn in its train. What distinguishes war and makes it the worst of all evils is not that man is thereby slain or despoiled, but that he is slain and despoiled by the cruelty, treachery, and injustice of his fellows. The distinguishing evil of war is moral evil. To go to war is to enthrone force and defy justice." (F. W. Hirst.)

"Dr. Johnson laughed much over Lord Kaimes' opinion that war was a good thing occasionally, as -so much valor and virtue were exhibited in it. 'A fire,' said Johnson, 'might as well be thought a good thing; there is the bravery and address of the firemen in extinguishing it; there is much humanity exerted in saving the lives and property of the poor sufferers; yet, after all, who can say

that fire is a good thing?" (Boswell's "Life of Johnson.")

"No citizen of a civilized nation is permitted to wage war against his fellow citizen or to redress his wrongs, real or fancied. . . . Now, nations being only aggregations of individuals, why should they be permitted to wage war against other nations, when, if all were classed as citizens of one nation, they would be denied this right of war and would have to subject themselves to the reign of war? Not long can this continue and commend itself to the judgment of intelligent men." (Andrew Carnegie.)

"I join with you most cordially in rejoicing at the return of peace. I hope that it will be lasting and that mankind will at length, as they call themselves reasonable creatures, have reason enough to settle their differences without cutting throats; *for, in my opinion, there never was a good war or a bad peace.* What vast additions to the conveniences and the comforts of life might mankind have acquired if the money spent in war had been employed in works of public utility!" (Benjamin Franklin.)

"The thirst of renown sometimes insinuates itself into our council under the hypocritical garb of national honor. It dwells upon imaginary insults, it suggests harsh and abusive language, and people go on from one time to another till they put an end to the lives of half a million of men. The call for war proceeds generally from those who have no active share in its toils. A military man becomes so sick of bloody scenes in war that at peace he is averse to recommence them. It is ignorance or levity which is always cruel, which makes cabinets lean to the side of war." (Prince Eugene.)

"Though the word of God requires implicit obedience to rulers in all things not contrary to the Scriptures, it utterly forbids compliance with such commands as are inconsistent with the gospel. We must obey God rather than man, and fear God as well as honor the king. But governments, whether monarchical or republican, make laws as they please and compel obedience at the point of the

sword. They declare wars and call upon all of their subjects to support them. But military governments, from their nature, necessarily infringe on the consciences of men." (D. L. Dodge.)

"I stand in awe at the mighty conflict to which two great nations are advancing, and recoil with horror at the ferociousness of man. Will nations never devise a more rational umpire of differences than force? Wonderful has been the progress of human improvement in other respects. Let us then hope that we shall at length be sensible that war is an instrument entirely inefficient toward redress of wrongs and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses. Were we to go to war for redress of wrongs that we have suffered, we should only plunge deeper into loss and disqualify ourselves for half a century more for attaining the same end." (Thomas Jefferson.)

"After the battle of Martinique, Benjamin Franklin wrote his 'Pest of Glory' as follows: 'A young angel of distinction, being sent down to this world on some business for the first time, had a courier spirit assigned him as a guide. They arrived over the sea of Martinique in the middle of the long day of an obstinate fight between the fleets of Rodney and de Grasse, when, through the clouds of smoke, he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs and bodies dead or dying, the ships sinking, burning, or blown into the air, and the quantity of pain, misery, and destruction. The crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing around to one another, he turned eagerly to his guide: "You blundering blockhead, you, so ignorant of your business; you undertook to conduct me to earth, and you have brought me to hell." "No, sir," replied the guide, "I have made no mistake. This is really the earth, and these are men. Devils never treat each other in this cruel manner. They have more sense and more of what men call humanity.'"

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE
AS A GIFT TO YOUR FRIENDS

Many good, liberal-hearted people, both men and women, give the Gospel Advocate to friends and relatives every year.

Why not send a year's subscription to the Gospel Advocate as a gift? Your friends will appreciate it, and you will be doing them and their families a real favor. The Gospel Advocate will go into their homes with a message of God's truth *fifty-two times* during the year. No other gift may prove such a blessing to them in time or in eternity. Send their names and addresses with your check, and the Gospel Advocate will be mailed to them. The subscription price is \$2 per year.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.

TRAVELS IN BIBLE LANDS

BY ANDY T. RITCHIE

A book giving a brief account of a four-months' trip through the countries of the East, dwelling especially on the interests of Egypt and Palestine. It is an unconditional treatise by one who has made the Bible his chief study for several years, and who made a trip for the purpose of obtaining information along the line of Biblical and historical studies, and demonstrating to our boys that it does not require a million dollars to see the "Holy Land."

"It was my pleasure and profit to read 'Travels in Bible Lands' when it was first offered to the public, and I thought then, and think now, that it is one of the most interesting and profitable books that has ever been written on travels in the Holy Land."

—F. W. Smith.

PRICE, \$2.00, POSTPAID

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

BY LIPSCOMB AND SEWELL

(Edited by M. C. Kurfees)

Questions bearing on the Bible, the church, the Christian life, and kindred subjects, are constantly coming up. You need some good book to help you along this line. The new book, "Questions Answered," by David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell, will be of great assistance to you. Those who have seen and examined it closely are highly pleased. W. A. Schultz, a very useful evangelist residing at El Paso, Texas, writes: "I have 'Questions Answered,' by Lipscomb and Sewell, compiled by Kurfees, and it contains more Bible information than any book I ever saw. I have all the works of Campbell, Milligan, Franklin, Errett, McGarvey, Rotherham, B. W. Johnson, and others of our noted preachers and educators, but none was the peer of David Lipscomb." Cloth bound; 700 pages.

PRICE, \$4.00, POSTPAID

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN THE WORSHIP

BY M. C. KURFEES

This is the most comprehensive book on this important subject now before the public. In it the Greek verb "psallo" is philologically and historically examined, together with a full discussion of kindred matters relating to music in Christian worship. The book is the result of a lifetime of critical study and research, and has become the standard of information on the music question. It has been highly recommended by scholarly brethren in the church of Christ and in the religious world.

PRICE, \$3.00, POSTPAID

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.