

Fighting Christians



W. Carl Ketcherside

Loyd Cochran
Summersville,
Missouri
Fighting Christians

1947

▼

Answering the Question:

**"WHAT SHALL A CHRISTIAN DO
IN THE WAR WITH THE AXIS POWERS?"**

▼

*A book for the folk at home, and
the boys away from home.*

▼

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE
7505 Trenton Ave.
UNIVERSITY CITY, MO.

*To the boys from our Saint Louis Churches
especially, and to all Christians from
everywhere in the service of our
country, fighting for liberty and
right, this book is affec-
tionately dedicated.*

*"May God speed you on your way, and bring
you safely back to us"*

FOUR REASONS FOR THIS BOOK

Today the whole world is seething with conflict! Wars and rumors of wars are on every hand. America has become involved in this titanic struggle. As a result the age old question of the obligation of Christians under such circumstances has again arisen. Shall we bear arms in defense of our nation? Shall we train and fight for the principles which we hold sacred? Or, shall we register ourselves as conscientious objectors to all warfare, either aggressive or defensive? This book is sent forth to help you understand my position upon these issues. It is printed for the following reasons:

1. Since the United States again adopted the conscription method of raising an armed force, and especially since the treacherous attack of the Japanese against Pearl Harbor, on December 7, of last year, my mailbox has been flooded with questions from brethren, especially young brethren, asking what we should do in these perilous moments. Due to the immense amount of work which I am regularly carrying on, it is impossible for me to answer all personally by individual letter.

2. It has been stated by some, that the Church of Christ is opposed to defending our rights against deliberate aggression of totalitarian powers, and thus I feel that a wrong impression has been gained by the world, and the church suffers from a misconception of its true attitude. I do not, herein, attempt to speak for the church as a whole, for we have no system of popery, but I candidly and freely state that I do not believe the various congregations of the Church of Christ take the attitude above referred to.

3. It seems to me that in many of the discussions thus

far indulged in on this controversial issue, certain laws of scriptural interpretation have been violently set aside, or positively ignored, and thus the cloud of doubt has deepened in the hearts of many sincere, but uninformed souls. I believe that if we rightly divide the Word of Truth, we can all stand as a unit upon these questions.

4. Certain preachers, especially in the south, have publicly declared from the pulpit and taken the position over the radio that all who go forth in defense of the United States in this present war, are murderers, if they carry a gun and participate in combat. The hearts of many parents have been made to bleed by these false theories, and the sacrifices of the fairest flower of American youth, have been discounted and brought into disrepute. Herein, I am going to defend the mission upon which those brave, hardy and courageous young men have been sent, and if I can do anything to keep their name from being besmirched and their lives from being maligned, I shall do it, insofar as I can go hand-in-hand with the scripture.

No History Needed

It is not essential that I should waste precious space in detailing for you the steps which brought about our entrance into this conflict. Those events are so recent, that to rehearse them would be only a refreshment of your memory. Suffice it to state, that the cruel, hero-worshipping, God-dishonoring political doctrine of Nazi-ism is being forced upon the world by its fuehrer, Adolf Hitler. Aligned with him in this diabolical attempt to destroy the free governments of men from the earth, are representatives of two other totalitarian systems with headquarters in Italy and Japan. Tyrannical, despotic men with love for bombastic display and materialistic might are driving their mechanized armies in

a last ditch fight to banish from existence the elements which have made civilization reach the high pinnacle which it occupies today.

The issues are clear. If we win, the "four freedoms" of speech, press, worship and that from fear will not perish. If we lose, we shall sacrifice all the rights of free men, and be driven like cringing beasts to the lairs which we are permitted to retain. There can be no alternative for us. He who draws back and flinches from duty is aiding the forces of aggression to the extent in which he refuses to bear his share of the tasks allotted. It is up to all the remaining free peoples of the earth as to what the future will hold for their posterity. What shall the Christian do?

CHAPTER I

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND WAR

I am aware of the fact that we are not under the Old Testament as our rule of faith and practice. Yet, we must also recall that "the things which were written aforetime, were written for our learning" (Rom. 15:4). Foolish indeed then, would he be, who refused to learn that which is advanced in the Old Testament as to the nature of God.

God ordained civil government as a police power to protect man from murderers, who would not be restrained by their natural love for others or their respect for His image, from the taking of human life. Here is the law which ordained that government, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, *by*

man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." There are three persons mentioned in that verse, the murdered, the murderer, and the third person ordained of God to exact the murderer's life for his crime. This passage (Gen. 9:6) definitely passes the sentence upon the murderer and at the same time details his punishment. That punishment is death! The punishment is to be enforced by a third party appointed by God "to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil". As long as it can be proven that man was made in God's image, that long will the scripture authorize the taking of the life of a murderer, be he guilty of a crime of state, national or international importance.

It is false to say as do some that civil government began with Satan, and as a result of man's rebellion. David Lipscomb declared that it began with Nimrod and Babel (Gen. 11:1-9) but he missed it, both in time and place. The statement made many years before Nimrod, that "by man shall his blood be shed" presupposes a trial, and execution of the sentence. Had this been stated, "by God shall his blood be shed" and had there been no provision for man as an avenger of blood, then we might well conclude that God was always going to exercise police power over his people, but such is not the case.

Then it is evident, that God appointed men to exercise his wrath upon those who are guilty of the wilful taking of human life. Some are so foolish as to argue on this passage that when a murderer kills a man, then a man kills the murderer, that someone else has to kill the other, and so on ad infinitum. This is ridiculing God's law, and since God gave the instruction, it is an accusation against God and equivalent to calling HIM a murderer. One should be careful that in an attempt to uphold a speculation, he does not hurl accusations broadside at the Almighty.

Distinction Between Murderer and Executor

In Num. 35:19 God declares, "The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer: when he meeteth him, he shall slay him". Here the Lord makes a clear distinction between the murderer and the revenger appointed to shed his blood. The "revenger of blood" could not kill a man inside the cities of refuge, but "If the slayer shall at any time come without the border of the city of his refuge whither he has fled; and the revenger of blood find him without the borders of his city of refuge, and the revenger of blood kill the slayer; HE SHALL NOT BE GUILTY OF BLOOD" (Num. 35:26, 27). This shows that those who absurdly reason that if the avenger kills the murderer, he becomes equally guilty and will have to die also, are ignorant of God's legislation.

In the New Testament we learn that the higher power (civil government) is the minister of God (that is God's servant as was the revenger of blood under the Old Testament). As a matter of fact the same God who ordained the avenger of blood under the Old Testament ordained the higher powers according to the new. "The powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). Under the Old Testament the avenger bore a sword, he was the minister of God, he executed wrath upon him that did evil. Under the New Testament Civil Government "beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil" (Rom. 13:4). Therefore when the United States rises up against a group of international bloodthirsty murderers and removes them by force of arms, they are acting as God's ministers. Is it wrong for our boys to help God's minister? Is it wrong to do God's will? I grant that it isn't always an easy thing to do, nor is it always the most pleasant thing, but many of God's assignments are neither easy or

pleasant. God plainly declares that those who act in a capacity as his appointed revengers are NOT GUILTY OF BLOOD. So that nails the idea that a soldier of the United States army is a murderer just because he is a soldier!

Aggression and Defense

I am opposed to territorial aggression. I do not think it is right for me to go across the street and pick a fight with my neighbor. I do not think I should agitate him until he will come across the street so I can whip him on my own side of the road. I'm taught to "Follow after things that make for peace" (Rom. 14:19). But if I am living as peacefully as possible, staying on my side of the fence and taking care of my business, and then my neighbor out of sheer malice comes sneaking up behind me and stabs one of my children in the back, I do not think that God expects me to use only moral suasion to take the blood-dripping knife from his hand. I want peace and I am convinced that this nation wanted peace, but there are some people and nations that will not permit you to enjoy that peace. Thus God gave us the instruction, "Live peaceably with all men, as much as lieth in you". If that last means anything at all, it means we are to continue in peace to the limit of our possibilities. We are not to be the aggressors.

Under the Old Testament God was presented as a God of War. A few scriptures only will suffice to show that he acknowledged the name, taught his people to war and recognized the wars as His own.

When the Lord had just destroyed the entire Egyptian army with one grand exhibition of power and strategy it was said, "The Lord is a man of war: the Lord is his name" (Exo. 15:3). This with later conquests was referred to as the war of the Lord (Num. 21:14).

Judges 3:1, 2 says, "Now these are the nations which the Lord left to prove Israel by them, even as many as had not known all the wars of Canaan; only that the generations of the children of Israel might know, **TO TEACH THEM WAR**, at the least such as before knew nothing thereof". David declares, "He teacheth my hands to war; so that a bow of steel is broken by my arms" (2 Sam. 22:35). It will be useless for the opponents of our position to refer to the next verse and try to emphasize the gentleness of God and ask how God could be gentle and warlike at the same time, for the remainder of this chapter shows conclusively that David was talking about real, literal warfare, and not some spiritual battle. God actually allied himself with his people and their sword became His, or better **HIS SWORD** became theirs. That's why we have the expression, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon." (Jud. 7:20).

In spite of all this, God did not encourage his people to become aggressive, or to desire the land of nations round about. The iniquity of the Amorites being full, he sent them into Canaan to blot out those treacherous, idolatrous nations. But after the conquest, he expected his law to develop Israel into a quiet, peace-loving, and agricultural race. To that end he blessed them bountifully with plenty in their harvests, and for awhile they were content, until nations attracted by their potential wealth came to trade and barter, remained to dwell and thus established their idolatrous worship. Even during their regime of peace, God recognized the possibility of attack and provided against it, "And if ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppreseth you, then ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets, and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies" (Num. 10:9). This indicates that the Father of Heaven realizes that even when we are

at peace there may be those who will mistake that peace for unpreparedness and attack without warrant and justification. Thus he taught Israel to summon their armies and fight the "enemy that opposeth you".

In Eccl. 3:8 we are plainly told that there is "a time of war and a time of peace". When is the time of war? Is it when we get ready to go out and despoil some other people living in quiet? I think not! We are never to disturb the peace! But when is it? Evidently it must be at such time as another nation will rise up, and attempt to destroy our homes, kill our little ones before our eyes and defile our wives in our presence. If that isn't a time for war, then pray tell us when it is! And if you'd protect your children if the enemy was at your gate, what about when that enemy stands at the gate of the nation? Sometimes men attempt to break the force of Eccl. 3:8, by referring to verse 4, which says there is a "time to mourn and a time to dance". They ask, "When is the time to dance?" Even if I didn't know, that still would not break the force of the statement, "There is a time of war", but we can answer. Of course Solomon did not have reference to the modern dances of mixed couples, but to the times of rejoicing when men expressed their happiness by this method, as in the case of David, the father of Solomon, who danced for joy when the ark was being returned. The time to dance is the opposite of the time to mourn, as this verse shows. Now, when is the time of war? Evidently it must be at such time as peace and quiet is disturbed!

Causeless Bloodshed

All through the Bible God makes a distinction between the shedding of blood without cause, and that which is shed in justifiable war. Abigail, the wife of Nabal the wicked churl, said to David, "That this shall be no grief unto thee,

nor offence of heart unto thee, either that thou hast shed blood causeless, or that my lord hath avenged himself" (1 Sam. 25:31). Here we learn that it should be a grief of heart and an offence of conscience to shed blood *without cause* or for mere personal vengeance. The opposite then must also hold true that blood shed in a worthy cause should neither be a grief in remembrance nor an offence against conscience. The Book is very specific in defining the matter for in listing the seven things which are abominable unto God it specifies, "Hands that shed *innocent* blood" (Prov. 6:17).

The line between the blood of war and that of peace is maintained ever. Joab, captain of the host, moved by envy and other unjustifiable reasons killed two men. David condemns him saying, "He shed the blood of war in peace, and put the blood of war upon his girdle that was about his loins, and his shoes that were on his feet" (1 Kings 2:5). Bloodshed in war, and bloodshed for personal gain in time of peace are different! When Jonathan, the friend of David was pleading with Saul his father he asked the question, "Wherefore then wilt thou sin against innocent blood to slay David without a cause?" It seems that Jonathan recognized the difference between death of one who was guilty, and for sufficient cause; and the death of one who was innocent and without cause. Why cannot we recognize that same difference, for legislation has not changed the principle? Principles never change! Laws which regulate them may, but the principles are fixed. It is a principle of God that whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. If it was entirely wrong to take up arms, there would be no one to enforce God's decree.

CHAPTER II

THE CRUX OF THE TROUBLE

The controversy as to the place Christians should occupy in their national relationships, arises because of a failure to remember that we owe a dual allegiance in this life. We are citizens of two commonwealths and thus subject to two governments and sets of laws. I am a Christian and an American. As such I am subject both to the law of God and to the laws of the nation. I did not cease to be an American when I became a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven. Had I done so, I would no longer be subject to the Constitution of the United States, for it governs only citizens. It does not govern people in England, France or Italy, for they are not citizens of this country. That men retain their national rights and citizenship after their obedience to the gospel is proven by the case of Paul who said, "I *am* a man which am a Jew of Tarsus . . . a citizen of no mean city" (Acts 21:39). But because Paul's family in Tarsus was entitled to free citizenship as Romans, he for the advantage it gave him, appealed to the law saying, "I am a freeborn Roman (Cp. Acts 22:25-28). This proves that a man is still a national citizen, entitled to the rights and prerogatives of such citizenship after he becomes a member of the church.

One of these kingdoms cannot be advanced or protected by force of arms; the other can. The church is not to make converts at the point of a bayonet. You cannot shoot a man full of the gospel, or carve him down to God's pattern. Mohammed made the mistake of thinking that you can advance a spiritual realm by carnal weapons. Christ knew and

taught better. But the UNITED STATES can and must be defended by arms if defended at all. You cannot throw Bibles at Nazis, or subjugate Mussolini with tracts, any more than you can convert men with buckshot! Christ also knew that! So he carefully states the difference between the two as I shall show.

Jesus said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:21). This teaches us that there is a national government of which we are citizens, and likewise a spiritual. The two do not conflict. We owe something to both of them, and to each we are required to give what belongs to them. We look to our government for protection from enemy forces. Then we owe it in reciprocation protection from those forces that would seek to overthrow it. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". If I am too cowardly or too unconcerned to protect my government in time of peril, what right have I to seek redress from them in time of personal need? But someone says, "We are not to give them our armed service!" Then where is the scripture that says so? Certainly the sword belongs to civil government! Certainly it is to be wielded for our protection! If I am a part of that government I am a party to its "sword wielding", whether I pull a trigger, or pull the switch that makes the bullets in the factory. Foy E. Wallace says, "It is a weak theory that assumes that Christians are set aside from society in such a way that society must perform a necessary service for them which they cannot perform for themselves or for society. God is no such respecter of persons".

"Then Would My Servants Fight"

When Christ was before Pilate, that Roman procurator was being urged to do away with him on the ground that he

claimed a kingship and thus was attempting to supercede Caesar. Christ satisfied him of the fact that his kingdom was not in conflict with Caesar's at all. Pilate asked,

"Art thou the King of the Jews?"

Jesus answered, "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 not my kingdom from hence".

This showed Pilate that the kingdom of Christ was not intended to conflict with earthly government, and he went out again unto the Jews and said, "I find no guilt in him at all".

This episode shows that we cannot fight in defense of the church or to advance the gospel, but as citizens of an earthly kingdom we can fight a defensive warfare. Christ in this demonstrated that he did not endorse an aggressor nation, by the statement, "Then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews". They would have defended him had he been the king of an earthly government. But we are citizens of an earthly government, and as such Christ says that we may fight a defensive warfare. How strange that men go to this and try to prove it is wrong for Christians to defend themselves at all. David Lipscomb deposes on this as follows, "Christ disavows the earthly nature of his kingdom; declares it is of a nature so different from all worldly kingdoms, that his servants could not fight for his kingdom; if they could not fight for his kingdom, they could not fight for any kingdom, hence in this respect could not be members and supporters of the earthly kingdoms". Let's see how that will work:

1. A horse differs from all other animals.
2. You must not eat a horse.
3. Therefore you must not eat any animal.

All that Christ said in this passage was that his servants could not fight to establish his kingdom, seeing that it was spiritual. But he endorses the idea that nations exist by defensive warfare, for if his nation were one like the United States, he declares his servants could fight to protect their government. Certainly to protect your king would be to protect him in whom the government was vested!

"I Appeal Unto Caesar"

"Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat where I ought to be judged . . . for if I be an offender, or have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if there be none of those things whereof they accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar"! When Paul made that statement he knew what was entailed in it. He realized that it would require military escort and protection for him. He knew that because of the hatred of the Jews there might be bitter fighting and bloodshed, yet he asserted his rights as a citizen and declared that since he was not guilty of treason, no man would deliver him to the tormentors. Should he have submitted without making such an appeal? Should he have said that his conscience forbade him doing anything which might call out the army and occasion use of the sword? He appealed to the government for protection! Do you think he would not have been willing to accord them the same protection?

"Beareth Not the Sword in Vain"

Objectors often quote Rom. 12:19 "Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath". They seem to forget that as we go into the next chapter we are told who or what the avenger is that is to execute the wrath of God. Ci-

vil government is "the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil". Would you say that Hitler has not done evil? Would you say that the slaughter of the Poles, the execution of innocent hostages, the persecution of the Jews, were all good works? They are either good or evil! If you say they are evil, since they are of international character, they must be punished by international opposition. God has ordained a method whereby we can settle disputes between brethren of a private nature, then he has ordained a way whereby we can settle disputes in the church as a whole; BUT, he has also ordained a way whereby we can discipline nations that refuse to stay within the bounds of social propriety. For the first two, he has set forth disciplinary powers in the church, for the last he has ordained civil government. In every case, he has set in order a policing power comparable to the offense.

"The powers that be are ordained of God" (not the devil)!! "He is the minister of God (not the devil). "For this cause pay ye tribute for they are God's ministers (not the devil's). Romans 13:1-4 clearly teaches that under the New Testament dispensation as well as under the Old, God has placed the sword in the hands of civil government. Now a sword is not used to spank babies with. It represents the highest form of punishment against evil on this earth. It stands between us and the tyranny of men, for anarchy is opposed not only to our nature, but also to the wishes of God.

God's nature has not been altered! The death of Christ took out of the way the "handwriting of ordinances" but did not abolish, abrogate or alter the nature of His Father. It has always been the policy and practice of God to punish the wickedness of one nation by another civil government. It still is, for Romans 13 applies to the New Testament age.

It is argued that we should not obey the civil govern-

ment when it asks us to do something that is wrong, and bearing of arms is wrong. That's begging the question, for that is the point at issue and it has to be proven that it is wrong for Christians to aid in defense of a righteous nation. No one has ever cited the passage yet that shows it. One man said then if the government legalizes adultery we will all have to engage in it. That's foolish! The Bible plainly says "Thou shalt not commit adultery" so in this "We ought to obey God rather than man". But where does it say, "Thou shalt not defend your nation?" if you'll show us, it will settle the point and in that too, we'll obey God rather than man. Does some one say "The Bible says thou shalt not kill". We'll take that up a little later and quite thoroughly.

"Sell Your Garment and Buy a Sword"

Let's read the Master's teaching in Luke 22:35-38. "And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. Then said he unto them, But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip, and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough."

Here the Savior tells his apostles that while he was with them he exercised care over them, but now since his life is to end as the prophets had foretold, they would be "on their own". He instructed them to take their purses, as well as their scrips (provision bags) and if they had no sword to sell a garment and buy one. We all understand why they were to take the purse. It was to purchase food. We understand

why they were to take the provision bag. It was to carry their groceries. Then why was each to have a sword? To open their canned goods? To slice their lunch meat? We hardly think so! Why did people in those robber-infested countries carry a sword? For protection, was it not? I do not believe that the Savior advocated the apostles purchasing swords to terrorize the inhabitants of the country! I do not think he wanted them to have swords in order to force men to come into the church. But since he was no longer with them, he wanted them to look out for their own protection!

A ridiculous position is sometimes taken on this verse with regard to the phrase, "It is enough". Some seem to feel that when the men said they had two swords, the Christ meant two swords were enough. And they urge that later on when Peter used a sword on the servant of the High Priest, this gave Christ a chance to rebuke the idea of carrying swords at all. If that were the case, why did he not rebuke them then and there and save the servant's ear? Was Christ wilfully encouraging Peter to do something, so he could rebuke him? The truth of it is that the term "It is enough" has nothing at all to do with the number of swords. It refers to the matter of ending the conversation. Young's Analytical Concordance says on this matter, "It is enough—that is, enough has been said on the subject (for Jesus saddened at the paltry ideas of the disciples breaks off in this way the conversation; the Jews when a companion uttered anything absurd, were wont to use the phrase, 'Let it suffice thee') Deut. 3:26."

The Savior said "HE that hath no sword let HIM sell HIS garment and buy one". The disciples showed their two swords, as if they thought they would always be together and two would suffice for the entire group. No wonder

Christ said "It is enough" i.e., "say no more about it". Nothing can destroy the force of the reason that is here given that the disciples of Christ when not afforded protection miraculously were to defend themselves.

CHAPTER III

"PUT UP AGAIN THY SWORD"

It is sometimes urged that Jesus discouraged self defense when he said to Peter, on the occasion of his smiting the servant of the priest and cutting off his ear, "Put up again thy sword into his place for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword". (Mt. 26:52). Instead of that he only teaches again what I have repeatedly affirmed that we are not to use the sword in defense of Christ and his Kingdom. He was not to be defended with earthly weapons. He says so in the next verse (53) when he declares that he could have summoned twelve legions of angels to his aid. Then he hits the center of the matter in verse 54, when he asks, "But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" Had the disciples defended the Savior and driven off the mob, they would have frustrated the purpose and prophecy of God.

But this passage teaches even more, it actually informs us that those who become aggressors, and take up the sword, shall perish with the sword. That means God has decreed that aggressors shall die by the sword. But if it is wrong for those who are non-aggressors to take up the sword in defense, then pray tell me how this passage will ever be fulfilled? Who is going to wield the sword that will kill the

man who deliberately takes up the sword? Someone has to do it! Whoever does it will not be violating God's Word, for God has ordained it, for the protection of society.

"Thou Shalt Not Kill"

Over and over we hear this passage used today, and generally completely out of its place, and constantly misapplied. It makes no difference how you pin men down on the scriptures, and how ridiculous you make their theories appear, they will always bob up with the statement, "Thou shalt not kill". Many times they use it in such a way as to make God contradict himself, and when that is shown, they use the old subterfuge, "Well it's there and I can't take it out". True indeed, but you can keep from warping it around to fit some foolish theory of your own. You can use it as God intended!

This is one of the ten commandments and found in Exodus 20:13. Whatever it means there it will mean wherever found stated just that way! Does the command "Thou shalt not kill" prohibit taking of human life under every circumstance? Absolutely not, for in the very next chapter God positively commands that murderers, kidnappers, and those who smite or curse a father and mother shall be killed. He says "*He shall surely be put to death*" (Exodus 21:12-17). Is God guilty of violating his own command in almost the next breath? Is the Bible contradictory? Remember God was talking to HIS PEOPLE and telling them to kill certain individuals! This law was to Israel! Was it wrong for God to give such orders? NO! NO! NO! Such persons as God deemed worthy of death were to be put to death. That was God's law, and it in no wise abrogated or contradicted the previously given law, "Thou shalt not kill".

Then what does that law mean? Simply this, "Thou shalt not murder a man". What is murder? It is the wilful

and malicious taking of a human life without cause! But someone says they think it means any killing of a human being, even by legal process. All right, tell that to God! He passed sentence on those who committed crimes of a certain nature and said put them to death. If you want to call God a murderer, that's between you and God. He'll take care of you, if reason will not reach your heart. Those who insist in quoting this to prove that soldiers are murderers had better think twice. Remember that this statement is first found in the Old Testament and there when given its boundaries are defined. Under it God permitted His people, yea, even commanded them to put down aggressors and other criminals by death. Now the commandment means the same wherever it is found as it meant when God gave it. When Christ said in the New Testament "Thou shalt not kill", he meant the same thing that God meant in the Old Testament when he said "Thou shalt not kill". But under the Old Testament God permitted defense against civil criminals. Then Christ was not condemning such either, unless he condemned his father's interpretation of it. But someone says that the Savior makes it stronger when he says, "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment". I agree and affirm that whosoever shall kill a man without a cause will be in danger. But what about killing where there is a cause? Have we not shown you that God makes a distinction between causeless slaying and that which is justifiable in fulfillment of His word. Christ is careful to make that SAME DISTINCTION even in cases of anger!

"Weapons Not Carnal"

Those who oppose defensive warfare under any condition, quote freely 2 Cor. 10:4, "for the weapons of our warfare

are not carnal". To handle this passage is to handle all that is produced by those who oppose our position. On this matter we need but say that this has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject at hand, viz., the relationship of Christians to civil government. It deals with the subject of the church and spiritual responsibility. Thus it is with every quotation brought forth and applied against justifiable defense. They all are misapplied, for they deal with the church and not with civil government. We agree that the weapons by which the church is upbuilt and sin conquered are not carnal. That this has nothing to do with defending ourselves against Hitler, with his tanks, planes, guns and ships will be seen by the results achieved by the use of these non-carnal weapons, i.e., casting down imaginations, and bringing into captivity every thought. Have I just imagined that there is a man like Hitler? Is Mussolini just a phantom thought that has struck the world? Then it will take something besides the weapons mentioned here to defend ourselves against such men.

"Not Learn War Anymore"

Isaiah prophecies (2:4) "and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and neither shall they learn war anymore". It is suggested that this refers to the church, and we have no right to train for warfare since that institution has come. To which we reply with a comment by E. M. Zerr, on the passage, "This means the sword shall not be resorted to in defense of the church. It is also true that the tendencies of the church are against war, in other words, an institution affecting men in all the relations of life, and yet which exists without the use of carnal warfare, would logically tend to produce peace as a 'by-

product' ". Whatever it means, it does not apply to 1942, insofar as the nations of the earth are concerned, for they certainly have lifted up the sword against each other. It is admitted that we would like to see peace reign, but it does not, so what shall we do about it? We cannot ostrich-like hide our heads and pretend that there is no strife. War has been forced upon us, we are in it whether we want to be or not! Shall we dreamily look for some Utopia while the dictators trample under foot the priceless heritage of our fathers? "Is peace so sweet, or life so dear, as to be purchased with chains and bondage?"

It is a law that those who receive stolen goods are equally guilty with the thief who stole them! If our soldiers are murderers for obtaining our freedom, are we not equally guilty for sharing in it and enjoying it, when they paid for it with blood? Do you not realize that this nation exists because of its strength in war? We enjoy our rights today because others fought for them. If it was wrong to obtain these rights in that fashion, is it not wrong to enjoy them? Then why not leave the United States and go to one of the subjugated countries, where people are spoiled and desecrated, rather than be a partaker of that which was won on the battlefield? Can it be possible that in some instances we are unconscientious "fraidy-cats" when it comes to risking our all on the battlefield?

New Testament Soldiers

When certain publicans came to John the Baptist and asked what they should do, he replied "Exact no more than that which is appointed you". He did not tell them that civil government was of the devil and when they were baptized, they would have to quit their job of taking taxes, but he sim-

ply instructed them not to abuse their power, but be honest in their dealings.

When soldiers asked him what they should do, he did not tell them that since they were preparing for the kingdom of heaven, they would have to quit their job, but he merely said, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely and be content with your wages". In other words do not abuse your power to place any man in false fear who is not guilty, do not falsely accuse and be content with your soldier's allowance, i.e., do not use your force of arms for extorting more from anyone. If it was incompatible with the kingdom whose coming John was preaching, for its members to remain soldiers, why did he not tell them to get out of the army, desert their colors, and lay down their arms? Instead he told them how to conduct themselves as soldiers, and how to feel concerning their allowances.

In Acts 10:7 a "devout soldier" is mentioned, and the same chapter tells us that a captain of a band was converted. Not one word is said about his leaving the army after his conversion. The Holy Spirit is strangely silent on this matter. If it was incompatible with Christian living for one to remain in the armed forces of his country, here would have been the perfect opportunity to have informed us. Some men say the Bible doesn't tell us when a liar is converted that he gave up lying, neither does it tell us when an adulterer is converted that he gave up his sin, but that is understood. Why is it understood? Simply because the New Testament plainly says "LIE NOT one to another" and "FLEE FORNICATION". But where does it say, "You shall not defend your country from an aggressor"? Find that passage and you'll take Cornelius out of the army like you took the former liar out of the "Liar's Club" or the adulterer out of his lust. But if you can't find it, it will insofar as

God's Word is concerned leave Cornelius still at Caesarea and still over his devout soldiers. Can you get Cornelius out of the army without adding to God's Word to suit your theory? Someone says, "But do you not add to God's Word when you say he remained in the army"? Listen, all I said was that insofar as God's Word was concerned, he remained there. He was in the army when the angel appeared and told him his prayer was heard, he was in the army when he sent a devout soldier to Peter, he was still in there when baptized. Can you take him out without adding to God's Word, or laying down a command which God has not given?

"Shall We All Enlist?"

It is argued that if it is God's will and method to put down aggressors by warfare, then all of us are duty bound to enlist at once or we will rebel against God's will. That argument is based upon a lack of knowledge of the true situation even as it pertains to the science and technique of war. If everyone were to enlist at once, it would overthrow the very purpose of enlistment! There must be someone to man the machines, someone to produce the farm products, etc. Thus the government has developed an orderly method of selective service and in obedience to it, we can carry on a systematic method of training for the greatest benefit to our country. Let's be in subjection to the powers that be. In so doing, we will please God, obey His word and render the greatest service.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is sent forth with a prayer to Our Heavenly Father that it may help answer some of your questions. No one realizes more than do I, the seriousness of recommending that you take up arms in defense of democracy and

the American way of life. Too, no one can realize more fully the terrible consequences which we shall suffer, if we have become so decadent in spirit, so spineless in courage that we sit back and let the Juggernaut of Nazi-ism crush between its powerful treads the Truth of God and the pillars of civilization which we have helped to erect. Today, those of us who are young stand as it were a wall between the living and the dead. Let us say as did those brave ones of the first World War, "They shall not pass!" May it be said of us as it was spoken to Joshua,

"Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest".



Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation!
Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just;
And this be our motto: "In God is our trust";
And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

CHRISTIAN COUNTY REPUBLICAN
OZARK, MO.